

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

<u>HB 1555</u>	PA 409	<u>1955</u>
Judiciary	205 - 222	(18)
Senate	2429 - 2445	(17)
House	2217 - 2256	(40)

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

75p.

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 1
PAGES 1 - 393

1955

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

TUESDAY

MARCH 15, 1955

Chairmen Pruyn & Longo, presiding

Members present: Sen. Sweeney
Rep. Cady, Conard, Pope, Eielson, Welles,
Bruno, Schlossbach, Burnham, Curran,
Parker, Googel, Fisk & Pinney

Rep. Pruyn: We shall first take up the bazaar and raffle bills,
and hear from those in favor of these bills first.

S. B. No. 586 ✓ - Healey - AN ACT CONCERNING BAZAARS AND RAFFLES

S. B. No. 607 ✓ - Whelan - AN ACT CONCERNING BINGO, BAZAARS AND
RAFFLES

S. B. No. 857 ✓ - Whelan - AN ACT CONCERNING BAZAARS AND RAFFLES

H. B. No. 7 ✓ - Mopsik & Demuth - AN ACT CONCERNING BAZAARS AND
RAFFLES

H. B. No. 152 ✓ - Serena - AN ACT CONCERNING GAMES OF CHANCE

H. B. No. 1078 ✓ - Testa - AN ACT CONCERNING BAZAARS AND RAFFLES

H. B. No. 1554 ✓ - Simko - AN ACT CONCERNING BAZAARS AND RAFFLES

H. B. No. 1555 ✓ - Schlossbach - AN ACT CONCERNING BAZAARS AND
RAFFLES

Sen. Whelan, 22nd District - I am the sponsor and speak in favor
of S. B. 857. This bill is designed to establish
methods of raising funds for non-profit organizations.
It provides that permits be secured by the organiza-
tion holding the bazaar. It limits the operation of
a bazaar to 10 days in any one year. The raffles per-
mit would not exceed three months and merchandise
prizes not to exceed \$350. The organization must
have been organized for two years. There is a new
protection requiring the organization to file a re-
port within 90 days after completion of the raffle,
the original copy going to the permit issuing author-
ity, one copy to the State Police and one copy to the
Town Clerk. This eliminates any possibility or promo-
tion of racketeering. There is also a local option
feature allowing each town and city to decide whether
or not they desire to participate in it. The legis-
lature has not the right to deny any town the right
to determine if they want to have bazaars and raffles.
I believe that if this committee fails to adopt this
bill, they are denying the people of our state of
their rights. The majority of our citizens did not
believe that in running a raffle they were violating
the law. I urge a favorable report by this committee.

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

It has the consent and approval of the majority of our citizens.

Rep. Schlossbach, Westbrook: I am sponsor of H. B. 1555, which I believe will be a bill that will lend itself to passage by your committee. I would like to say that in drawing up this bill, an attempt has been made to face every possible safeguard against the so-called gambling aspect of the law which is the one feature of the bill. We are offering a substitute bill which in effect is the same as 1555 except that it does have one further safeguard and it follows the statement "The promotion and operation of said bazaar and/or raffles shall be confined solely to the duly qualified members of the sponsoring organizations. The change follows, "No such member or members shall receive any revenue". Otherwise the bills are identical. It seems that everyone is afraid that we are going to open the door to gambling and that the racketeers are going to invade our state. I do not believe racketeers are interested in bazaars or raffles. I would be the first to stand here and speak and work against horse racing and pari-mutual betting and those of us who were in the last session and those on the sub-committee know that the cost to the state of Connecticut would be a great many times more than anything they gained by revenue. If this were a horse racing bill I would speak against it because I am not in favor of legalized gambling. We have a neighboring state which has had this experience under its bazaars and raffles law. In New Jersey there were 15,000 organizations licensed for the first time. Of that 6000 were churches, 2400 volunteer fire departments, 2000 veterans' organizations and the balance different charitable agencies. In the state of New Jersey 947,676 voted for their bazaar bill as against 347,818. Of the 567 communities 535 voted to permit these raffle and bazaar games. I believe we have placed in our bill every possible safeguard against that particular thought that the racketeer or gambler is going to take over the state. If each town has the right to decide for itself whether or not they want it, the people will speak as they have done in the past. I can understand the feelings of a great many persons who are connected with our religious organizations, but I believe that the people of the state of Connecticut have no fear of the raffles and bazaar bill. I believe it can work and work honestly with the safeguards we have placed in it. I hope you will bring out a favorable report on it.

Rep. Testa, Windsor: I am sponsor of a bill, H. B. 1078. I

Judiciary

March 15, 1955

concur with the remarks of Senator Wheland and Mr. Schlossbach. Various organizations approached me in support of this and I conducted a survey of my own. I am opposed to horse racing and pari-mutual betting for I feel it will invite the gangsters into the state. My bill is the same as that of the senator and representative who have just spoken. It was the same four years ago when the legislature passed it and was sent to the governor. I have included one restriction. I contacted three organizations in the city of Hartford conducting weekly bingo games. They pointed out they have entertained 13,000 people. Seventy-five percent of the participants are 28 to 65 years of age. I talked with them and they are in favor. I talked to the mothers and grandmothers and also asked what their average of expenditures were each week and it was \$2 to \$3. They feel you are taking away their relaxation. The restriction in my bill, the ten year rule, is to strike out fly by night organizations. I have found organizations that band together and call themselves social clubs. I do not feel that this type of organization should be permitted. I want to point out that in my town I had 7 letters in opposition with no explanation but that they did not want gambling. There were over 60 letters in favor and they have taken the time to go into detail as to why they were in favor. I approached the Police Department and they report that of the 13,000 people playing bingo where there is a policeman on duty, there was not one disturbance. If we are to deny the people in the State of Connecticut we are taking away the very same freedom we have fought for. I would be the first one to fight against legalized gambling and I hope your committee will come out with one bill to give back the right to the various towns to conduct bazaars and raffles. I have listened to both sides and the majority are in favor of this bill and I have acted with their wishes. I merely question the right of the General Assembly to take the right away from the citizens of Connecticut and I hope you will come out with a favorable bill.

Rep. Mopsik, Plainfield: I have H. B. 7 which is the same thing and I agree with the gentlemen who previously spoke. This bill is one of the first to be introduced and it has everything that the others have. Whether it is a good thing or bad, I do not know. When I put it in I thought it was a good bill. I hope that this committee will consider the bazaars and raffles bills and if they find my bill is good, they will give it considerable looking over and find a way to pas the bill. I have another bill, H. B. 8 AN ACT CONCERNING BINGO PRIZES, which my colleague and I introduced.

JUDICIARY'

MARCH 15, 1955

This would permit us to legalize bingo. It would be quite a revenue for the state and we feel the bill would do a lot of good to different organizations because several years ago I operated a bingo for the American Legion and I know how much it helped us.

Rep. Lewis, Danbury: I have a letter here from the Volunteer Fireman's Association of the town of Danbury which I have been requested to read to your committee:
"At the January meeting of the Volunteer Fireman's Association of the town of Danbury, representing the five volunteer companies of the town, it was voted unanimously to urge you to support the bazaar and raffle bill sponsored by the Connecticut State Fireman's Association. This bill is S. B. 857 and H. B. 1555. In addition to the endorsement of the Connecticut State Fireman's Association, it is also endorsed by the Connecticut Fire Chiefs Association and the Connecticut Uniformed Firemens Association, in all, representing 26,000 Connecticut firemen. Thanking you again for all the interest you have displayed in the welfare of the volunteer firemen, we remain Francis R. O'Hara, President".

Sen. Reinhard, 23rd District: I rise today in support of S. B. 857 and H. B. 1555. The statistics given the committee by Rep. Schlossbach point out that we in the legislature should not foist upon the people of Connecticut the will of the minority. Under these bills we give the people of the various towns the right to decide whether or not they wish to participate in bazaars and raffles. I think that New Jersey presents enough evidence that we can, with proper safeguards, conduct bazaars and raffles.

Mr. Curtin, Newtown: My volunteer firemen have asked me to say that we are supporting H. B. 1555.

Rep. Simko, Bridgeport: I am sponsor of H. B. 1554. It has been my experience that not other bill has brought so much individual response from the people in my city. I see nothing wrong in it, no moral danger, even with the arguments against. I just want to say that this will be a help to many people of the state and the group here before you opposing it - if they would direct their interest to other crimes, they would be of more service to the state of Connecticut.

Rep. Cutler, Newtown: I favor S. B. 857. At the present time Section 703 makes bingo legal and I do not see why bazaars and raffles cannot have the same treatment.

Rep. Jos. Reath, Durham: I wish to register in favor of H. B.

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

7 and H. B. 1555 and echo the sentiments of Sen. Whelan and Rep. Schlossbach. From my canvass of the program in my town it is two to one in favor.

Rep. Kirker, Norwich: It seems that there are two points involved - one is morals and the other is morale. There is quite a difference between the two. The bills before you are good bills in a way, but I would still like to see your committee come out with a bill which would be fair to all people of the state. No one has a right to deny a referendum to the people on a great a legislation that is facing you. Many people will say it is wrong morally, and I defy you to find anything in the Scriptures that deny gambling. I say it is our duty to come out with a good bill with safeguards in it and give to the people of the state what they are looking for.

Francis R. Burnes, chairman of the Legislative Committee, Connecticut Firemen's Association: I am here to support H. B. 1555 and S. B. 857. The passage of these bills will prevent professional gamblers. The safeguards will assure that all organizations will be required to make strict accounting to public agencies; only authorized members of non-profit organizations will be permitted to participate in any bazaar or raffle and no private profit will be permitted, so that all proceeds will go into desirable projects. Under stringent controls it would harness the natural urge to wager into constructive channels.

John Moehring, Stamford, Connecticut State Firemen's Association: It is quite confusing when we come up every two years and hear told that if we legalize this raffles and bazaars bill we will have a lot of lotteries run by racketeers. I think it is very stupid to hear people say that once it is legalized the racketeers will come in. I am sure that if we pass a bill where raffles will become legal, the numbers racket and the bookies will not get the money. As far as racketeers are concerned, we have in the city of Stamford bazaars. About two years ago a traveling carnival came into town from Louisiana and took \$75,000 out of the city. Crooked games and games of skill accounted for the carnival's success. Last year the association should have had 20 new organized fire stations. During this time we had only one. Why? You talk about taxes - we cannot go to a town meeting and ask for it. We have to start a fire department first, so in the old days we would run a raffle to get started and perhaps afterwards the town would come through with the money. The one department organized last year - the only one -

was a paid fire department in the city of New Britain. We hear so much about gambling. You have gamblin in every city of the state right now. The stock market goes up and down. They call it speculating. How about cards. The state of New Jersey who has a commission to control bazaars and raffles are now getting prepared to make card parties legal. Lots of people do not consider cards gamblina, but a poker game will be raided. If they arrest fellows for playing poker, why cant' they arrest them for playing pinochle. You can make a bet on this too. I would like to quote an article from one of the papers in Bridgeport. In 1954 the Red Cross only collected \$119,000. The people are being tired of solicitation. And also the statement that firemen are mixed up with rackets - firemen are accused of playing with the underworld. The fellows who want legalized gambling are not racketeers. At some of the church carnivals, who did they get to run the money wheels - the firemen.

Joseph F. Farr, president of the Connecticut State Fire Association: We favor 857 and 1555. The volunteer firemen need support and hope your committee will be generous enough to give it to them.

John F. Delaney, Rau Locke Post, American Legion: Wish to go on record in favor of S. B. 586. We have heard some lengthy speeches and I am not going to repeat them. This bill makes raffles and bazaars optional, requires licensing and requires records. The people who oppose this seem to be hiding their heads in the sand. I think the big thing is to control these raffles and bazaars so that they will not get into the hands of professional gamblers.

Henry T. Pinchera, Department Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars: The veterans organization would spend thousands and thousands of dollars for rehabilitation work. We certainly spend money on the patients in veterans hospitals throughout the state and we find it difficult to continue on the good work of taking care of the veterans in hospitals throughout the state and New England because of financial trouble. We believe that with controlled legalized bazaars and raffles, and we are opposed to horse racing and pari-mutual, it would assist greatly in raising money to carry on the work.

