

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

<u>HB6170</u>	PA 428	<u>1977</u> <small>FAV COY</small>
<u>Senate</u> : P.2907-2911		(5p)
<u>House</u> : P.2942-2944		(3p)
<u>Judiciary</u> : P.295-300, 330-331		(8p)

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

Total 16 PAGES

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

S 126

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1977

VOL. 21
PART 1
495-504

SENATE

WEDNESDAY

MAY 25, 1977

62
LFU

SENATOR DE PIANO:

Mr. President, I move for passage of the Bill as amended.

THE CHAIR:

The Clerk will announce another Roll Call vote please.

THE CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call in the Senate. Would all Senators be seated. An immediate Roll Call in the Senate. Would all Senators please take their seats.

THE CHAIR:

This is on the Bill. The machine is open. The machine is closed.

The vote on the Bill.

TOTAL VOTING	35
NECESSARY FOR PASSAGE	18
YEAS	21
NAYS	14

The Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Turning to page ten of the Calendar, Calendar 914, File 811, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary, Substitute for House Bill 6170, AN ACT CONCERNING ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN MATRIMONIAL JUDGEMENTS as amended by House Amendment, Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Guidera.

SENATOR GUIDERA:

Mr. President, I move passage of the Committee's Favorable Report as amended by House Amendment, Schedule A.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY

MAY 25, 1977

63
LFU

THE CHAIR:

Senator Guidera, will you remark?

SENATOR GUIDERA:

Mr. President, this is an important piece of legislation for us to pass this year and one of the more important ones that's come out of the Committee on the Judiciary. What this Bill does is to change the method by which matrimonial judgments; that is, divorce judgments or judgments affecting custody, support, alimony and that sort of thing - how they are enforced here in the State of Connecticut when they have been rendered in other states. The House Amendment which was tacked on, House A, makes it clear that both of the parties to this matrimonial matter in another state, have to have appeared in that other state so that, for example, what I am about to say about this Bill would not apply to a husband who went to Las Vegas, stayed the required six week residency period, without the wife being there, without filing an appearance, and went ahead and got a divorce judgment in that state affecting alimony, support, marital status and so on and so forth. But would only be a judgment in which both of the parties appeared in another state.

Now, the method, Mr. President, by which two parties who are divorced, let's say in the State of Massachusetts, would come to the State of Connecticut and have it enforced and one of the parties has moved since the date of the judgment to the State of Connecticut and fails to make his alimony payments, how would the wife get him in Connecticut to make those payments which are now in arrears? The method presently used would be that a certified copy of the judgment would be brought to the State of Connecticut and a whole new action would be begun by the wife in the State of Connecticut to enforce a judgment

SENATE

WEDNESDAY

MAY 25, 1977

64
LFU

that has been rendered by a sister state. And let us bear in mind that the United States Constitution requires that the State of Connecticut give full faith and credit to the Judicial Acts and deeds of other states. This Bill does not apply to Mexican divorces, Haitian divorces or divorces anywhere outside the State of Connecticut. What it does do is it says to that wife, you can bring your Massachusetts judgment into the State of Connecticut and it becomes in twenty days, and can be enforced within twenty days, a judgment of the State of Connecticut.

It is the judgment as it may have been modified in the State of Massachusetts from time to time and the State of Connecticut would be able to modify that judgment themselves. They would, when they make modifications on that judgment, have to apply the substantive law of the jurisdiction in which the judgment was originally rendered which would, in the example that I have used, the law of the State of Massachusetts.

I am sure this is all as clear as mud to anyone who is not an attorney in this Circle, but in effect, what it does is to facilitate the carrying out of judgments that have been rendered by the courts of other states. Presently, we are facing the problem of child napping by fathers and mothers from one state to another. We are faced with the problem of a husband who takes off from the state where the judgment was rendered and fails to pay alimony, fails to pay support or fails to do some other thing which is required in the original judgment and the wife has to chase him all over the United States of America. He can hop, skip and jump from one state to another so that in effect, quite often the people who really suffer the greatest are the children of the marriage because he's failing to make the support payments. This will facilitate the idea that the original judgment will be enforced here in the State of Connecticut. You may be

1977 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

WEDNESDAY

MAY 25, 1977

65
LFU

wondering if any other state has such a law. There are fourteen states that have similar laws. You may say what about the other 36? The answer to that is we are in fact, by this law, granting to 36 states in this union, something that they do not grant to us when we take a Connecticut to another state. For the number of states who are passing laws like this, it's growing every year and we are simply adding our names to that long list. It's a good piece of legislation. It's long overdue and if anyone has any questions, I'd be more than happy to try to answer them. But if there is no objection, I'd move this matter to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR: (Senator Fauliso in the Chair.)

