

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

<u>SB 1109</u>	PA 476	<u>1975</u>
Judiciary 995-		(1)
Senate 2119, 2849		(2)
House 4504-4513, 4756-58, 4910-4913		(17)

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY 20p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2015

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

JUDICIARY
PART 3
806 - 1250

1975

have an existing procedure that really well handles this whole area. And it is just a bill that would terribly confuse things in the future.

Representative Healey:

And you concur Doctor.

Dr. Johnson:

I do indeed.

And one of the major reasons I concur is that it imposes on our clinicians the obligations of making conclusionary testimony. And we feel that this is a obligation before the hearing to make these determinations not the psychiatrists to make these determinations. And we would respectfully like to see that bill killed because we don't want to be put in the position of making legal determinations. We would be glad to testify to fact but not to conclusions.

I would like to speak to the following Bills SB 1472 and 1109 which are related. 1472 is actually a bill that simply eliminates the opportunity of our facilities for sending individuals who have been sent there under 53-847 on temporary leaves. The following bill adds the facilities for sending individuals - adds the court hearings in order to determine that. So actually 1472 is unnecessary, it is incorporated in 1109.

And insofar as 1109 is concerned, the first section indicates that release on a temporary basis shall be in accordance with provisions spelled out under Section 2. Unfortunately under Section 2, that language was originally designed for permanent release of such individuals and the bill has not been changed to make the distinction between permanent release and temporary release and we would like to suggest that the wording be changed to incorporate that opportunity also. We tend to treat many of these patients that come to us from corrections or from the courts, just as we would any other patients and one of the therapeutic modalities is the prospect of temporary leaves or furloughs to determine how an individual is going to function outside of a structured situation. The corrections already has this opportunity without court hearings and although we are not opposed to court hearings prior to such temporary release, we would like to have that specifically spelled out in that bill if the legislature so determines that it wants to eliminate such releases.

The only other bill that we have some concerns about and this was alluded to earlier by Mr. Gormley is SB 1559. And the department was somewhat surprised by this bill for two reasons. One, already in the statutes was the opportunity for the court to release such individuals under such conditions and supervision as the court deemed appropriate. Now one would presume in the past that the court had deemed it appropriate that such individuals be discharged to the care and supervision of the Department of Mental Health, it has had

S-109

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1975

VOL. 10
PART 5
2066-2073

May 19, 1975 C.G.C. 41

Judiciary, substitute Senate Bill 1109 AN ACT CONCERNING COMMIT-
MENT OF ACCUSED WHO APPEARS TO BE INCOMPETENT TO STAND TRIAL.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lieberman.

SEN. LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, the absence of the distinguished Chairman
of the Judiciary Committee, who is in the chair at the moment.
But in the style that he has made almost inimitable, I would move
this matter to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, it will be placed on the Consent Calen-
dar.

THE CLERK:

Calendar #707 file #568 favorable report joint standing
committee on Appropriations, substitute House Bill 5275 AN ACT
PERMITTING A LOCAL FIRE DEPARTMENT TO INSPECT ANY STATE OWNED OR
LEASED BUILDING.

THE CHAIR:

He hasn't asked for recognition . . . Senator Ciarlone.

SEN. CIARLONE:

Mr. President, thank you very much, Mr. President. Move
for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report, and
passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

. . . (inaudible) accept and passage, will you remark?

SEN. CIARLONE:

S-110

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1975

VOL. 18
PART 6
2629-3188

Thursday, May 29, 1975

38.

THE CLERK:

roc

Page thirteen under the title DISAGREEING ACTION. Cal. 654, File 563 and 684. Favorable report joint standing committee on Education, Substitute for House Bill 6747, AN ACT CONCERNING DUTIES OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS RELATIVE TO SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION, AS amended by House Amendment Schedules A and C and Senate Amendment Schedule A.

THE PRESIDENT:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN:

Mr. President, could we Pass that temporarily.

THE PRESIDENT:

Certainly. The bill is passed temporarily.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 706, File 719. Favorable report joint standing committee on Judiciary. Substitute for Senate Bill 1109, AN ACT CONCERNING COMMITMENT OF ACCUSED WHO APPEARS TO BE INCOMPETENT TO STAND TRIAL, as amended by House Amendment Schedules B and C.