Edward McKean, Uniformed Fire Fighters of Connecticut, representing all the paid firemen of Connecticut: We favor S. B. 857 and H. B. 1555. In spite of the fact that

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

paid firemen do not have the same problem that volunteer firemen do, we feel we have a tremendous stake in this particular bill. Most of our large towns have adopted mutual aid agreements. They provide that in the case of conflagration or other emergency they will be called in to contribute. The cold war state which we are in now has accentuated this type of agreement. It is not unusual to find paid firemen using equipment belonging to volunteer fire companies. It is a matter of self preservation that we support these bills and it is the only way we can get our equipment. The author of this law never intended to prevent charitable organizations to raise money for worthy causes. I think the only reasonable objection that could possibly be raised is that if there was a failure to provide adequate safeguards. These bills provided that and the volunteer firemen have dedicated their lives to protect lives and property. It is most unfair to deny them this right.

Edward Lettick, Department Commander, representing the legislative committee of the Department of Connecticut, Jewish War Veterans of the United States: We favor the adoption of S. B. 607 with the exception of Section 4. We recommend that Section 4 be changed to read "Any veterans organization must have been organized for not less than three years and any other organization or group must have been organized for not less than five years prior to its application for a permit under this section." In addition the bill should incorporate the following: Promotion - "The promotion and operation of such bingo, bazaar or raffle shall be confined solely to the qualified members of the sponsoring organization, who shall receive no compensation of any kind for such promotion and operation. Funds derived from bingos, bazaars or raffles shall be used exclusively for the purpose for which the sponsoring organization was organized. No person under the age of twenty-one years shall sponsor, conduct or operate any bingo, bazaar or raffle." We are opposed to that part of Section 6 referring to "Class D" permits. Many organizations might conduct monthly drawings at its meetings for their own membership. Class "D" permits as written would preclude the holding of more than three drawings a year.

L. B. Butler, Senior Vice Commander, American Legion, Department of Connecticut: We wish to go on record favoring the bazaars and raffles bills. We do not take a specific stand on any one bill but urge your favorable support.

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

Rep. Curran, Bridgeport: Although I am a member of this committee, I am also legislative chairman of the Bridgeport Veterans Council and legislative chairman of the Catholic War Veterans. These various veterans organizations are unanimously in favor of a local option bill which would give each community the opportunity to pass on it to help them carry on their great rehabilitation work among the veterans and orphans and widows. I see nothing immoral in it if it is run with the proper safeguards and controls.

Noel Henry, West Haven Fire Department: We favor 857 and 1555. Back in 1907 funds were raised from bazaars, raffles and carnivals for our fire department and it was finally turned over to the district, but in outlying sections of the towns other fire departments need to be started, and these bills would help.

William Canty, Executive Board of the State Firemen's Association: We favor S. B. 857 and H. B. 1555. At a meeting last night in Litchfield County there were over 136 members present who went in favor.

Chrmn. Longo: I think we have heard enough from the proponents of this. We will now hear from the opponents.

Sen. Watson, 4th District: I am opposed to any one of these bills. We already have a law on our books, Section 703 of the General Statutes. In that law there are all the safeguards that are presented in these bills and if I am correctly informed, there are two cities in the state that are overrun with bingo that do not meet the statutes.

Sen. Bauer, 5th District: I oppose legalized raffles in the state. Raffles and other money games of gambling are the snad lot league of bigger operations. To legalize gambling is to encourage it; to encourage it is to broaden its scope. I am sympathetic towards churches, fire departments and charitable institutions but I am opposed to the spread of gambling.

Rep. Lawrence, East Windsor: In my town six out of a total of seven chruches are in opposition to any gaming legalization. That is enough for me. I hope you will give an unfavorable report.

Rep. Grab, Canterbury: The P. T. A. has sent me a petition and all are opposed to these bills.

Sen. Finney, 36th District: You have in times past confused me,

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

and some of these people do. They tell you they are opposed to gambling and yet under certain auspices it is all right. It seems in the past six years we have talked about the gainless way to collect money. The Red Cross and Community Chest do not need to run gambling. I am not opposed to fire departments or churches but I think my job is to support them voluntarily. I do not think it is my job to encourage people to look for the fast buck. Let's not put charitable and educational institutions in the same category as gambling.

Rep. Mastropietro, Naugatuck: It seems to me that the religious basis comes in but regardless of religious faith, I am in opposition. Nothing can be accomplished from these bills. I know of instances where families have been deprived of food and clothing because some member has been placing bets on horses or bazaars or raffles. As an individual I want to state that I have been a victim of horse racing. I have learned my lesson. For this reason I know of housewives, and I can verify it, who have taken their husband's money just to play bingo. I have representation from my home town and I ask that the committee vote unfavorably on these bills.

Rep. Sweeton, Canton: I would like to go on record against all of the bills easing the gambling laws and providing for the expansion of lotteries, raffles, bingo and other games of chance for charitable and other purposes. I have received numerous requests from my constituents to appear against these bills and I am also expressing my own personal convictions. My reasons are that I believe it is possible to find better ways of raising money for charity and other purposes. It is not for the best interests of the state or county to encourage our people to squander their money on gambling games. All of these bills may look innocent enough, but they constitute a first step, a toe in the door, so to speak, toward breaking down our legal restraints on gambling. We hope for unfavorable action.

Rep. Holt, Newington: I have received practically no requests from our community in support but many, many requests from the people asking me to oppose the bills. I know of no churches who are in favor of these bills so I do not know why they are listed. I think the fire departments should be supported by public funds rather than raffles.

Rep. Walker, Eastford: I am in opposition to these bills. The

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

churches do not need them, the fire companies do not need them and the state does not need them.

Rep. Minor, Plymouth: I think we would regret to read on the front pages of the press that the legislature had legalized the gaming laws in the state. We are very much concerned with juvenile delinquency and to think that we would spread that kind of news before thousands of young boys and girls! It would be unthinkable to me.

Rep. Suarez, Cheshire: I would like to register my opposition to all these bills.

Rep. Paul Andrews, Cheshire: The people of Cheshire have urged me to go on record as opposing any relaxation of our present laws. Letters, telegrams and phone calls have indicated clearly the sentiment of many of the voters in our town. I, therefore, strongly urge that your committee report unfavorably on any and all bills which pertain to this matter.

Rep. Welles, Vernon: Opposed to all the bills. I feel gambling demoralizes our youth.

Mrs. John Luther, West Hartford, PTA Association of Connecticut: This is the only legislation we oppose in its entirety. Money can be raised without resulting to games of chance. School children will be exposed to gambling by selling raffle tickets and we do not want that in the state of Connecticut. Let's don't have gambling.

Loyd Worley, Connecticut Council of Churches: We are opposed to these bills. We do not charge that these people are serving the purposes of the gambling underworld. We admit the volunteer firemen need help, but we believe there are better ways to obtain these objectives. Groups like the P. T. A. and I have a letter from the Connecticut Chiefs of Police Association indicating a stand against this. The Grange - there are 900 of them - and not one of them want these bills. We do not speak for every individual; they speak for themselves. Why do churches object? Back in the Mosaic law there is the plain statement against stealth. It is a modified form of stealing; and gambling is making a promise, holding a hope which is only a dispair to the great majority. Another thing in the bible - about the strong bearing the burdens of the weak. We are considerate for the people who have not the strength of character to resist. This method

-11-

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

would hurt the case - the Community Chest and the Red Cross. These organizations are approved by responsible citizens. Certainly there is no argument in gambling if the Red Cross did not go over the top in Bridgeport. This so-called local option feature is a snare and delusion. You are using terms which are not based in fact. Anyone can get 5% of the electors for almost anything. A legislative body like you ought to deal with this and deal with it right. We have all these people in favor of it who say the law is not being enforced now. How can they expect it will be better if they legalize it? Gambling is recognized as questionable, as another evil by 47 of the 48 states. Nevada is called a sodden state. The public is complaining of bogus charity drives. This is a special privilege for certain groups, many of whom do not want it. It is a growing cancer. We were told in 1939 that nothing else would be asked for and now they come back and ask for more. That is the trouble with this gambling business. You are faced with an unhappy decision among the citizenry. Look into this legislation - it would not be here if it had not been for history, if it had not been for sad experience why 47 of the 48 states had it recalled. Those of you who are Republicans know that your leader, Gov. Lodge, did his duty by vetoing it. Those of you who are democrats may well remember that the first inroads of race track gambling was vetoed by Gov. Wilbur Cross.

Jesse F. Smith, Suffield Academy, Suffield: I wish to refrain from taking up the time devoted to the hearing on the various bills concerning gambling, but I want to register my opposition to all these bills on one point: As a teacher in Connecticut schools for more than 35 years, I protest the encouragement of our youth to believe in the false principle that it is possible to get something for nothing. For the state, through its legislature, to promote this principle is deplorable, and more especially because the victims of these bills are, and will continue to be, the rising generation. I am also opposed to that feature of some of these bills which confers the responsibility of deciding legalizing of bingo, raffles, etc. upon the individual towns, which is simply "passing the buck". The problem is now in the laps of the legislators. They should not side step the problem but have the courage to solve it.

L. P. Clarke, Chairman, New London Association of the Congrega-

-12-

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

tion of Laymen: There are 194 laymen opposed to any relaxation of our gambling laws. I believe that each and every one of us should support our volunteer fire companies through taxation, and I believe they are essential. I would also like to say in the matter of charities, if you have money to give to charity you should give it directly to the charities where the money will do more good.

William L. Hawkins, Executive Committee, Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce: We are certainly opposed to these gambling bills.

Rev. Fred Wilkins, Waterbury: There have been many references to the bills discussed here today. I am a practical man and as a citizen of Waterbury, I decided to do a little investigating on my own and I went down to the local bingo parlors and when I found some paying off in cash, I realized it was against the law. The story will be in the Waterbury papers this weekend. This one particular parlor is a large one with professional setup. There are five sponsoring organizations, composed of churches, veterans groups, etc. They get about 10% of all proceeds. I checked with the local police and they told me there is no real way of checking the amount of money taken in. What do we have? We have a law with reference to bingo. What do your police say? There is something on the record from our superintendent of police in Waterbury - "said law as written is next to unenforcible". No local fire department has individual equipment to run these things, so they invite in the professionals. As a pastor, I am not interested in talking only as they affect my people and I wish to say that I have found people in churches who are addicts. They spend \$10 to \$15 a day on bingo parties. I feel that these gambling bills will undermine our society. I also feel that it is improper to compare gambling with the stock market. The stock market is one of our basic economic life. The moral implication - this is to get something for nothing. This is in direct opposition to the basic philosophy of our Lord Jesus Christ. The point is raising money - if some of the fire departments are having trouble raising money, I would like to help them with it. I will stand right here and say now, if anyone in this hall would like to donate to our fire departments, I will accept the money and see that they get not just 10% but all of what was given to me. Just this week we raised \$20,000 from average workers for a little church in Bakerville which had burned down. I realize there are many for and against and I am per-

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

sonally against. If you recommend that these bills go through, I hope you will tighten them up a great deal.

Second Selectman, town of Lisbon: Also speaking for the volunteer fire department. Thursday night at a meeting a great majority of the fire department opposed these bills. Our department is run by the town and supported by the town. When we started to have raffles and bazaars, everyone felt that through town taxation it could be paid for.

Rep. Donaldson, Wilton: I have received many communications, all of which are opposed to this bill. Inasmuch as I am a representative, I am opposed to them also.

William A. Dower, Hartford Chamber of Commerce, Retail Merchants Association, also president of the Chamber of Commerce Managers group in Connecticut: Our objections on the bills are based on economic grounds, not moral. Any relaxation of the gambling laws now in the statutes would be bad, even though the relaxation is minor. I would suggest that you cannot have a little cancer - you are either well or infected.

Rev. Howard Orr, Bridgeport, chairman of a statewide independent organization called the Connecticut Committee Opposed to Legalized Gambling: The arguments have been many and long and you have heard all of them. We are sympathetic with the people who try to do what is right, but I am a simple pastor and I know that enough relaxation of these laws is going to lead to disaster.