Remark further? Senator Barry.

SENATOR BARRY:

Mr. President, I have no objection. I would like to ask through you, sir, to Senator Guidera, do I understand that you mentioned child napping - in the event that that occurred, that this would - this law would obviate the necessity of a hearing in order to enforce a decree of the court having to do with custody? As I understand the present law, and it's always seemed to me to be a terrible need to have uniform child custody act in this State, which we do not have and could not get reported out of the Judiciary Committee. I'm wondering if this kind of a - if this law does the same thing, in effect?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Guidera.

SENATOR GUIDERA:

Mr. President, through you to Senator Barry, I too, am sorry that the Judiciary Committee did not report it out. I think we will in 1978 report out the proper statute involved. But what it would mean, passage of this Act, is that it does

SENATE

WEDNESDAY

MAY 25, 1977

66
LFU

not take the place of the statute you hope Judiciary will report out - what it does is cut down the number of days in which a resolution of this problem could be arrived at. Under the present system, you have the cumbersome process of suing on the judgment and getting a whole new judgment here in the State of Connecticut. Within five days, the wife would simply notify the husband to the affect that she has filed a Massachusetts judgment in the State of Connecticut. He has his time period in which to contest the judgment and on the basis of that, it controvenes Connecticut policy. It was obtained illegally in the State of Massachusetts - some such valid defense to the jurisdiction of the State of Massachusetts in this case. But what this statute would do would be to cut down on the number of days in which it would take the wife to get some resolution to get the child back, but it does not take the place of a child napping statute which I hope the Judiciary Committee will report out favorably next year.

THE CHAIR:

Any further comments? Is your Motion to place it on the Consent Calendar, Senator Guidera? Hearing no objection, so ordered. Senator Hudson, would you please assume the Chair?

THE CLERK:

Continuing on page ten of the Calendar, Calendar 915, File 779, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary, Substitute for House Bill 6329, AN ACT CONCERNING SUPERIOR COURT JURISDICTION TO CONFORM INSTRUMENTS TO FEDERAL TAX REQUIREMENTS.

THE CHAIR: (Senator Hudson in the Chair.)

Senator DePiano.

SENATOR DE PIANO:

Madam President, I would ask for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

H-188

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1977

VOL. 20
PART 7
2539-2978

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 10, 1977

57
djh

MR. O'NEILL (34th):

Mr. Speaker, may this item be passed retaining its place.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You've heard the motion that this item be passed retaining its place on the Calendar. Any objection to the motion? Any objections? So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 916, substitute for H.B. No. 6170, File No. 811, An Act Concerning Enforcement of Foreign Matrimonial Judgements, favorable report of the Committee on Judiciary.

MR. SPONHEIMER (103th):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Would you remark, sir?

MR. SPONHEIMER (103rd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment. Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 7743 offered by Rep. Lowden.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Clerk has LCO 7743 designated as House Amendment Schedule "A". Will the Clerk please call and read.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO 7743, offered by Rep. Lowden, 146th district.

In line 9, before the period insert ", in which both parties have entered an appearance".

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 10, 1977

58
djh

MR. SPONHEIMER (103rd):

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of explanation, I yield to the gentleman from the 146th, Rep. Lowden.

MR. LOWDEN (146th):

Mr. Speaker, the amendment has been offered because there has been some concern expressed that the bill as written would permit the court in Connecticut to honor judgments in other jurisdictions wherein both parties had not appeared. The amendment cures that problem, and I would move its adoption.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Would you remark further? Would you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. All those opposed? House "A" is ADOPTED and ruled technical.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A"?

MR. SPONHEIMER (103rd):

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the merits of the particular bill, this bill would allow a person who obtains a divorce or dissolution of marriage in another state to render--or excuse me, to take that decision and file it with the Clerk of the courts in Connecticut. Upon filing that decision, it will become, it would have full effect here in this state. Rep. Lowden's amendment to make sure that each party was represented at the particular hearing in the jurisdiction where that decree was rendered will allow each party to have notice by the state in Connecticut when the decree is filed in Connecticut. It is mandatory upon the court to notify the other party to the decree that such notice was filed.