THE PRESIDENT:

Senator Lieberman.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance and passage of the joint committees favorable report as amended by the House.

THE PRESIDENT:

Will you remark on it?

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, I would move it to the Consent Calendar.

H-166

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1975

VOL. 18
PART 9
4041-4553

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 02, 1975

35
LFU

The Committee on Finance. Two stars, Calendar 1059, Substitute for Senate Bill 1109, AN ACT CONCERNING COMMITMENT OF ACCUSED WHO APPEARS TO BE INCOMPETENT TO STAND TRIAL. Committee on Judiciary.

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 21st, Representative Thomas Clark.

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

I move the acceptance of the substitute Bill. Acceptance of the Favorable Report and passage of the substitute Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Basically, this Bill provides a method first for examining an accused who is or may be found unable to understand the proceedings against him at time of trial. Unfortunately, under the current statute as it exists, it places an accused who is incompetent to stand trial, in the position of having to fight that challenge of his competency. If he is found incompetent under present statutes, he may simply be committed and he will not be placed in any treatment facility and may end up serving his time without a chance for review. What this Bill would attempt - what we would be trying to do in this Bill and I believe it would accomplish it, is to provide that if a person is found incompetent to stand trial, he would then be committed under the Probate Court as a person who is insane, rather than a person who merely is incompetent who then stays in sort of a limbo. I urge passage of the Bill.

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

36
LFU

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 119th.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Mr. Speaker, I have questions on this Bill that I'd like to direct to the gentleman who reported the Bill out. Through you, Mr. Speaker, in Section 1 b, are we increasing the required responsibility of the individual appointed to assist the defendant?

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

I'm sorry. Through you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stevens, someone was talking in my other ear. If you would repeat the question.

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 119th.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman did not hear my question.

THE CHAIR:

Will the Chamber please come to order? The gentleman from the 119th care to restate his question.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to Section 1 B, Lines 22 through 27. Is the requirement for one or more psychiatrists for a clinical team of psychiatrists a new requirement?

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

37
LFU

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, are the obligations of the clinical team increased in terms of scope in any way by the additional language?

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, in fact, I believe they would be limited by this Bill.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would indicate the limiting factors.

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

Rather than examining, as is in Line 45, etc., under prior law, it merely stated that he shall examine him as to his mental condition and make a written report. Now the examination is limited to the ability to understand the proceedings against him and assist in his own defense.

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 119th.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the intent of that language then is to confine the examination to two specific points set forth in the Bill?

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the intent of the Legislation is to define from a legal standpoint, what the test of competency to stand trial is and presumably that is what the examination would be directed at.

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

38
LFU

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, then directing our attention to Section 3 D of the Bill, would the gentleman would the gentleman please explain the intent behind the reduction of the maximum period of confinement to 18 months prior to review.

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, through you, I believe when I brought the Bill out I pointed out that when you're defending a person who is both incompetent and insane, if a person under the current act is found incompetent, he unfortunately has no limit to his incarceration and, therefore, you have to try to have the person found competent to stand trial and then insane. Because the treatment under the insanity provision is far more inclusive as in terms of review of his condition. This is merely attempting to eliminate that unfortunate occurrence.

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 119th.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, under the present procedures with an individual who would be charged and incarcerated, are the Probate Courts involved presently?

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

In incompetence? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

39
LFU

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Through you, in regard to a person who has been charged with a crime wherein incompetence is raised as a defense?

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 119th.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, does section 3 and 4, when read together in the Bill now involve the Probate Courts in this proceeding?

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, only after the 18 months have elapsed or prior to that time, there is a determination that the party will not be able, within the maximum length of time he could possibly be committed for the crime involved, he would not at any time be competent to stand trial, at that point, he would be subject to the Probate Court's jurisdiction.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, by involving the Probate Court, are we then saying that the same standard for commitment and conditions of commitment for those who have been charged with serious crimes would apply for an individual not charged with a serious crime, but found incompetent and committed to one of the State's facilities?

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

40
LFU

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

I believe the thrust of the question is, as I understand it, if a person is found incompetent or such that he cannot understand the proceedings against him, that he is in fact, mentally ill concerning the charge against him and that, as such, he would be treated the same as a sane person, same rights of review through the Probate Court as an insane person would have. Rather than setting up the category of incompetence, with unlimited incarceration and insanity for the same offense with right of review.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS (119th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Bill? Gentleman from the 136th.