Gerald J. Jud, pastor of the First Congregational Church, West Haven, speaking in behalf of the New Haven Council of Churches: We live in a town with the biggest amusement park in the state and a town which bears the scars in its morality and politics of the gambling problem. Because we are concerned about the morals and politics of our community, we voice our opinion strongly against the relaxation of the gambling laws. Our opposition in particular is based on many reasons, both philosophical and practical. 1 - We are opposed to the relaxation of the gambling laws because we believe that gambling supports a false philosophy of life, namely, that you get something for nothing. It teaches people to rely on chance rather than industry and thrift and leads to dishonesty and undermining of character. It is hard work which built our country and the strength of a man's life and the strength of our nation's life is in character, not chance or circumstance.

-14-

2 - When gambling is used as a means of raising money it destroys the proper motivation for charity. We believe that we should give to charitable causes because of our love of God and of our fellowman and because we desire to bear our share of responsibility and not because we have a chance of getting back much more than we gave. When we use unworthy means to serve good ends, we are living one of the devil's greatest lies, that the end justifies the means. When we utilize gambling to support these ends we are using a fake remedy. These bills ask the privilege for churches and charitable groups to gamble. We know of no churches who are asking for this and we do not want it. These bills are plainly opening wedges and the churches and charitable groups are being used as a means to an end by those who stand to profit most by gambling. It is logical that if it is right for churches and charitable groups to do it, it is right for all. Since gambling breeds and supports a false philosophy of life and since it destroys the proper motivation for charity, we are strongly opposed to these bills.

Edward Aiken, representing the State Committee Opposed to the Legalization of Lotteries: Speaking for myself and as a member of the organization, we hope that all these bills presented to this committee will be opposed and defeated. The background history of lotteries is known. I have here a booklet by a writer on educational schools which gives the background of the lotteries and games of chance. Here is a more important book written by Virgil Peterson, lawyer, 12 years with the F. B. I and director of the Chicago Crime Commission. He has examined gambling in all its forms and his conclusion is that an enlightened society has no place for legalized gambling. In this country illegal gambling has increased. I am not talking about a little private bet between a few people. I do not see any great harm in that, but it is the business of gambling where the harm comes. It leads to the same sort of violations and corruptions. It was recognized from the beginning, right down to the turn of this century. In some of the states lotteries and games of chance were always associated with corruption with the result that our country rose up by action of the states, one after another, and kicked it out altogether. Thirty-four of these states have put it in their constitution. Speaking of frauds and cheats and cash prizes - cash prizes are being given in almost every town in Connecticut today. It is almost impossible to get a newspaper to print that fact. Waterbury is the

-15-

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

only paper in the state that has dared to write about these cash prizes. These professional gamblers are suave, quiet speaking men interested in getting other people's money without working for it. I have a letter here from a Roman Catholic priest who says his church is better off without lotteries. Carnivals are expensive. Less than 50% goes to the church. I know of a church that used to have these games; now they say no more, they can raise the money and more money without the games. They paid a professional \$5000 for furnishing equipment. I know of a service club that hired a professional carnivalist to come in; he taught some of the members to operate the devices and he go 50¢ out of every dollar taken in. The legislature is a law to itself. What you decide is the law. Had you better not consider the experience and word of our experienced law enforcement officers? The late Commissioner of State Police Edward Hickey once declared we would have to double our existing forces to handle the situation if gambling came to this state. There is nothing in these bills to prevent anyone from getting in and promoting these games. You can never catch up with him. If you did, there is nothing you could do about it when just the right religious or political pressure is applied locally. There are several letters from the Jewish leaders. The Jewish Ledger had in its report to defeat the gambling bills. They maintained it is a form of stealing. The Roman Catholic Dioceses "Thou shalt not steal - Thou shalt not covet". Indiana passed the same law as this. The state supreme court said it was unconstitutional. I wonder if these laws are not unconstitutional, if it is discriminatory legislation. I maintain that the organizations asking for this legislation does not deserve them. One town of this state had a big fair. When the ban came on they said they were going to do it just the same. They got their heads together and decided on a new type of game - a fish game for 25¢ apiece with a line and a hook and if you pulled out a fish with a certain number they gave you a prize. There was a tape recorder as one of the prizes. One young lad wanted the tape recorder badly. He did not get it after spending all his quarters. He decided he would make a fish just like the others and give it the same number as the tape recorder. He then put it in the pool when noone was looking and fished until he got the right fish. He got the tape recorder. Later, one of the managers came around and noticed that the tape recorder gone. Upon questioning he found that it had been won. He said, "That cannot be so, because there was no such number on any of the fish in the pool".

-16-

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

Rev. Victor Braun, First Congregational Church of New Milford:
I agree with all that was said in opposition to these bills. The time has come for us to recover a sense of dignity and respect in the manner in which our charities are supported. I do not want my people to find it possible for a small by-product to go to the support of the church. It deprives the individual of sacrificial giving.

Rev. Leonard B. Kolhofer, Durham: Our representative, Mr. Reath, based his argument in favor of legalized gambling by saying that in our community they are two to one in favor of it. The ministers - 3 out of 3 - have spoken against extending any of the gambling bills. On February 28, 1955, at an open meeting, not a single person showed up in favor. There has been no single organization who publicly has spoken in extending the bills. I challenge his figures - I am opposed and I am sure that people in our community are opposed. Do not be misled without demanding proof.

Rev. Philip Rose, Buckingham Church in Glastonbury and for 14 years a probation officer in Glastonbury: I remember the breakup of a family in our town with two teen age children in it. They had to go separate ways because the father used all earnings for pari-mutuel gambling and the mother had to go out to work to support the family. Last evening the court was obliged to spend more than two hours to root out bookies and associates who were there and placing bets. It was difficult to oppose the lawyers who represented them. The town court of Glastonbury and all the way up to the police officers of the state to the commissioner have said it would be difficult to control such a situation. The testimony given here has been such that the inability to control the situation is great right now; it will be greater afterward, and the cost to the state would be greater.

Atty. Anson Cook, Hartford: I want to make it clear that I am speaking personally. I am opposed to these bills and I think you will find a very substantial number of individuals in those organizations who are more interested in the public than the money involved. No organization is worth its salt that cannot stand on its own feet. It is a real issue.

F. W. Jacobs, representing 400 underprivileged children who want to go to camp this summer: I am representing the mothers of these children and the question came up as to how much the expense would be. The question

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

of bazaars came up as a good means to solicit money. The unanimous decision was that they did not want to secure funds through gambling. They asked me to come here and say that we would much prefer letting our program stand on its merits rather than go into gambling.

Stephen R. Chamberlain, pastor of the First Congregational Church in Andover: Volunteer firemen in small communities such as ours find it difficult at times to raise funds but our firemen would rather get it legitimately rather than to go into gambling.

James B. Yale, minister of the East Hampton Congregational Church: Our volunteer firemen raise money without running gambling games. I do not think it is very easy to enforce the way bingo games are now run. I feel it my responsibility to teach our young people that they will gain what they want in life if they work hard fairly and squarely through life. Anyone who wants the passage of these bills ought to put themselves in the place of the religious leaders.

William Sale Terrell, Executive Secretary and Recording Secretary, The Connecticut Baptist Convention: I would like to quote the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by our convention in annual session at the First Baptist Church, New London, on October 22, 1954: "We believe that gambling is a moral and social evil that tends to undermine our economic order, defeats true benevolence, and among other things leads to social demoralization. We hereby express ourselves as being opposed to legislation which would make lotteries, bingo, and all other games of chance legal. We urge our fellow citizens to ascertain the attitudes of candidates for public office on this issue, expressing our own convictions in the matter not only to candidates but to incumbents as well.

Harvey Parker, West Suffield, pastor of the Congregational Church: I do not speak as a pastor. I would just make a few comments to the Judiciary Committee. First, I think the fact is that the issue seems to be between religious leaders and PTA as the opposition and the firemen and American Legion the proponents. The absence here is the educational institutions. I have not heard one educational institution in favor or against these bills. They could be supported by legalized gambling and therefore not be in opposition to these bills. The second thing is the fact that one of the gentlemen speaking in opposition identified himself as representing the Retail Merchants of Hartford. He called

JUDICIARY

MARCH 15, 1955

attention to the fact that if these laws were to be passed they would be undemocratic. Is there any member of this committee who would like to have the General Assembly, if they passed these bills, come out with the slogan that this was the "American way of life"? If you did it would be subversive to the best interests of all.

Rev. Hoskie, Bethlehem: We wish to register in opposition to these bills and say that 2/3rds of the amount of public safety tax is going to the volunteer fire departments.

Allen Pirker, Windsor: Opposed to these bills. If there have been arguments that these bills will keep out undesirables and gangsters - why we cannot have legalized gambling. Connecticut would be a breeding place for criminals. That is why the state has not legalized it. In Florida you must possess an identification card if you are employed and the reason for this is because of big time gamblers. Not long ago Alabama - and I might say the rest of the nation - saw the result of gambling when Alabama's candidate for attorney general swore he would clean up gambling. That very day he was murdered. We as citizens of Connecticut do not want any part of this. It has been stated that all the surrounding states have legalized gambling. That does not mean that Connecticut has to fall into the same category of that corruption and evil, and I urge our General Assembly to vote against this type of legislation.

Chrmn. Pruyn: The hearing is closed on these bills. We will take up H. B. 8. Is there anybody in favor of this?

H. B. No. 8 ✓ Mopsik and Demuth - AN ACT CONCERNING BINGO PRIZES

Chrmn. Pruyn: Anyone opposed. The hearing is closed. We will take up H. B. 1013, 1053 and 1057. Is there anyone in favor?

H. B. No. 1013 ✓ Rivers & Billings - AN ACT CREATING A CONNECTICUT RACING COMMISSION

H. B. No. 1053 ✓ Farmer - AN ACT CONCERNING A REFERENDUM FOR HARNESS HORSE RACING AND PARI-MUTEUL WAGERING MACHINES

H. B. No. 1057 ✓ Farmer - AN ACT CONCERNING A REFERENDUM FOR HARNESS RACING AND PARI-MUTUEL WAGERING MACHINES

S 16

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1955

VOL. 6
PART 7
2325-2775

JUNE 3, 1955

bill as amended is passed.

THE CLERK: Calendar No. 1504, Substitute for House Bill No. 1555, An Act concerning Bazaars and Raffles. File No. 1149.

SENATOR WHELAN OF THE TWENTY SECOND DISTRICT: Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR: Question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

SENATOR WHELAN: Mr. President, this bill liberalizes the present gambling laws of our State to permit the operation of bazaars or raffles when conducted by a church or religious organizations, veterans, fraternal, civic, educational organizations, and volunteer fire departments. This bill is a tightly drawn bill, it sets up various restrictions to assure the public that the professional promoter and the gambling racketeer will be eliminated from the operation. Let me give you some of the protective features of this bill. Before any bazaar or raffle can be held in any city or town in our state there must first be a petition filed containing the bona fide signatures of at least five per cent of the electors of that individual city or town. Secondly, after the filing of such petition the legislative body is requested to call a special election at which all electors will have an opportunity to vote on the question as to whether they desire a bazaar or raffle to be conducted in their community. After such election is held and a

24b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

majority of the electors have decided in favor of holding the raffles or bazaars then and only then can such bazaar or raffle be ~~conducted~~ conducted. Another section provides that bazaars and raffles can only be conducted by bona fide members of the sponsoring organization, and that they must be at least twenty one years of age and that the funds derived from such bazaar or raffle must be used for the purpose stated in the application of the sponsoring organization. The bill provides that the issuance of three types of permits, class number one permit allows conducting of a raffle which totals not more than \$5,000 can be obtained in prizes. Such raffle must be consummated within the period of three months. Class No. 2 permits operation and conduct of a raffle with a limit of \$1,000 and must be consummated in two months. The class No. 3 permit allows conduct of a bazaar for not more than ten consecutive days; not more than one Class 1 or one Class 3 permit will be issued in any year. Another restrictive feature in this bill is that all prizes must be merchandise or tangible personal property and no prize shall be redeemable in cash. Further no prize shall consist of alcoholic liquor. Another restrictive feature of this permit is that the applicant must contain in the application for the permit full information as to the sponsoring organization and the conduct of the g bazaar or raffle, and within thirty days after the conclusion of the affair the sponsoring group shall file a complete report

25b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

of receipts and disbursements and disclosing the profits derived from such affair. Finally, there is a provision that an applicant for a permit who makes a false statement in the application or in the final report shall be fined not more than \$1000 and/or imprisoned for one year in jail. Mr. President, this bill is the result of much study by the members of the Judiciary Committee on the basis of several bills that were presented to them, and it is a good bill because it contains restrictive features that have not been contained in any other legislation that's ever been offered to this General Assembly. We must realize that the majority of the electors of our State don't feel that if they took a chance on an automobile or buy a ticket at a bazaar that they are criminals, and we must realize that you cannot legislate something that people don't agree is wrong. For years bazaars and raffles have been conducted in the state and until a period of several years ago there was no question in relation to them. However, at that time the question was raised that they were technically against the laws of our state, and since that time the prosecutors in the various counties have held that to be so which was their sworn duty and which they had to do. This bill permits many organizations an opportunity to secure funds which otherwise might not be obtainable, to secure them in a reasonable manner. There is no one forced to take a ticket; there is no one forced to attend a bazaar. It is

JUNE 3, 1955

the free act of an individual, and it certainly is something that I believe is right and proper. I think this bill is a good bill. I think it once and for all will clear the possibility of the many raffles and different types of affairs that have been run in this state during the last seven or eight years and that have been conducted by outside interests. They have been raffles conducted by gamblers and they have been making profits, thousands of dollars of profits out of the people of the State of Connecticut by the illicit operation of those affairs. It is time the State realizes that this type of operation is not a criminal offense and that we should allow the reasonable use of this law to permit bazaars and raffles to be run by properly sponsoring organizations. I move for the passage of this bill.