What this will do, Mr. Speaker, is prevent the cumbersome method which we have right now of when a foreign decree and by foreign I mean from another jurisdiction, not necessarily from another country, when a decree is granted and one wishes to make a motion on that decree in Connecticut, they must file a whole new action which is very time consuming and very expensive. This will alleviate that action but will still provide for all proper notices to any particular party to this action.

I move the bill, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark further? If not, will the members please be seated, will the staff and guests come to the well of the House. Will the members please refrain from playing with their buttons. The machine will be open. Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If so, the machine will be locked, the Clerk please take a tally.

The Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting.....	145
Necessary for Passage.....	73
Those Voting Yea.....	145
Those Voting Nay.....	0
Those Absent and Not Voting.....	6

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The bill as amended is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 917, substitute for H.B. No. 6091, File No.812,
An Act Concerning the Appointment of Municipal Auditors.

MR. O'NEILL (34th):

Mr. Speaker, may this item be passed temporarily please.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

JUDICIARY
PART 1
1-353

1977
INDEX

MR. SCHOONMAKER: It's a basic policy decision as to who, you are going to have pay for the education of children. I suppose it get's right down to that.

REPRESENTATIVE GUIDERA: Right. Suppose you have a case and most of the time this -- "rights" in it -- a dissolution of marriage question anyway. Usually, the childred are way below eighteen, nobody wants to make provisions for them after they are eighteen, and I'll see what I can afford, is usually the attitude of the husband. Don't you think this Bill needs to be changed, so that, again, to cut down on expense and to cut down on multiplicity of actions, provide that a child in a divorce situation like that, might actually, either have counsel, but would intercede in that particular case and the decision would be made in that particular case. Or, later on if the child is fourteen and later on fours later he is eighteen, now the father under the spearation agreement has not made provision, if the child wants to come in, let him come in, in the same action, because the court does have continuing jurisdiction in a divorce action.

MR. SCHOONMAKER: I'm not so concerned about the vehicle. I'm not so concerned about whether they intervene in an existing action or bring a new action. I think it's probably less expensive for the parties if they can possibly use an existing vehicle. If there is a law suit pending, that they can intervene in, because of the continuing jurisdiction. It's probably better for them, to go into that action. But, if there is no action pending, say there is no divorce between the parties then I think they have no alternative, but to start a new law suit, unfortunately.

SENATOR DePIANO: Are there any further questions on that?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: The next Bill I have in front of me is 6170 An Act Concerning Enforcement of Foreign Matrimonial Judgments, and to those who aren't familiar with family law, this may seem a little confusing at first, but let me tell you the basic underlying philosophy of this Bill and what the problem is.

have
When you highly mobile society, such as we have now, and you obtain a judgment in the State of Connecticut and you have litigated for a considerable period of time and negotiated you finally got a judgment or an agreement and you have a Court Order, that says, that the parties are to conduct themselves in certain ways visa vie each other, such as, the for example the husband may be required to pay alimony and child support and a lot of work and wffort went into the rendition of that judgment, and then the next thing that happens is that the -- on of the parties moves to another State.

Now--and the party who moves to the other State then defaults. Let's say that the father is obligated to pay support under Connecticut judgment and he moves to New York and he doesn't

MR. SCHOONMAKER (Continued): pay. Well traditionally, traditionally, the law has not done very well by the mother in Connecticut. Because she has to go down to New York, especially on alimony, child support is, I suppose, a slightly different problem, but she has to go down to New York and start a new law suit in New York, and that's expensive and it's time consuming and and by the time she's got her judgment there, he's in Alabama. And, they keep bouncing around, now this is a very, very difficult problem for the alimony recipient or the child support recipient, to pursue people throughout the country, to be hiring lawyers, starting law suits. It's not a good use of judicial time it's expensive for the parties and it's very frustrating and results often, at times, in extreme hardship.

Now, what we would like to do is get some better cooperation between the States-- among the States. With respect to the enforcement of sister State judgments. This Act, this Bill that you have in front of you, 6170 is designed to help people from other states, who want to enforce a decree of another State in Connecticut. Let's say somebody from California, let's say the husband moves to Connecticut, the wife in California, then comes to Connecticut, she does not have to start another law suit. She simply goes to the Superior Court and she files her California Judgment and the Affidavits required by the Statute here and that becomes a Judgment of the Connecticut Superior Court, enforceable by contempt, without having to have her go through the whole process of starting a suit in Connecticut on the Judgment.