REPRESENTATIVE NEVAS (136th):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment, LCO 7895 and I would ask him to please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Clerk please call House A.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment, Schedule A, LCO 7895, Mr. Nevas of the 136th. In Line 179, delete the period and insert the following. Semi-colon, provided none of the provisions herein shall prevent prosecution of the accused at the time of his official discharge in accordance with Section 4 of this Act or Section 17-178.

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

41
LFU

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 136th.

REPRESENTATIVE NEVAS (136th):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption of A. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE NEVAS (136th):

Yes. Mr. Speaker, this Amendment merely makes clear what I think is the intention of this change in the statute to the affect that if a person is discharged under the terms of this Act or under the terms of 17-178 which is the Probate committal, and if they are discharged, they are in affect being held competent, that they are still liable for prosecution for whatever crime may have been committed and that they could not use any committment or any adjudication under the terms of this Act as a bar to such prosecution. As an example, Mr. Speaker, supposing someone had committed the crime of murder, under the changes now being proposed, the end of 18 months they could be released or could be further committed by a Probate Court for say an additional 6 months and then released. The purpose of my Amendment is to make certain that at the time of such release, they could still be prosecuted which I think is the law but I want to be certain it is clear in this statute.

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 21st.

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

42
LFU

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK (21st):

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that I must disagree with the Amendment. I'm afraid the thrust of the Amendment would be to undo what is trying to be done with this Bill. In affect, what is being said in this Bill is that a Court is deciding that during whatever maximum term of a person charged with an offense might be, that at some point in time, there's going to be a report that that person will not gain the competency to stand trial for that full period of time which he might be incarcerated. And then he would be released under the jurisdiction of the Probate Court based on that. Now, with this Amendment back in again, you would once again eliminate from a defense standpoint, possibility of incarceration; the possibility of seeking as a defense. You would once again be required to go to insanity and to try to defeat incompetency. The reason being that when you are found - when you raise the defense of insanity, you are not guilty by reason of insanity. That is a final determination of no guilt. What we were trying to do under the incompetency statute, is say as best we can, that there will be a termination point at the end of 18 months where the Court will say on incompetency, in affect, you're not guilty because of incompetency. You will never be able to understand these proceedings against you. In affect, we're trying to undo the problem which you have now, where the State must put on all of its evidence, establish its case, then you raise the defense of insanity. By this Amendment, what you in affect will be saying to defense counsel is you can't do that - you can't raise incompetency and preclude the necessity of a

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

43
LFU

trial. You'll still have to go through the trial and still get a finding of not guilty because of insanity. What we are trying to do is say after 18 months in effect, the Court may find you, as you were, as you correctly stated, at the end of 18 months, the Court may make a determination that even as to somebody who has pleaded incompetency, there is no likelihood they will ever understand the offense against which they have been charged and, therefore, we are going to commit these people to Probate Court. If you put this Amendment in, you are going to once again eliminate the incompetency and you're going to require the State to put the trial on and you're going to require defense counsel to raise the defense of insanity so that they can get a not guilty finding.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Amendment? The gentleman from the 72nd.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY (72nd):

It is with great reluctance that I take issue with my esteemed colleague, Mr. Clark. But my own personal opinion is that Mr. Nevas is correct and I support the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on House Amendment, Schedule B? If not, the question is on adoption of House B. All those in favor will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The ayes clearly have it and House B is adopted and ruled technical. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended by House A and B? The Chair would make a correction. We have just adopted

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

44
LFU

ICO 7895, House Amendment, Schedule A. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended by House A? The gentleman from the 72nd.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY (72nd):

Mr. Speaker, Representative Sweeney informs me that he wants to prepare an additional Amendment. He is not on the floor of the House. I assume he is in the Legislative Commissioner's Office.

THE CHAIR:

What is your pleasure, sir?

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY (72nd):

In courtesy to him, sir, I move that this be passed temporarily.

THE CHAIR:

Is there objection? Hearing none, the matter will be passed temporarily.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1061, Substitute for Senate Bill 1640, AN ACT CONCERNING STATE GRANTS IN AID FOR HOUSING CODE ENFORCEMENT.