SENATOR BAUER OF THE FIFTH DISTRICT: Mr. President, I was glad to hear the Senator from the Twenty Second point out that this is a bill concerning gambling. Now, it seems to me the forms of gambling which are mentioned in this bill are forms of gambling. In regard to this bill I take the position that we should not legalize these forms of gambling, because by legalizing them we encourage them. I also take the position which is based on experience that laws pertaining to gambling, that such laws which attempt to control gambling are not successful because they cannot be enforced. I also take the position which is also based on observation

28b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

issue. People are running these things today. We saw one example recently. I think it's about time we attempt to do this orderly and on a fair basis to all concerned. Therefore, I intend to vote for this bill with the hope that if experience proves otherwise we can improve this bill at later sessions.

SENATOR WATSON OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT: Mr. President, I am not in favor of the bill as it is written. I agree with the Senator from the Twenty Fifth that it should have a commission in the state to handle it. I don't think it can be handled on a local basis. I will admit that this bill is a great improvement over the bill which we passed four years ago and was vetoed by the Governor, but for the record I would like to inquire from the Senator from the Twenty Second the question of legislative intent because I am a little puzzled by the wording; in Section 5 on prizes, I would like to have it in the record, the question I am going to ask - it says "all prizes given at any bazaar or raffle shall be merchandise or tangible personal property."

It seems to me that many raffles are run or have been run in the past and the prize would be a ticket to Bermuda, a travel ticket of some kind. Would it be considered that travel tickets are merchandise? That is the question I would like to have answered for the record because it has been asked of me, whether travel tickets, either railroad, air, boat, whatnot, would be considered merchandise.

29b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

SENATOR WHELAN: Mr. President, I will be glad to answer the Senator from the Fourth through the Chair. I certainly do not think a ticket to Bermuda or a ticket to Europe could be considered as tangible merchandise. I think what is considered as tangible merchandise would be a television set or something of a similar nature, but certainly that in my opinion would not be in line with anything that would be permitted under this present act. I respect their wishes.

SENATOR WATSON: Then I am even more opposed to it because I to feel if you are going to raffle things I think a ticket to Bermuda or a ticket to Florida is certainly something that should be included, and in my personal opinion I think it would be considered tangible merchandise. I was hoping the Senator from the Twenty Second would answer in the other

SENATOR WATSON OF THE TWENTY FIRST DISTRICT: Mr. President,

SENATOR WHELAN: I oppose that on the basis that the provision further states that the article may not be redeemed for cash. Now, on that basis, a ticket to some place is very very easily redeemable for cash.

SENATOR WATSON: It could be stated it was not redeemable. In that case would it be considered tangible merchandise?

SENATOR REINHARD OF THE TWENTY THIRD DISTRICT: Mr. President, I suggest we pass a resolution to send the Senator from the Fourth to Bermuda at the expense of the Senate.

THE CHAIR: Speaking for the Senator I am sure he will accept.

SENATOR REINHARD: Mr. President, I rise to favor this bill.

30b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

think this bill is a tribute to the men on the Judiciary Committee who worked long and worked hard hours to try to hammer out a bill which would be a bill that presented many safeguards. There have been many people who have been concerned about this bill. I respect their wishes. I don't agree with them. I don't think some of the things they claim will happen as the result of the passage of a bill like this will happen. I wish to say I respect their wishes. I know the Judiciary Committee had a very difficult job to do. It certainly isn't easy to try to do something like this when you have some people who are so vitally concerned about what can happen in the event the bill isn't properly drawn. Again I wish to state I think that this bill is a good bill. I urge its adoption.

SENATOR STOCK OF THE TWENTY FIRST DISTRICT: Mr. President, I intend to vote for this bill. Also I would like to make this one additional comment, that I think the beneficiaries of the bill, the charitable and other organizations, should realize that the bill is being passed in some sense in a probationary manner. If there is a recurrence of the type of abuse which has existed in some places in the past I think these organizations should realize there will in that event certainly be a demand for the repeal of this law. I personally believe our charitable and fraternal organizations will use good sense, good judgment and reasonableness in availing themselves of the opportunities under this act.

I

31b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

I sincerely hope they will do so, so this legislation will be able to be used in years to come.

SENATOR GILMAN OF THE TWENTIETH DISTRICT: Mr. President, I have had quite a bit of correspondence on both sides of this issue, and now that I see the bill and have it explained to me by the Senator from the Twenty Second, who says it is a tightly drawn bill, I believe in view of the fact that it has so many restrictions, and particularly the fact that it has a referendum, I shall vote for the bill.

SENATOR FINNEY OF THE THIRTY SIXTH DISTRICT: Mr. President, members of this Circle, you know, it seems to me what we are saying here is that in order to stake some of the best organizations in the State of Connecticut we must decide that it is good and proper and necessary to gamble, and the thing that amazes me, it seems a little inconsistent to say that by these means the best people in the State of Connecticut shall be supported, and at the same time feel that you must put these restrictions around it as though you yourself in the Judiciary Committee think it was a horror that must be carefully confined. I am afraid I am opposed to this bill. I always have been, and perhaps you can put it down to the viewpoint of a lady who is concerned sometimes with the pay envelope that a gentleman may bring home, and let me assure you that I am not worrying about my husband, he is a very conservative man, but it is true that it makes very little difference to a family where the father

32b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

went out and paid his two dollars on the nose of a good many horses, or whether he went out and carefully put it on a wheel which may or may not function as it should. I have heard in the last seven years here in Hartford that if we didn't have such a bill there would be no fire companies, there would be no schools and other things. In my own district in this State, and I hope that I will not hear again that I live on the goalposts of Connecticut, we have had during the last year all kinds of drives, voluntary drives for funds. In Stamford St. Joseph's Hospital went out with/tickets, without wheels, without anything, and asked for a million dollars, and amazingly they got \$1,400,000, voluntarily given because people were persuaded that this was something that was good for the whole community. In my own town of Greenwich we have had a parochial school on voluntary contributions to the town of \$360,000. The Presbyterian Church as collected \$300,000. The thing you have to do is to work, and in my book what we are doing here is saying look, don't work, don't believe in this thing, go out and have fun, put down your dime and go home with a blanket. It's a wonder we didn't do it here in this Senate the other day when we decided to have a collection for the Cancer Society. We don't do it for polio. My own feeling is that the good outfit that does it this way loses some of its dignity, and I am for good causes but I do believe that when we believe in causes we should go

33b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

out voluntarily and with all our hearts. I shall vote
against this bill.

SENATOR LAING OF THE SEVENTH DISTRICT: Mr. President, I always am distressed to oppose the Senator from the Thirty Sixth because I feel that fundamentally she represents what she believe in, and I know that she respects every other member of this Senate and allows them to represent what they believe in, and I don't want to spend any great time on this thing but I feel that as a public duty due to the many letters I have received in opposition to this bill that I must make my stand clear, and she has given me the clue to the thing. I want to say the greatest gamble we have today is the gamble against cancer, and we contributed voluntarily, and certainly nobody is going to force anybody with a club to buy a chance for some worthy organization. We gamble on the polio drive. We contributed and I think we won, but it was a gamble, a gamble with a philosophical base, but we still gambled. We are gambling now against cancer, tuberculosis and even poison ivy. Nobody forces anybody to buy a chance and there certainly hasn't been one distinguished gentleman in this State who during the past several weeks has found himself embroiled in the very unfortunate situation of being the recipient of a door prize of which he had no knowledge, and yet he's been pilloried for receiving that prize and accepting it, and I say that this bill is honorable, it is decent. I will admit today that I monthly pay

34b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

one dollar toward a subterfuge to avoid a law on our books today to take care of a worthy organization, I yield to a subterfuge that is being used in every organization and club throughout the State. In the Hartford Courant I think only three days ago it said that if we don't pass this bill we are indulging in mild hypocrisy, we are hypocrites because we really contribute toward these organizations through these subterfuges in our factories, our offices, because you can't stop gambling. As a matter of fact, although we haven't used this expression on the floor of the Senate this session, to the best of my knowledge the common expression in the United States today is "I'll bet you're wrong." I won't recount a certain recent encounter I witnessed, but I will say that we don't go through twenty four hours a day a week where somebody doesn't say "I'll bet you five to one you're wrong." As a matter of fact I have a very nice story I could tell about that but I can't tell it on this floor today, but I will be glad to tell the Senator from the Thirty Sixth that story in private some time. I think she might enjoy it. I know her. I know she enjoys a good story in private. But this bill does eliminate mild hypocrisy, it eliminates things we are fighting against in gambling, and certainly two bucks on the nose is a lot different than one dollar for the volunteer fire company, one dollar for your local charity, and nobody uses a brickbat to make you buy it except if you are a Senator or

35b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

a Representatives, and then you can't afford not to buy it.

SENATOR GRANT OF THE TWENTY SEVENTH DISTRICT: Mr. President, I don't myself care for the approaches to this issue which are based on moralizing. I don't feel that way on it myself. But I am against the bill just the same. To me it seems like a step toward retrogression. I think there are levels in the way we do things in life. There are poor ways of doing things and better ways, very high ways of doing things, and I think when anyone seriously recommends that there is such a thing as not contributing to the great causes, hospitals, cancer and so on, purely on the merits, and there is a difference when you do it because you are looking for something for yourself; perhaps when you are going to come out ahead maybe it can't be evaluated on a moral basis, but it seems to me one is a little bit more selfish than the other in a way. It isn't quite as good a level of human conduct. I think a concession is being made to the weakness in human nature. I don't like to see these things happening. It is because I don't like to see it that I go on record against it.