There's a further problem because if she comes in with her California Judgment and sues in Connecticut on the Judgment, the only thing that the Connecticut Court is going to give her is the arrearage accrued up to the time they go to court. And the court is not going to order payments into the future, so that this out of State litigant now is faced with one law suit after another to collect a series of accrued arrearages.

Now, we can avoid all that, we can avoid all that, all we have to do is register the California Judgment in Connecticut and enforce it by contempt. The same way you would enforce any Connecticut Order.

SENATOR DePIANO: Are you aware of any other State that have this?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: This particular Act, no this particular Bill I happen draw myself. And so-- but I will tell you what I am doing with it. I'm very active in the American Bar Association Family Law Section, and I am, at the present time seeking to have this made either a Uniform Bill or an (OVERLAPPING CONVERSATION)

SENATOR DePIANO: What about the constitutionality of the proposal that you have here? Have you checked into that?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: Yes. This Bill tracks very closely to Statutes that you're probably familiar with.

One, that you pass here, which is the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act. You're probably very familiar with that. That Reciprocal Enforcement Judgments Act, is almost identical to this, except it applies, some people say, to money Judgments only.

SENATOR DePIANO: With this, this proposed Act, would that bind the Court in Connecticut to apply the Law of California for example?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: It does say that you have to look to California Law because under full faith and credit, a California Judgment can be modified in Connecticut only if the California (OVERLAPPING CONVERSATION).

SENATOR DePIANO: --- or an attach upon the Divorce Decree in Connecticut for fraud upon the jurisdiction of the State of California for example?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: Yes. That's all provided for in here. All the defenses, all the traditional defenses, such as fraud in obtaining the original judgment or perhaps the lack of jurisdiction of the California Court in the first place. Those defenses are all available--

SENATOR DePIANO: What about the costs to register a Divorce and what will it do to the case load in Connecticut?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: It wouldn't increase the case load in Connecticut at all, and would be subject to the same filing fees as any other Civil Action, so it would carry itself to the same extent that other Civil Actions carry themselves.

SENATOR DePIANO: Okay. Any questions that you have?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: Incidentally, there's another Act, The Federal Registration of Judgments Act. You may also be aware of that one. That's the Granddaddy of all of these reciprocal Enforcement of Judgment type of Acts. The Federal Registration of Judgment Acts has been in effect now for, I would guess ten or fifteen years and it works very well, with Federal District Court Judgments, registered throughout the United States. Now I think that you have very good acceptance of the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act, which you passed here in Connecticut, it's been passed by a great number of States. (OVERLAPPING CONVERSATION).

SENATOR DePIANO: Have you submitted this Bill to any other Legislature throughout the Country.

MR. SCHOONMAKER: No, this Bill has been submitted to no Legislature in the United States, at the moment.

MR. SCHOONMAKER (Continued): The next Bill is 6171, which is An Act Concerning the Personal Jurisdiction Over Non Residents of Certainly Matrimonial Matters. I've had discussions with the representatives of the Family Law Section of the Connecticut Bar Association and what I think we would like to do here, if there is no objection, is to submit an Amendment to this particular Bill, which will clarify some ambiguities which both groups find with this particular Bill as written. So, if there is no objection I would just pass this Bill for the moment if we could have an opportunity to do some redrafting with respect to what I think could be approved. It's over broad in certain aspects and I think it was not intended to be--

SENATOR DePIANO: Would you give us the jist of the Bill now, so that we will have it for filing record, you know.

MR. SCHOONMAKER: This Bill adopts a minimum contacts doctrine of of Federal Constitutional Law. In other words, how far can the State Court go in taking jurisdiction, personal jurisdiction over people by virtue of the person's contact with the State? Now that delimits of this so called Minimum Contacts Doctrine, has been tested time and time again, by the United States Supreme Court and other Courts.

This particular Bill is patterned closely again on a Bill in New York State an piece of Legislation in New York State, which is going to the Court of Appeals in New York, which is the highest Court in New York and has been found constitutional. So the Bill, really gives the Connecticut Judiciary the right to reach out and assume personal jurisdiction over people who have had contact with Connecticut, in certain specified ways, and the ways that they have had contact with Connecticut are set forth in the Statute. If they lived in Connecticut prior to the time that they seperated and things of that sort. If they entered into a seperation agreement in Connecticut under Connecticut Law --

SENATOR DePIANO: It's patterned after the Long Arm Statute.