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 110th, Representative Donald Esposito.

REPRESENTATIVE ESPOSITO (110th):

Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill in concurrence with the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on acceptance and passage in concurrence. Will you remark, sir?

H-167

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1975

VOL. 18
PART 10
4554-5052

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

287
LFU

The gentleman from the 66th.

(Tape #34)

REPRESENTATIVE HARLOW (66th):

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe my vote was recorded and I'd like it to be recorded in the affirmative. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Representative Harlow from the 66th in the affirmative.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting	120
Necessary for Passage	61
Those Voting Yea	114
Those Voting Nay	6
Those Absent and Not Voting	31

THE CHAIR:

The Bill is passed as amended by House B. The gentleman from the 72nd.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY (72nd):

Mr. Speaker, on page five of today's Calendar, I ask that the Clerk call Calendar No. 1059.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1059, Substitute for Senate Bill 1109, AN ACT CONCERNING COMMITMENT OF ACCUSED WHO APPEARS TO BE INCOMPETENT TO STAND TRIAL.

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 72nd.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY (72nd):

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day, we considered this Bill and in

4757

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

288
LFU

connection with that consideration, we adopted House Amendment, Schedule A. I move reconsideration of that action. I was on the prevailing side.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on reconsideration of House A. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY (72nd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Subsequent to the action in adopting House A, there was considerable and in-depth discussion between Mr. Clark and Mr. Nevas and other interested parties as a result of which, I understand that they have agreed upon a substitute for that Amendment. We will not meet, as I understand it, until next Tuesday but in between time, there will be technical Sessions and, as a result, this is the only time when a Motion for Reconsideration can be made with the full body present. My understanding is that Mr. Nevas is in agreement with the Motion to Reconsider and he was the proponent of that particular Amendment. Therefore, I move Reconsideration of this Amendment or action.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on Reconsideration? The gentleman from the 136th.

REPRESENTATIVE NEVAS (136th):

Mr. Speaker, I support the Gentleman's Motion for Reconsideration.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on Reconsideration? If not, all those in favor of Reconsideration of House A, signify by saying aye. Those who are opposed? House A is Reconsidered and is now before us. The gentleman from the 72nd.

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

289
IFU

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY (72nd):

Mr. Speaker, I now move rejection of House A.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on rejection of House A. Will you remark?

If not, all those in favor of the rejection of House A signify by saying aye. Those who are opposed? House A is rejected.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY (72nd):

Mr. Speaker, I now move that this matter be passed retaining its place on the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on pass retaining this particular item. Is there objection? Hearing none, the item is retained.

THE CLERK:

Page six Calendar 1074, Substitute for House Bill 7228, AN ACT CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FRANCHISOR AND A FRANCHISEE.

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman from the 92nd. The gentleman from the 77th.

REPRESENTATIVE FERRARI (15th):

Mr. Speaker, the 15th. Mr. Speaker, I move for Suspension of the Rules for immediate consideration of this one starred item.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on Suspension of the Rules for immediate consideration. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Rules are Suspended.

1975 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE

THURSDAY

MAY 22, 1975

290
LFU

REPRESENTATIVE FERRARI (15th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE FERRARI (15th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Clerk please call House A.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment, Schedule A. Offered by Mr. Ferrari of the 15th. Delete the existing section 2, Lines 52 to 60 and substitute the following in lieu thereof. "Section 2. Section 42-133g of the General Statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof. Any franchisee may bring an action for violation of section 42-133e, 44-133g inclusive in Superior Court to recover damages sustained by reason of such violation which action shall be privileged with respect to its assignment for trial and where appropriate may apply for injunctive relief as provided in Chapter 916. Such franchisee, if successful, shall be entitled to costs including, but not limited to, reasonable attorney's fees."

REPRESENTATIVE FERRARI (15th):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption of House A. Will you remark? The gentleman from the 15th still has the floor.

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 27, 1975

124
mmsOn page 4. Calendar 1059. Substitute for Senate Bill 1109.AN ACT CONCERNING COMMITMENT OF ACCUSED WHO APPEARS TO BE INCOMPETENT TO
STAND TRIAL.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 21st.