SENATOR BARRINGER OF THE THIRTY SECOND DISTRICT: Mr. President, this is the type of issue that a wise man would take off for the washroom. Nonetheless it is an issue which the people from my district have exhibited great interest in. I am going to vote against the bill, so that there is no question what I am going to do. Sometimes the gentlemen

36b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

from the press are a little uncertain what I am going to do, but that is what I am going to do and here are my reasons, and they are not moral reasons. I suppose in this country every man's got a right to go to hell in his own basket if he wants to go. That is a good premise in a free society. But I am not sure that the state should necessarily help him in that process, and I think the big question here, and I know, it is such a futile feeling, I know I won't change one vote, I know everybody's got their mind made up, but I want to point out in passing, I think the big gamble here is ~~that~~ with the essential security of the State of Connecticut. Now, the bingo business isn't worked very well. There are areas where that's been in operation, and this is another step and those who have been here any length of time know that horseracing, pinball machines, all the rest of them are in a sense at each session of the legislature lurking around the capitol trying to get a way in, and I am quite frank to say a number of years ago I looked with fond eyes on horseracing because I do love trotting, I have driven horses and I like them, so I am not going to be sanctimonious about this, but in the intervening years I have been connected with law enforcement, and the more you see of it the more you realize how thing thing ~~gr~~ creeps in. Now, you've got 350 State Policemen in this state. They've got a lot to do and they do it very well, but the reason that they can operate with

37b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

such a small number, and the reason that your small towns and cities can operate with such a small police force is the essential fact that organized crime has never gotten a foothold in here. Now, for a three year period I tried small case after small case, involving all the vicissitudes of small towns, and I said I am going to get through and never have anything to do with organized crime. I said it too soon because one snowy night in the middle of winter I was trying the first policy slip case I had ever run into and the fine there is some \$25 or \$30, and the penalty is, I think, 15 or 20 days in the can. It is a very small, miniscule, minor, small proposition, didn't amount to a row of pins. There are all kinds of cases that have a much severer penalty in the minor courts, so I thought this would be routine, give him an admonishment, a five buck fine and go on. A snowy night in the middle of winter - what can I say? Three esteemed attorneys, whose combined fee no man in this Circle could pay, on a criminal case - what are you here for? Want to represent this man. Amazing. Now, this man was part of a gambling group, and the idea was to get him to go to jail and keep his mouth shut so the thing wouldn't go higher up. Now it is there all the time, it is evidently so all the time. You have seen things like the Kefauver investigation; you have seen things like the trotting scandals in New York. This is a good State and a clean State and a nice State to live in, and I

38b.

VAS

JUNE 3, 1955

think you are playing hanky-panky with it in this thing, and while I can't say there is anything morally wrong about it - I bought slips, not slips, I bought these chances at raffles, I have gone to horseraces, and about everything everybody else in this Circle has done, but it is quite another thing to create this moral climate where it is slowly coming in because if there is anything I hate on the face of this earth is organized crime, where they do it for profit, and there's only a couple of things that supply the dough they need to operate; one is compulsory prostitution and the other is drugs and the third is gambling, and of the three gambling is the best, that's where the dough is, in the little five cents, ten cents, small chances. Now, as I say, I know I will change no vote, but I say it along the lines of an honest cop, the late Ed Hickey, and no ~~finer~~ finer thing can be said about a man than that he was honest and did credit to the department, that is the finest department. He set the moral tone for police departments all over this state. Now, a little earlier we were talking about this capital punishment. This is just as serious because this is the dough that carries and finances smart lawyers, influence in legislature, influences any judges, ~~buying~~ buying off prosecutors. Now, that's what the experience in other states has been. Is there any reason to think that human natures, human frailties being what they are, it would be any different in this State? I don't say

JUNE 3, 1955

that this specific, this particular bill is going to do that, but I say that it is part of a forward move, they are outside this State Capitol and they have been here for years trying to get in, and generations of men have said they shan't get in. Maybe I am belaboring it too much, but you know this is an awfully nice State to live in, this is an awfully nice state when one full time cop can keep order in a factory town of 7500, an awfully nice state to go through where you know that the State Police and law enforcement officers are on the up and up. It's a big change from some other places I have been, and I am just proud of it, and I think you are opening a progressive door here which someday is going to lead to trouble. Maybe that's wrong, but I have just got to say that in passing. I wish I didn't, I wish I was out in the washroom and did not have to vote on it, but the people who sent me here, they all know and ought to know why I am voting against it.

THE CHAIR: Any further remarks? If not, question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Those in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The bill is passed.

SENATOR WARD OF THE FIRST DISTRICT: Mr. President, I move we stand in recess until 8 P.M.

THE CHAIR: The Senate will stand in recess until 8 P.M.
(Senate recessed at 6:15 P.M.)

H-25

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY

HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1955

VOL. 6
PART 5
2211-2875

May 31, 1955

IDA
DA

AGM
A 7

report of the House Committee on Cities and Boroughs. "An Act concerning Appropriations by the City of Ansonia."

MR. SNYDER (BLOOMFIELD): that the committee's favorable report be
I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER: is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage.
Question is on acceptance and passage.

MR. SNYDER (BLOOMFIELD):

Mr. Speaker, this bill simply allows the City of Ansonia to raise or to increase the amount that they may expend on celebrations to not more than \$1500 from \$500. I hope the bill passes.

THE SPEAKER: first place, in order for a community to have bazaars and raffles. Any remarks? If not, question is on acceptance and passage. Those in favor say "aye"; opposed? The "ayes" have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: bazaar or raffle are veterans organizations, religious organizations, fraternal organizations, and other organizations.
House Bill No. 567 Calendar 1254 file No. 1171. Favorable report of the House Committee on Cities and Boroughs. "An Act providing for a Pension from the City of Ansonia for Florence H. Faber."

MR. SNYDER (BLOOMFIELD): have been in existence for not less than three years.
May that bill be passed, retaining its place on the Calendar?

THE SPEAKER: confined solely to the duly qualified members of the organization.
It will be passed, retaining.

THE CLERK: running the bazaar or raffle. No person under 21 years of age.
Substitute for House Bill No. 1555 Calendar No. 1353, File No. 1149. Favorable report of the Committee on Judiciary.

May 31, 1955

MOA
S AAGM
A 8

"An Act concerning Bazaars and Raffles."

MR. PRUYN (COLEBROOK):

Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee's favorable report be accepted and the bill passes.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

MR. PRUYN (COLEBROOK):

This bill, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

legalizes bazaars and raffles on an elective basis under very strict conditions. I should like briefly to touch on the highlights.

In the first place, in order for a community to have bazaars and raffles it must be by special referendum of the electors of that community and that referendum cannot be called until five per cent of the electors petition for it. The only organizations that can sponsor a bazaar or raffle are veterans organizations, religious organizations, civic or service clubs, fraternal or fraternal benefit societies, educational or charitable organizations and volunteer fire companies. These organizations must be bona fide organizations and must have been in existence for not less than three years before they apply for a permit. The operation of the bazaar is confined solely to the duly qualified members of the organization, and no member can receive any remuneration for his services in running the bazaar or raffle. No person under 21 years of age may operate a bazaar or raffle or work at the bazaar or raffle or take any part in it except that nobody under 16 years of

May 31, 1955

MOA
8 AAGM
A 9

age shall sell any raffle ticket. All funds derived from the bazaar or raffle must be devoted to the purposes specified in the application for the permit.

Now there are three kinds of permits. Class No. 1 permit allows the operation of a raffle within three months of the granting of the permit where the prizes cannot exceed \$5,000.00. Class No. 2 permit permits the operation of the raffle within two months where the aggregate value of the prize shall not exceed \$1,000.00. Class No. 3 permit is for a bazaar not exceed ten consecutive days. Only one class 1 permit can be issued during a calendar year, no more than three class No. 2 permits and only one class No. 3 permits. The prizes must be merchandise except for alcoholic liquor; no alcoholic liquor and no cash, and no prizes may be redeemed for cash. In order to have a bazaar the sponsoring organization must file an application in duplicate with the chief of police or the first selection in towns that have no organized police force and this application is to be on a form prepared by the Commissioner of State Police and it gives in great detail the life history of the organization, the type of bazaar and raffle that is to be conducted, the number and price of the raffle tickets and the purpose for which the net income is to be used, and any other information the Commissioner of State Police may require. There are fees for the issuance of each permit in order to carry the cost of operating the processing of the application. The Chief of police or first selectman must cause an investigation be made of the applicant and the facts cited in the application and if he

May 31, 1955

MDA
R AAGM
A10

finds them O.K. then he will issue the permit. No item of expense shall be paid in connection with the bazaar or raffle except those who are bona fide amounts for goods or merchandize purchased or service rendered, reasonably necessary in connection with the operation of the bazaar and nobody shall receive any recompense whatever to operate and conduct the bazaar or raffle. There are limitations on advertizing; it can't be advertised by television, sound truck or by billboard, except one sign of a small size may be displayed on the premises where the drawing is to be held and where the prizes will be exhibited. If, after the issuance of the permit there are any changes in the facts they must be reported to the chief of police or the authority and he has the authority then to revoke the permit if necessary. Within thirty days after the end of the bazaar or raffle the organization operating the bazaar or raffle has to file a sworn statement in duplicate showing in detail the items of receipts and expenses and any profit and the purpose for which the profit is to be used. A duplicate of that goes to the state police. It shall be placed on file so that anybody interested can examine it for a period of a year. These reports can be examined by the chief of police and the state police commissioner and compared with the application and if there's any discrepancy and the facts warrant it, the matter will be reported to the prosecuting authority. Any town can rescind its action in the same way, by referendum that is adopted by law. The state police commissioner has the power to make regulations in the interest of the protection of the public covering the operation of

May 31, 1955

MDA
OIAAGM
A 11

bazaars and raffles and the bill provides penalties for violation. That in very brief is a summary of this bill. It contains very very strict safeguards which, in the opinion of the committee is ample for the protection of the public and will enable these bazaars and raffles to be held. I realize that there are many people opposed to gambling of any kind and they will be opposed to this bill. There are also many people in favor of this bill. I shall not attempt to argue the morals of the religious and moral scruples involved in gambling. The matter is before this House for disposition. It is a good bill and a strong bill. I hope it passes.

MR. SMITH (MANSFIELD):

Mr. Speaker, I am between two fires. In the first place, I have just been advised I don't talk loud enough so I can be heard by some people. On the other hand I have been advised by good friends not to get too excited over this bill. I will try to follow both advices. I just heard what a fine bill this is. I want to say that I don't think it is a very fine bill and that is a very restrained comment to begin with. If we look through our statutes we see several pages that are devoted to the matter of gambling, lotteries and so forth. It would take several pages to set forth the position of Connecticut over the years with reference to this bill. I am sure you will find a chapter on bingo and you remember we made promise of strict enforcement and also about merchandize prizes and we all know what happened about the enforcement of bingo over the years. Just by way of illustration I happen to have in

May 31, 1955

MOA
II AAGM
A 12

my file a little illuminating matter with reference to bingo over in Windham County. The jackpot was \$980 over there in cash. The winner of the jackpot was unable to collect it. When they brought the group into court, particularly this one chap, his attorney argued there was nothing against him because attempted larceny on an illegal transaction can't be prosecuted. The judge took a different view and I think the bingo cheater was fined and jailed. It's a good illustration of what happened about enforcement of bingo with reference to merchandize prices and no cash prices, and so forth. Now the bill we have before us is on the bingo pattern. The bill would permit hundreds of crooks to conduct operations illegally under the circumstances. It is not constitutional. A member of this House who is now on one of the upper benches of the state had this to say two years ago about this matter: "We also feel a law granting special gambling privileges to certain organizations permitting them to engage in a practice denied to legally responsible organizations is unconstitutional." As a lawyer I think the Governor might be interested in that observation. Let's look at some of the provisions of this bill. There's no law in this bill about the attendance of children. There is some reference to nobody under 21 to be allowed to conduct or in any way take part in the operation of a raffle. There's some more about nobody under 16 being allowed to peddle tickets. There's nothing in the bill to prevent the participation of children and of course they will furnish part of the patronage to these bazaars and raffles. Now prices for merchandize only. Under bingo we found there were

May 31, 1955

MDA
I. A.AGM
A13

shops that would cash in all the prizes offered at the bingo games. There's nothing in this bill about offering \$100.00 worth of groceries in the First National. Isn't this a farce to attempt to palm this bill off as requiring merchandize only because it's only a subterfuge. It's use was to turn prices into cash. There's no limit on the number of tickets to be sold. There's no provision after the raffle is held there has to be a report of how many tickets have been sold. There's absolutely nothing in that bill to prevent how many tickets can be sold on a given piece of merchandise. A few years ago we had an exhibition outside the capitol an automobile that was to be raffled off. I protested to the person concerned that was poor public relations. It was a definite flouting of the law. I said, "You don't need that three thousand dollars" and he said, "We sold \$100,000.00 worth of tickets on that" and of course there's no protection in any of these bills. In this bill they do not contain the number to be sold and I think the buyer is entitled to that information as to whether he is going to have one chance in ten or one chance in a million. Absolutely no control over how many tickets sold. Advertising by television or sound truck or by billboards is prohibited but advertising by radio newspapers or circulars is not prohibited. If you are against television, why not bar radio, why not bar newspapers? I think the answer is the proponents of this bill did not want to forfeit the support or at least didn't want the opposition of people interested in radio and newspapers. Now whether it is so or not it is unfair competition to all other groups who are trying to raise money

May 31, 1955

MOA
EIAAGM
A 14

who would not or could not operate raffles. It is unfair competition with the Red Cross as well as the United Community Chest and all those things that now depend upon voluntary gifts of the people. They could not or they would not go into competition to get the public's money. If a volunteer fire company can conduct a raffle for equipment why don't the City of Hartford conduct a raffle to organize their fire department and maintain it? If the Elks can have raffles for their charitable purposes, why cannot the city of Bridgeport have a raffle to pay for their welfare and health, hospitals and schools and why can't the State of Connecticut conduct lotteries over a series of years to pay for education and to pay for highways? Sir, I make the suggestion it may come home to harness later on. Now we heard about the strict regulations in this bill. Of course I take those with a grain of salt. It has been mentioned in our previous discussions that a committee could be set up to enforce it, in New Jersey and the head of this commission is having his headaches in New Jersey enforcing the law. Bingo is just about as easy to handle as an eel with your bare hands. Mr. Speaker, why should we permit and encourage a program of this kind that we all know undermines private and public morality? I would say don't let the jingle of cash drown out the voice of common sense and conscience.