MR. SCHOONMAKER: It's a Long Arm Statute Extension, particularly geared to matrimonial matters.

SENATOR GUIDERA: Sam we have a Long Arm Statue on matrimonial matters. How does this Bill differ from what we have?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: It's an expansion.

SENATOR GUIDERA: In what way?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: in Sub Section (c) is entirely different. You don't deal with a question of whether or not you have Long Arm Jurisdiction over individuals who enter contracts in Connecticut,

MR. SCHOONMAKER (Continued): regarding visitation, maintenance, support, alimony etcetera. That's new. But, it's not really new, because your old Long Arm Statute that dealt with Contract Law generally, with twelve we pick this up. This picks it up specifically. So that, that's what's new there.

I think, as I say that what you've done, would be better served if we submitted something else.

The next Bill is technical in nature it's number 6173 and it deals with those of you who practice matrimonial law know that the, at anytime during the proceedings you can place a Lis Pendens on real estate owned by one party or the other. Unfortunately the Statute didn't say how you get the Lis Pendens off.

This Bill gives the Court discretion to remove the Lis Pendens or have a bond substituted for the Lis Pendens or do something to get the Lis Pendens off the Land Record. Several judges have mentioned to me that this is needed because they feel they have no power at the present time that the Lis Pendens is on the Land Record even though they are convinced that it is there for the purpose of harassment or otherwise that they have no power to remove it. Now, that's not right and just and proper, so we ought to give them the power to take these Lis Pendens off the Land Records, if they are unfair (OVERLAPPING CONVERSATION) that's a technical.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. SCHOONMAKER: The next one -- the next Bill deals with modification of Alimony Judgments, This particular Bill -- this is number 6174. Now this Bill states that if an alimony recipient, after the Alimony Order is entered, and begins to live with another person if, for example, the wife is the Alimony recipient --

SENATOR DePIANO: Isn't this bill designed to correct that situation that happened in Stamford, where the case was brought to the Supreme Court of Connecticut. Where somebody claimed that his wife was living with somebody else, out of wedlock and that therefore, he was not responsible to give her alimony and he lost that case?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: That's right.

SENATOR DePIANO: This would now make it within the discretion of the Court, am I correct? This Bill that you're proposing.

MR. SCHOONMAKER: That's right. There is another case in Stamford of which I am aware. Where a very heavy alimony award is in existence in favor of a wife whose husband has been living with another individual, for at least fifteen (15) years and collecting this very substantial alimony because they are not married. The former wife has not remarried and she is collecting the alimony,

MR. SCHOONMAKER (Continued): but also living with an individual whose providing her with very ample support.

SENATOR DePIANO: This Bill is designed primarily to stop someone from profiting from somebody from paying alimony.

MR. SCHOONMAKER: First of all, I want to say at the inception this is not an effort to legislate morality. That's the first thing it's not. It's very practical, it's a matter of economic justice.

SENATOR DePIANO: You want alimony to be used only by the person receiving the alimony and not anybody else getting the benefit of it and conspiring between the two not to get married, so that the alimony would stay on forever.

MR. SCHOONMAKER: That's right.

REPRESENTATIVE BERMAN: Mr. Schoonmaker, Representative Berman. Do you think that the situation covered under the change in circumstances concept now and wouldn't this be, wouldn't the judges misconstrue it as a change of circumstances and therefore not (OVERLAPPING CONVERSATION).

MR. SCHOONMAKER: Don't count on it ^{MRS.} Mr. Berman. Some Judges yes, some Judges no. The way we attack it now is we say that the needs of the spouse have changed, because they're living with somebody else and therefore they don't need as much because someone else is paying for part of their needs, or we say that they have constructive income. But, that's coming at the problem indirectly. By circumvention we might as well go right at it and decide whether or not, under certain circumstances if somebody is contributing to the support of a alimony recipient whether or not the person paying the alimony ought to get some relief and this Bill puts that question directly.

The next one, is a technical change is number 6220 --

SENATOR DePIANO: You have one more after this, am I correct?