REP. CLARK (21st):

I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable
Report and passage of the Bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage and will you remark
sir?

REP. CLARK (21st):

Yes Mr. Speaker. I would yield to Mr. Nevas who has a...an
Amendment on this Bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 136th.

REP. NEVAS (136th):

Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk call LCO 7895 please?

THE SPEAKER:

Clerk please call LCO 7895, House Amendment "A".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. Clark of the
21st, Mr. Nevas of the 136th. LCO Number 7895:In line 179, delete the period and insert the following:
"semi-colon provided none of the provisions herein shall prevent prosecu-
tion of the accused at the time of his official discharge in accordance
with Section 4 of this Act or Section 17-178, unless such prosecution is
barred by Section 54-193."

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 27, 1975

125
mms

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 136th.

REP. NEVAS(136th):

I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of House "A". Will you remark sir?

REP. NEVAS (136th):

Yes Mr. Speaker. If the Members of the House will recall, last week we considered this Bill and I offered an Amendment at that time, which Mr. Clark opposed and which Mr. Healey supported. The Amendment was adopted. Subsequent to the adoption of the Amendment, the three of us conferred, along with other Members and it was decided that, we were both right. Mr. Clark was right and Mr. Healey and I were right. Just before the adjournment on Thursday, Mr. Healey moved re-consideration and the Amendment was reconsidered and defeated, rejected.

For the purpose of offering the Amendment that we're now offering now. The Amendment that we're now offering Mr. Speaker, in effect, provides for the prosecution of persons who are discharged unless their prosecution is barred by the Statute of Limitations. And essentially that last part is the new language, the part...part dealing with barring a prosecution when barred by the Statute of Limitations.

I think now we have a good Amendment and I think we can all support it.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair would like to correct its presenting the Amendment at hand as House Amendment Schedule "A". It should properly be ascribed House Amendment Schedule "B" and the Chair will incorporate the motion

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 27, 1975

126
mms

for adoption of the gentleman from the 136th as that viz a viz House "B".
Remark further on House "B"? Remark further on House "B"? If not, the
question is on its adoption. All those in favor will indicate by saying
Aye. Opposed? House "B" is adopted and ruled technical. Remark further
on the Bill as amended? The gentleman from the 37th.

REP. TOBIN (37th):

The Clerk has an Amendment LCO 9720.

THE SPEAKER:

Clerk please call House "C".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "C" LCO 9720, offered by Represent-
ative Tobin of the 37th, Mr. Sweeney of the 46th:

Add a new section 4 as follows:

REP. TOBIN (37th):

Mr. Speaker, may I be granted permission to summarize?

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection to the gentleman from the 37th summarizing?
If not, the gentleman from the 37th for that purpose.

REP. TOBIN (37th):

Mr. Speaker, this would amend Section 53a-47 by adding a
new sub-Section (i). The Section deals with those who are committed after
having been found criminally insane. The Amendment makes clear that where
a person is dangerous to himself or others, he should be confined under
conditions of maximum security. I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Remark further on House "C"? The gentleman from the 46th.

REP. SWEENEY (46th):

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 27, 1975

127
mms

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to support this Amendment. I think it's...it's needed in this Bill and it certainly will go a long way in securing safety for the employees and people in the community where a mental hospital is situated. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Remark further on House "C"? If not, the question is on its adoption. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed? House "C" is adopted and ruled technical. Remark further on the Bill as amended by House "B" and "C"? The gentleman from the 21st.

REP. CLARK (21st):

Mr. Speaker, basically we went into this Bill in...in detail last week and what it does is provide some finality to the person who is committed prior to trial. It gives him somewhat the same right that the person who is found not guilty by reason of insanity.

It's a good Bill and I believe it should pass.

THE SPEAKER:

Remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further? If not, will the Members please be seated and the staff come to the well? The machine will be open. Have all the Members voted and is your vote properly recorded? The machine is still open. The machine is still open. Have all the Members voted? Is your vote properly recorded? If so, the machine will be closed, and the Clerk will take a tally.

THE ASSISTANT CLERK:

Total Number Voting.....	139
Necessary for Passage.....	70
Those Voting Yea.....	139
Those Voting Nay.....	0
Those absent and not Voting.....	12

THE SPEAKER:

The Bill as amended is passed.