MR. GOOGLE (NEW BRITAIN):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to request a point of information from the Gentleman from Mansfield which I direct through you, Mr. Speaker. That is this: He quoted a statement made by a judge and I think

May 31, 1955

MDA
41 A

AGM
A 15

in order to complete that statement, that information he submitted to us, he should furnish us with the name of the Judge he is quoting on that statement.

MR. SMITH (MANSFIELD): The deflation of bazaar under this act that this Mr. Speaker, the statement was made by a member of the Legislative Council in making a minority report to that council on the legislation. The Gentleman is Mr. Charles House who is now on the Superior Court bench. I believe that disqualifies him from passing on any bills that might come up to him later.

MR. BERGIN (ANSONIA):

I would like to say a few words in favor of this bill. I belong to the volunteer fire department in my town -- think that it

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE: language when voting that is the language used Can't hear. Section 1 of the bill refers to bazaars and

MR. BERGIN (ANSONIA): (Continuing) and I think that the vote it-

-- and I have a letter from one of the leaders there, a low Republican fire department there which is very much in favor of this bill. I was wondering, for a time, if my friend was the gentleman that won that automobile over there. (Could not hear

Mr. Bergin of Ansonia)

MR. EIELSON (TRUMBULL): If not, question is on adoption of House

The Clerk has an amendment. Favor say "aye"; opposed? The

THE SPEAKER: The amendment is lost.

The Clerk will read the amendment.

THE CLERK: to speak in opposition to the enactment of this act.

This House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. Eielson of Trumbull:

May 31, 1955

MDA
21 A

AGM
A16

In Section 2 line 25 and 26 strike out the word "bazaar" and insert in lieu thereof "games of chance."

MR. EIELSON (TRUMBULL): This proposed legislation is--

THE SPEAKER: It is only under the definition of bazaar under this act that this has to go before the public on a referendum. Bazaars are legal at the present time provided there's no game of chance involved. I feel this is very misleading to the public who will be voting on this thing to be asked if they are in favor of bazaars when many will think of bazaars as they are presently run and not under games of chance.

MR. PARSELLS (FAIRFIELD): us on the road to moral decadence if

we I want to oppose this amendment just because I think that it is better to use the language when voting that is the language used in the bill. Section 1 of the bill refers to bazaars and raffles and I think it defines them and I think that the vote itself should be in the language that is now in the bill, to allow bazaars "yes" or to allow bazaars and raffles "no". I can't believe that anybody who goes to vote in this particular referendum will go without knowing before they go what they are voting on.

THE SPEAKER: every community across the nation is faced with actions

of Any further remarks? If not, question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Those in favor say "aye"; opposed? The "nays" have it. The amendment is lost.

MR. WHITE (VERNON): two additional hours of public drinking on

Sum I rise to speak in opposition to the enactment of this act.

This I believe: I am no puritan and incidently Webster's definition

May 31, 1955

MDA
DIA

AGM
A17

of one isn't too complimentary. I wish it understood there is no halo of righteousness encircling my head nor do I assume to foster my beliefs on other people. This proposed legislation is--

THE SPEAKER: or compromise in the next legislative session. That's

just Would the Gentleman from Vernon speak nearer the microphone?

MR. WHITE (VERNON): (Continuing) dies and Gentlemen, be a part of

the The structure of this great nation was founded and undoubtedly

will be perpetuated by strong religious convictions so strongly

adhered to by our forefathers. It would seem that the time has

come for sober reflection and a reflection of the forces that are

ever progressively bearing us on the road to moral decadence if

we are to retain our self respect and dignity as a god-fearing

nation. This bill is, in my opinion, involved in the master mind

of the Democratic party and we of the Republican party, fearful

of being out-done are riding along authorizing them to go along.

You must not go along. You are forgetting that a large segment

of our voting population including many organizations whose votes

this measure is trying to capture, is just as opposed to any, not

gambling law as those who are pushing for its enactment. In these

days in which every community across the nation is faced with actions

of violence, murder, robbery and juvenile delinquency, instead of

fighting every avenue that leads to these cases of degeneracy we

will create additional stimulation. It's a shame a bill was passed

recently permitting two additional hours of public drinking on

Sunday. Now to add insult to injury we want to include legalized

gambling. I ask where are we going? The proponents of this bill,

May 31, 1955

MDA
71AAGM
A18

and perhaps honestly so have brought out a compromise bill that is air-tight but believe you me, with this sort of legislation there isn't any compromise. There's just a widening of the doorway to further compromise in the next legislative session. That's just what the boys who thrive on this sort of thing have been waiting for. Don't, I beg you Ladies and Gentlemen, be a part of the passing of this bill. It isn't enforceable insofar as the state police will tell you. They will have to augment their police force by many additional men preferring that it be police action on a lower level. This is a moral issue and I ask these two gentlemen on the left side of the aisle so eloquent in a recent debate defining their moral senseibilities, not compromise in defeating this bill. This bill in my opinion is loaded with political implications but instead of yielding to pressure groups let's have a moral group when it comes to a vote and stand up on our two feet and be counted on the side of good citizenship and set a good example to the youths of our state and the people of our state and look them in the face and say we have done our part, now we ask that you do yours. In the chance this should come to the Governor's desk I trust that he will and I believe him a gentleman of strong moral convictions, have the courage to veto it. If this is a moral issue, and I believe it is, then we must face it. If gambling is good, then why not go whole hog. Let's have a race track and a state lottery. If gambling is bad, it is not sanctified by letting a church use it. Should I be the only member who votes against this bill and the only member who disapproves I shall still

May 31, 1955

MDA
81A

AGM
A19

vote against it. I am not interested in popularity unless it can be obtained by upright means. I have seen much to disgust me here and I don't care to represent my fellow citizens unless permitted to act conscientiously. Mr. Speaker, I move when the vote be taken it be by roll call. Thank you, Sir.

THE SPEAKER: I think that I every played over half a dozen bingo games. The motion is when the vote be taken it be taken by roll call. We will dispose of this motion first. Those in favor of the motion that when the vote be taken it be taken by roll call vote kindly rise and remain standing until counted by the tellers. Those I opposed? The motion is carried.

MR. WELLES (VERNON): are conducted. I saw no fights, no arrests or anything. Mr. Speaker, I am against this bill. I am against legalized gambling in any form, no matter how sugar-coated it may be. Our State of Connecticut is morally good and economically sound without gambling. Connecticut is a good place to live in; let's keep it that way. Again I say I am against this bill.

MR. BURKITT (ANSONIA): be as much wrong-doing as they could. It is. Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect and admiration for those who will oppose this bill, I am going to support this bill. I cannot and do not want to try to control their beliefs. They speak of gambling here as though it was a terrible sin and it might be, but we have sinners in our church; I don't think anyone will deny that and we have one of the biggest gambling casinos in all the world on Wall Street. They gamble every day. Right here in this House in 1947 this General Assembly wiped off 218 million dollars of the stockholders' money but you don't call that gambling.

May 31, 1955

MOA
EJAAGM
A20

Mr. Speaker, every day hundreds of thousands of dollars of shares is sold at a loss or a profit. If you don't call that gambling I would like to know what it is. I personally do not gamble in any shape or form or fashion. Mr. Speaker however I do believe in allowing my fellow citizens to pursue their own way of life also. I don't think that I ever played over half a dozen bingo games in my life and that was when I was a young boy when it first started and my girl friend who became my wife played the game a few times. And Mr. Speaker I have been in states, large and small, where gambling went on, where it was legalized, and believe me I could tell no difference in the people-- I could tell no difference in the way things were conducted. I saw no fights, no arrests or anything; everybody seemed to mind their own business and attend to their own affairs. They never bothered me, although I didn't participate. I want to say to the Members of this House that I can see no harm in this bill. I think it is a good bill. I think they have used every means and every effort to try to write a good bill to try to eliminate as much wrong-doing as they could. It amuses me to hear people say that don't want any gambling or they don't want this or they don't want that. I cannot see for the life of me why some sanctimonious people will practice their own way of life and no one disturbs them yet they would control the lives of other people. That Mr. Speaker, is not in my heart. That I cannot do. I wouldn't try to force my own way of life on someone else. I disagree with people it is true, as you know, right here on this floor of the House. I have been beaten by a great majority

May 31, 1955

MDA
DSA

AGM
A21

many times, but I know any person who voted against the thing had a right to for the very simple fact that I gave them that right, that they have that right in our form of governor and I have no right to criticise anyone who votes against me. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I hope that everyone that hasn't gambled at any time in their lives votes against this bill and I hope that everyone that has gambled votes for it. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to our judges, I am a god-fearing man, I like to go to church my family likes to go to church, I believe in God with all my heart yet I could not take it upon myself to control the lives of other people. Mr. Speaker I believe with all my heart this is a good bill. I don't believe it will do any harm. I hope it passes. Thank you.

MRS. WELLES (OLD SAYBROOK): This is a good amendment and I hope it passes. The Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment B offered by Mrs. Welles of Old Saybrook:

In section 3 line 20 strike out everything beginning with the word "sixteen years" through "sale of such tickets". In line 24, insert in lieu thereof "eighteen years shall be permitted to participate in any game or games of chance held, operated or conducted pursuant to any license issued under this act."

MRS. WELLES (OLD SAYBROOK): from 21 to 18 the age of a person that

They said they can't hear me unless I use a microphone. I am not worried whether you and you and you take a chance on a bazaar or raffle or buy as many tickets as you want to, but I am interested

This may be a good amendment although as I see it, it will

May 31, 1955

MDA
ISA

AGM
A22

in the minor child of this state and we are doing one thing on one side and then turning our faces and our backs to them on the other. We are talking about protecting the child from comic books we are appointing a special commission, we are spending money on them in the State of Connecticut and I can't see that the comic books are going to do a bit more harm than teaching children to gamble and I think this amendment should be included in this bill. We are working on things that have to do with juvenile delinquency. I certainly don't think gambling helps prevent juvenile delinquency and I believe if this were included in the bill there can be no question. Every town in which we have a bazarr we have children 9 and 10 running around from door to door selling chance on things. I think this bill should be so tight that under no circumstances could this possibly happen. This is a good amendment and I hope it passes.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of the amendment.

MR. PRUYN (COLEBROOK):

Would the Clerk please read the amendment again?

(The Clerk read amendment B again.)

MR. LAWRENCE (EAST WINDSOR):

Mr. Speaker, in going over that amendment I see actually we are lowering the age limit from 21 to 18 the age of a person that can conduct such a raffle or bazaar. I wonder if that is the intent of the amendment?

MR. SMITH (MANSFIELD):

This may be a good amendment although as I see it, it will go

May 31, 1955

MDA
SSAAGM
A23

down, it will cut it down. I am afraid if enough amendments are passed somebody might think this is a good bill.