MR. SCHOONMAKER: One more and then I'm through, I'm sorry to take (OVERLAPPING CONVERSATION) 6220, I'll be very, very, brief on this, do you see the underlined portion? It's about termination of parental rights in the Probate Court and one of the criteria of determining parental rights, is that the person doesn't have a day to day relationship and contact with his child.

We want to put an exception in there, except where there is a -- where the parent has visitation rights. In other words, you can't terminate somebody's parental rights because he is exercising his visitation rights under a --

SENATOR DePIANO: That's a technical change.

MR. KIEFER (Continued): but also and perhaps more importantly as a member of the Family Law Committee of the Connecticut Bar Association.

My purpose is to address or to report the feeling of the Committee as to three of the Bills which you are presently considering.

I might say it's been considered that whenever you have two attorneys, you often end up with at least three opinions if not, five, and to the extent that the Family Law Committee has seen eye to eye on positions on these three Bills, represents to me something very significant.

The first one is the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act. Now, as far as the actual application, this isn't going to effect some much the people who are snatching children from Connecticut and leaving, but it will prevent those who decide they are going to snatch their child and move into Connecticut, and try and get the protection of the Connecticut court in those situations, in which the court should not be granting it.

I'm impressed with the way the Act is written to the extent that it does not totally mean that the court cannot consider what is best in the child's interest. However, what it does seem to say, is that it is going to require the proper procedural steps to insist upon a form where the court would have the best way of determining what is best for the child, and for that reason the Committee hopes that you will adopt that legislation.

The second Act in which the Family Law Committee and the Bar Association was in favor, was Enforcement of Foreign Matrimonial Judgments, it's not unlike the Uniform Reciprocal Judgment Act, it does permit a contest in Connecticut as to basic jurisdictional problems, before the enforcement of the action and yet it also simplifies the procedure at the initial stages.

And finally we agree with Mr. Schoonmaker, that this Bill #6171⁰, dealing with the granting of personal jurisdiction over non-residents in certain matrimonial support actions.

We're in favor in principle, although we do have some problems as to the extent that this long arm has been lengthened. And, in particular, it was brought out that one of the reasons that would give "perssonum" jurisdiction, would be the mere fact the seperation agreement was entered into in Connecticut. Now this may be that only the parties attorney happened to have his place of business here and the parties came from New York, to sign it in Connecticut. Question, whether that

MR. KIEFER: should be enough of a tie with Connecticut to grant jurisdiction.

Furthermore, the fact that the parties may have at sometime lived in Connecticut, perhaps there should be some limitation on that. The fact that or a married couple lived in Connecticut for six months, twenty years ago, perhaps should not give the court jurisdiction, but those are the objections we have and I thank you for the opportunity to testify.

SENATOR DePIANO. Thank you for taking the time out to come here we appreciate it. Virginia Knauf? (VOICE FROM AUDIENCE IN-AUDIBLE) What is your name? Did I call your name? Well, I didn't bypass anybody's name. It was underneath Regina Smith's. No I just called Virginia Knauf. Your name is Madeline--what is your name? Barnara Korn. Sorry Mam, I don't see your name down here, maybe you could come up here and show it to me, but I haven't bypassed anybody. Your name is Barbara Korn, allright go ahead.

BARBARA KORN: I'm in support of Bill 6221. I would like to read two short statements please, from professional people who are not abble to be here today. This is from Daniel Israel, M. D. Pediatrician, Danielson, Connecticut. Dear Mr. Chairman, As a practicing Peditrician and a Specialist in Neonatology, I support Bill 6221.

A baby is neither the product nor the property of his mother to the exclusion of all others. He is created through the union of his parents and this merging forms a person totally unique. From the first breath the infant inhales, he is no longer dependent upon his mother for subsistence.

He is a separate entity and a citizen of the world. Therefore, the newborn has a right to protection by society which would cause him harm or jeopardize his life.

Bill #6221 guarantees that protection to all babies, regardless of the circumstances of their birth.

Physicians have responsibilities to care for all children. They should not have the choice of discriminating against any infant because he is unwanted by his biological mother.

I urge you to support and pass this bill. Daniel Israel, M.D.

This is from Sister Joan Nicholas, Chairperson, Department of Philosophy, Albertus Magnus College.

As a citizen and a human being who feels deeply a sense of responsibility to other human beings, I wish to add my support to this legislation.

There is already too much violence in Society. I appeal to you as the lawmakers of this State, to insure this vital legal protection.