MR. MAUTTE (EAST HAVEN):

Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I was not one of the persons had anything to do with drawing this bill. As I sat here and listened to this amendment as it has been presented, it occurred to me that maybe there was a purpose in mentioning the age of sixteen years. I have here a newspaper and I am going to read an article from that newspaper. I think the time is appropriate for that. "Raffle tickets for two custom built livingroom seats are now being sold by the high school varsity club. The benefit drawing will be held May 27, proceeds for the ticket sales will be used for buying new trophies for members of the school's athletic team." Ladies and Gentlemen, I think the purpose of inserting the wording "sixteen years" was just to take care of a situation of this kind. The Ladies Aid Society, the religious organizations have got raffles and they are being run now. These people don't realize under the present law that they can be prosecuted and the winner can be prosecuted and the prizes confiscated. I am going to take my seat and when the remarks on the regular bill comes up, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be allowed to speak again.

MR. LEWIS (DANBURY):

I know nothing about the laws in New Jersey and I have all the faith in the world in the state police and the local police. I do not know of one case where they have not been able to cope with the situation. And I can't see where there's any special privileges

May 31, 1955

MDA
ESA
AGM
A 24

according to this bill. I don't think the amendment

MR. MINOR (PLYMOUTH): of good anywhere. I think it would do a lot

I rise to a point of order.

THE SPEAKER:

State your point of order. amendment Schedule "B"? If not,

MR. MINOR (PLYMOUTH): In the opinion of the Chair

I think the Gentleman is not talking on the amendment.

THE SPEAKER (WEST HARTFORD):

Will the Gentleman from Danbury confine his remarks to the amendment? House Amendment Schedule "B".

MR. LEWIS (DANBURY): Schedule "C" offered by Mr. Conard of West

I apologize.

THE SPEAKER: words "newspapers, radio".

MR. Any further remarks on the amendment Schedule "B"?

MR. GRIFFITH (EAST HARTFORD): amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment. I think that if this law is passed for sixteen years old, or eighteen years old or anyone else in the State of Connecticut, the bill should be defeated all together. Now what are we going to do in this bill, if this bill is passed with this amendment? The young people of our State will go to those carnivals or bazaars or whatever you call them and watch them playing and pretty soon they are going to wish they could play and pretty soon they are going to be sneaking around lying about their age as they have done in many things before and learn to break the law very easily and early in life and learn to lose respect for that law. I think if this bill were

May 31, 1955

MDA
#S 1A
AGM
A25

passed it should be passed as is. I don't think the amendment would do the least bit of good anywhere. I think it would do a lot of harm to the juveniles in our state. House the Federal Commu-
THE SPEAKER: will not permit the use of radio for this purpose.

We Any further remarks on the amendment Schedule "B"? If not, those in favor say "aye"; opposed? In the opinion of the Chair the "nays" have it. The "nays" have it. The amendment is lost.

MR. CONARD (WEST HARTFORD): forth has been to enable them in the towns The Clerk has an amendment which they claim will not harm the

THE CLERK: the people in that town and will enable them to raise money House Amendment Schedule "C" offered by Mr. Conard of West Hartford: In section 10 line 4 after the words "by the means of" insert the words "newspapers, radio". would cross town lines. This

MR. CONARD (WEST HARTFORD): would allow us to have the small raffles and I move adoption of this amendment. if a bill of this kind is

THE SPEAKER: we should limit the advertising to the extent that it would Question is on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "C".

MR. CONARD (WEST HARTFORD):

MR. Speaker, I want it plainly understood before I speak on this amendment that I am opposed to this bill in its present form and I am opposed to this bill even if this amendment is adopted. However, if any such bill is to be passed by this House of Representatives I feel very strongly that it should be as tight a bill as we possibly can develop. A bill was reported out of sub-committee of the Judiciary and substantially tightened in Judiciary. This one matter of advertising, I think, is quite important. As

May 31, 1955

MDA
75AAGM
A26

Representative Smith has said we discriminate between radio and television. Is that proper? As has been pointed out personally to me by another representative in this House the Federal Communication System will not permit the use of radio for this purpose. We should, therefore, treat radio and television in the same way. Why do we have in this amendment newspapers? The whole purpose of this bill expressed by those representing the volunteer fire groups, legion groups and so forth has been to enable them in their towns to conduct small raffles which they claim will not harm the morals of the people in that town and will enable them to raise money for their good purposes. Let's not open this up to a large type raffle which would be advertised outside of these towns in which the raffle is being held which would cross town lines. This is a local option bill and would allow us to have the small raffles and bazaars. I think very strongly that if a bill of this kind is to be passed we should limit the advertising to the extent that it would not be advertised in radio nor in newspapers as well as in television.

MR. GOOGLE (NEW BRITAIN): I am opposed to this amendment for this reason: There's a serious question in my mind if we pass this amendment whether or not radio or newspapers could carry news stories about some church affairs, some church bazaar or some organization bazaar or raffle because it might be construed as advertising and the people who carry the news story could be prosecuted under the terms of this section of chance commission which is an expensive and rather doubtful proposition. We felt that that was not the answer in this

May 31, 1955

MDA
DSA

AGM
A27

Mr. CONARD (WEST HARTFORD): Speaking again on the amendment, speaking again, this is not a very valid position for the gentleman from New Britain to take since that would apply against television and if that were true, the word "television" should not be in there.

THE SPEAKER: Any further remarks? If not, question is on the adoption of House Amendment "C". Those in favor say "aye"; opposed? In the opinion of the Chair the "nays" have it. The amendment is lost.

MR. POPE (FAIRFIELD): I would like to say a word in behalf of this bill. We drafted the bill in Judiciary Committee-- previously, we have faith in the MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE: local law enforcement authorities and in their Can't hear. enforce the law; that being so, Mr. Speaker, I

MR. POPE (FAIRFIELD) (Continuing) a good bill and it ought to be passed. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a brief word in support of this bill, and in support of the Judiciary Committee which drafted it. We were faced with the serious problem on the one hand of allowing private organizations to use bazaars and raffles as a method of raising funds for worthy causes and, on the other hand, to keep out racketeers and other criminal elements which might be brought in by this type of activity. This raised the question of enforcement and it seems to me the great problem in this type of legislation and in this bill is the question of enforcement. We had, on the one hand, the experience in New Jersey where there is a legalized games of chance commission which is an expensive and rather doubtful proposition. We felt that that was not the answer in this

May 31, 1955

MDA
SSA

AGM
A28

state, at least at this time until it is show the size of the problem is such that the expenditure of money and the other outlays that are involved in a commission of this sort are merited. However, in leaving out the commission as a method of enforcement, we had tried to write in as much as possible in order to make certain that the thing will be enforced against those elements that we all do not want participating. The backbone of the enforcement, to my opinion, is in the detailed application form and the detailed reports which are provided for in the bill. You who have examined the bill can see any person or organization desiring to run a raffle or bazaar would have to put himself or themselves on record in no uncertain terms. As has been said previously, we have faith in the state police and in the local law enforcement authorities and in their ability to enforce the law; that being so, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a bill that is a good bill and it ought to be passed. I might say to me this is not a moral problem. I know that there are those who differ with me on that point. It is a problem, primarily, of raising money for causes that we all consider to be worthwhile. I think most of you will realize that the largest number of people who buy raffle tickets or participate in bazaars do so on a contribution basis. I doubt if there are too many who feel that they are actually taking a chance on winning a three thousand or four thousand dollar car and therefore the argument that this is a moral problem to me is out. We do have, on the other hand, the problem of the racketeer and that is the problem they had in New Jersey and I think that in the bill we have set up law enforcements and that being so, I feel it is a good bill. I hope it

May 31, 1955

MDA
8SA
AGM
A29

MR. SIMKO (BRIDGEPORT):

I would like to say, first, I concur wholeheartedly with the remarks of the Gentleman from Fairfield and I would ask further, since the proponents of legalized raffles and bazaars have been the subject of remarks, the proponents have been subjected to pressure, but how different, sir? They have been subjected to the pressure of outstanding civic and charitable organizations. What better pressure could a legislator have than this type of pressure we respect? The interest in this bill have come not only from the organizations named in the bill, but also from the individual citizens of our state. There's definite public spirit and public support for this bill. Most of these people feel it is long overdue. The average citizen who supports this bill doesn't consider it to be gambling and, more important, he sees no harm in it. I think we are becoming over-concerned with dangers that do not exist. We are at the point where we are looking for trouble of which there is no evidence today and I think the sub-committee of the Judiciary Committee are to be commended for bringing out a bill as fine as this.

MR. O'CONNOR (WINCHESTER):

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been well explained in detail by the Gentleman from Colebrook. I am especially pleased that it has a referendum feature, for in my opinion, by taking favorable action on the bill here today all we would be doing is giving the several towns an opportunity to decide for themselves whether they want bazaars or rafflex. It has been mentioned the bill also contains a medium whereby another referendum in the towns to repeal its

May 30, 1955

MOR
RSAAGM
A30

action subsequent to the time it has taken the original action may be held. I believe further that if bazaars and raffles are held the funds derived could be used for the public good. I believe it is a good bill and I hope it passes.

MR. LEWIS (DANBURY): Mr. Speaker, I number 5 here I'd like to ask every lady with all respect-- now my wife has had Stanley parties, Fuller Brush parties and Plastic parties. Everyone of those parties that she had gave a door prize. Now if there's a lady here within the sound of my voice has attended one of those parties, didn't every one of them have a door prize? Some one said to me one-armed bandits would be made legal by the proposed bill. That is wrong. How can anyone in this House pass a law that would legalize one-armed bandits? Now you can't get these one-armed bandits and don't believe anybody who tells you you can because you cannot get them to run. I urge everyone to vote for this bill.

MR. CONARD (WEST HARTFORD): Mr. Speaker, there are those who consider this question of religious or moral issue. I personally do not, but no matter how I personally feel it becomes such an issue by virtue of the large segment of our population who consider it as such. These persons believe with all their hearts and souls that it is morally wrong to gamble; they believe as did our first President, George Washington when he banned card games in the continental army because it was impossible to discriminate between innocent play and criminal cases. I cannot be sure that they are wrong. I can believe otherwise.

May 31, 1955

MDA
OEAAGM
A31

Believing otherwise, however, I must respect their basic belief and be slow to agree to changes in our law which to these people involve basic morality. But turn from this moral and religious issue for a moment. Just what's connected with gambling? I believe that what's wrong with gambling is not the act itself, but the state of mind. Say I pay \$5.00 for a good game of poker, for inducement. So far so good. The difficulty comes when I begin to spend that \$5.00 to get \$5,000.00, when I begin to believe that this is right, I am flying in the face of the morals of the universe, at least so far as they have been revealed to the human race. Man individually may think in a specific instance that he can get it, or is getting something for nothing; in the long run we have found that this is seldom, if ever, the case. We know from sad experience that this is never the case; when we take men collectively, or in other words, society as a whole. We are to this day paying for this same basic misconception which underlay the philosophy of the new deal. The new deal could only subscribe to the believe of something for nothing, but taught many of us that we had a right to expect it. (Time: 2:00 P.M. - The transcript which follows reported by
Were it not for the advent of the second World War we would have long since been bankrupt because of this attitude.)

MR. KIRKER (NORWICH):

Point of order. I don't think the Gentleman is citing the facts of the bill. He is talking now about politics. We are not interested now in a political argument; if he wants it O.K., we will answer it. We are interested in debating this bill and that's what he should stick to.

(Please turn to the next page. Nothing omitted.)

May 31, 1955

MGA
LEA

AGM
A32

THE SPEAKER:

Will the Gentleman from West Hartford continue his remarks on the bill?

MR. CONARD (WEST HARTFORD):

I will. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the other members of this General Assembly, that I am not so much concerned with the occurrence of individual cases of gambling but I am with the proposed action where in this State we would be placing the stamp of approval on the basic idea that mankind can expect something for nothing. If these organizations which are referred to in this bill cannot obtain their support by other means I say they are not worth their salt.

(Applause)

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully point out that in seeking this easy way to extract money from their constituency, they may be helping to create the evil or some of the evil which they are set up to eradicate.

(Time: 2:00 P.M. - The transcript which follows reported by Mrs. Marie Hill, Relief Stenographer, until otherwise noted in this record.)

There is talk of pressure groups. I can tell you I am under pressure on this thing, but I have not been pressured on this bill by the church or any other groups but by the faith and teachings of my father and mother a good many years ago. And it is my firm conviction that gambling, call it what you like -- there are all sorts of definitions for it -- call it raffles or bazaars or what you like -- (Please turn to the next page. Nothing omitted.)

When is not good. Not only that, but we are here as legislators

May 31, 1955.

MDA
SEA

B-1

(Continued from the "A" transcript of Alice Miller.) 2:00 p.m.

MLH

Mr. Marsters (Litchfield): It is good for the State of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Gentleman from Colebrook, the man who introduces this bill and the others who are supporting it, are doing so for the Yale Alumni Association. Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I feel that our primary concern here should be an honest effort to solve a situation which has been a knotty problem of the State for a long time. This bill is neither sincere nor is it feasible. It is nothing but a gold-plated phoney. I think that before considering passing such a measure, we should hold a state-wide referendum on it just as other states have done. There should be no law permitting gambling on the statute books of our state without the weight of public opinion behind it. I hope the bill is defeated.

Mr. Minor (Plymouth): Its repeal. I believe that you are not doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know just where to begin or end on this bill. I would like to say first, however, that I do not consider myself any better than any other person in this Hall. Everyone who talks on it is putting a good deal too much antagonism into this thing. There is talk of pressure groups. I can tell you I am under pressure on this thing, but I have not been pressured on this bill by the church or any other groups but by the faith and teachings of my father and mother a good many years ago. And it is my firm conviction that gambling, call it what you like -- there are all sorts of definitions for it -- call it raffles or bazaars or whatever you like, they are all, I believe, something which is not good. Not only that, but we are here as legislators

May 31, 1955.

I-8

HJM

B-2

MLH

and as legislators we have the right and the duty of opposing any law unless we believe that it is good for the State of Connecticut. The eyes of every school child is upon us. Is there any one of us who wants to go out of the Hall of this House and say they had voted for a gambling bill whether it be for a firemen's association or anything else. I can't find words strong enough to condemn as much as I would like to this bill. There is a master mind behind this, and I think that the master minds who propose such things don't think that anyone could lay hands on any of them because they are outside the State. A bill such as this one comes up every two years, and will, I suppose, until such time as one of them is passed -- if that's ever possible. But just as soon as it is passed there will be movements on foot and strong ones too for its repeal; and they will have plenty of reasons for wanting its repeal. I believe that you are not doing your duty as legislators of this state if you vote for this bill or any like it. ~~has ever been to a clamor, or played a~~ Mr. Reath (Durham): ~~money, if when he did, did he run out and~~ Mr. Speaker, I don't think that what I am going to say will change any vote in this House, but I would like to call your attention, and the attention of the Ladies and Gentlemen in this House to one fact. The nation and the State of Connecticut just celebrated Memorial Day. I would like to remind you that the selection of the men who went to be killed first was constituted by a ~~raffle~~ raffle; the men who would give up their lives for their country, -- and many of them did -- was constituted by a raffle. I am not a great orator like the Gentleman from West

May 31, 1955.

S-8

B-3

MLH

MLH

Hartford, but we came here to do a job. I feel that everyone here has an opinion on this; their minds are all made up. Let's settle this thing once and for all, and pass it if you think it's a good bill. (East Haven);

Mr. Carlson (Killingworth): of the boys, stick to it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill. There has been a lot said about its need by the volunteer fire departments and others, and I feel that they have never had to resort to this means to support themselves; they have supported their departments by group activities, taxes, donations and other means. Every organization which is worthwhile gets its support by some means other than holding out something for nothing. I hope that this bill is defeated.

Mr. Lewis (Danbury): ed by the local Chief of Police or the Selectmen I have nothing but a high school education, while my friend on the other side of the House is an attorney. However, I would like to ask him if he has ever been to a clambake, or played a game of chance for money, if when he did, did he run out and holler "police"?

Mr. Mautte (East Haven): ere can be no money involved in these

Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House; I heard a remark made here a few minutes ago from a Gentleman on my left who stated that if an organization can't exist without such a bill that it is not worth its salt. I wonder if the Gentleman belongs to any service group, or would even like me to mention service organizations. I think this is a good bill, and I hope it passes.

Time 2:15 Continued with transcript of Alice Miller.

May 31, 1955.

E-8

B-4

HJM

MLH

Mr. Griffith (East Hartford):

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to correct the Gentleman. The gentleman who made that remark was on that side of the House.

Mr. Mautte (East Haven):

I appreciate your support of the boys, stick to it. There are many service organizations which have been using the method of raising money through the raffle system. I think that we ought to legalize it so some of my friends don't get in trouble. But I also have friends in this House who have been led to believe that if this raffle bill is passed there will be a crap game on every corner. I know that that is not so. That is not the intent of the bill, and not the way it was written at all. The bill is well-written. It starts off by stating that permits will be issued by the local Chief of Police or the Selectmen of the town, and if you can't put your faith in them, we certainly have the wrong people in office. Secondly, it states that it must be cleared through the state police commissioner, and that there shall be a certain fee paid, and that it can only be brought into a town by a referendum with five percent of the people voting on it. There can be no money involved in these raffles, -- only merchandise being passed out. It also says that only members of the organizations involved can work at these bazaars and raffles, and an organization must be organized for over three years in order to qualify. I think it's a good bill and that it will do a great many worthwhile things for many charitable organizations. I think this is a good bill, and I hope it passes.

Time 2:15 Continued with transcript of Alice Miller.

2-10P
7/29/

May 31, 1955

AGM
C-1

(Time 2:15 P.M. - Following reported by Official Stenographer Alice Gallivan Miller until otherwise noted in the transcript.)

MR. YESUKIEWICZ (ENFIELD):

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee for several terms, this type of bill has come before us on many occasions and I think the present sub-committee of the Judiciary worked harder and more dilligently to attempt to get out a bill that would be satisfactory to the people as a whole. I don't know that sub-committee, but after they got through with their work-- and believe me it took hours; the items were gone over item by item before the entire judiciary committee checking and rechecking the bill in order to make it the best possible bill-- the Judiciary Committee thought that this issue should be brought out on the floor where the people would be given an opportunity to express their views and vote on it. Now over the years I have had my own thoughts on this type of bill. I have never played cards for money and don't know how. I never expect something for nothing out of a project of this type and as a matter of fact, when I did buy a ticket or so it was a donation, as far as I was concerned, to various organizations. There were times when I, as an official of various organizations, was placed in an embarrassing spot where the group as a whole voted to have a raffle of one type or another and I, as their head officer, felt the responsibility was mine and I think that happens to a lot of people but thank goodness as often as I have bought tickets, I have never, one and therefore never got my name in the papers and subjected to all kinds of criticisms. Now there's no need to hide some of the personalities involved in this thing. I

May 31, 1955

AGM
C-2

recall one great man, a great Judge, who has opposed this type of bill for years before the committees of this Legislature and others, a retired Chief Justice, a leading exponent of the law, an authority in the State, who received quite a bit of publicity both in Connecticut and New York papers because of a little incident that occurred and as I say, I am fortunate in that I never won and it is the misfortune of this great judge when he did win and it made news in many states throughout the country. This chief justice has won a new Ford ranch wagon in a drawing conducted by the Yale Club of Hartford, a drawing which was held in Connecticut with the club's annual spring outing. The outing is sponsored by the Club Scholarship Fund and like the arguments say, apparently it's for a good purpose in this case, a scholarship fund to send several Hartford area boys to Yale every year and I can see why a Harvard man would oppose such a bill. The tickets sold for \$5.00. The outing originally drew only 40 or 50 people. Now it draws 400 and 500 people-- I understand all Yale Alumni for the most part and believe me there's some pretty good men among them, too. So I would assume that it wasn't only one Judge who participated in this particular project. The others are not known because they have not won, but I am sure there must be judges and chiefs and mayors and maybe Governors and all kinds of people that you can think of who have participated in this particular raffle. Now it's pretty hard to sell the people of the State of Connecticut that gambling is wrong when the chief authority on the law participates in it and the illustrious alumni of Yale and the benefits

May 31, 1955

MDA
S-0AGM
C-3

are derived by students who will be sent to Yale who, in all probability would not be able to afford that education. In my own experience, I have been approached by parent-teachers associations; I have been approached by veterans' groups; I have been approached by firemen's groups; I have been approached by other groups and many many people. In all these instances understand I am breaking the law when they come to me and I resent being placed in that position but I have to live with my brothers and if they have a ticket to be sold and the law is not being enforced I am forced to buy and I am being forced by public opinion in my own town, if by no other process, to participate in the breaking of the law, too. Now it is about time that we recognized that all of this is going around so throughout the entire State it is going to be hard to ever convince anybody in this State that it is wrong when our chief lawmakers or law enforcers do it and think it is right. have come in contact with many of the (Applause) establishments of that State.

MR. WALKER (EASTFORD): had a gambling law permitting race tracks, slot Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill. A great deal has been said about the fact that a gambling or raffle bill can be written so as to be fool-proof. I venture to say there has yet to be a good law written that a good lawyer can't find a loophole or a way to circumvent it. The proponents of this bill feel in all sincerity and only because there's a need for it, they feel the necessity of permitting and passing such legislation and they are rendering a great service to our churches, fraternal organizations, charitable organizations and volunteer fire companies. This, I

May 31, 1955

MDA
E-0AGM
C-4

believe is not so for in my opinion it's a great dis-service to these organizations as well as to the State of Connecticut if this bill is allowed to pass because it will set in motion the wheels of progressive gambling. We will be allowed to go to a church bazaar where everyone is encouraged to lay their coins on the line for a good cause. Anything sponsored by a church is considered respectable therefore it must be all right for the youngsters. Then what happens? The youngsters get older-- they have grown to accept gambling as part of their social life. Many of them no doubt will come to this legislature; they will be conditioned to this way of life. There will be laws passed permitting slot machines race tracks and many other types of gambling when this happens. And it will happen! You will really see big time operators take over. During the past several years I have had occasion to travel throughout the State of Maryland considerably and in so doing have come in contact with many of the mercantile establishments of that State. Several years ago they had a gambling law permitting race tracks, slot machines and many other gambling devices. At first the many people that first patronized the slot machines were highly respectable and had means to carry on such a business. Now it had dwindled down to those who are seeking something for nothing-- something to augment their family budget. Is this the type of legislation that we want here in Connecticut? I don't think so. It is said that our churches want to run raffles. I don't believe this is for any church organization desiring money for capital outlay or current expenses-- they know how and when to get all of the money they need. As far as the volunteer firemen are concerned, they can get the

May 31, 1955

MOA
4-0

AGM
C-5

money they need. These companies are for the benefit of all the people in any town and no town in this day and age will allow a fire company to close its doors for lack of necessary funds to purchase necessary equipment and cut down the cost of insurance on all property. Our law enforcement agencies are not in favor of this kind of legislation. We all know that one of our greatest law enforcement officers was very definite in his position as opposing legalized gambling. If this bill is written into our statutes you will see our welfare costs rise. Mr. Speaker I hope this bill is defeated.

MR. CONARD (WEST HARTFORD):

Mr. Speaker, I would like the privilege of answering the gentleman.

THE SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from West Hartford. The Gentleman from West Hartford on the other side.

MR. GIDEON (WEST HARTFORD):

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, as I understand it, this is not a Democratic or a Republican bill; neither has it a religious atmosphere about it, at all. I want to tell you from my experience what I think about gambling and I don't say that I often gamble-- I have played cards occasionally for a very small stake and I am not "holier than thou" in any way, shape or form. I have also bought raffle tickets but the trouble is that legalized gambling you never can enforce or you can't enforce the laws of gambling as they are now. I have prosecuted gambling cases--

May 31, 1955

AGM
C-6

I have defended them. If you want to see gambling go to Miami and Rhode Island or Massachusetts--the whole thing is bad and we should vote it down. ~~not be amended but should be defeated.~~

(Applause)

~~think it would be unenforceable and discriminatory and to say the least, would be very expensive to enforce. I hope the bill will be defeated.~~

MR. MINOR (PLYMOUTH):

I realize that it is presumptuous to speak twice on this subject when there are so many here who wish to speak today. We have heard so much here about this money going for good causes that I can't help but they why not license prostitution? Why not legalize it? It's going on all about us. I don't see very much difference.

MRS. PITT (WOODSTOCK):

Mr. Speaker I oppose this bill with my whole heart. It sounds like a tight bill and it sounds like a good bill and I know and you know Mr. Speaker if this bill goes through it will cause great excitement across the border in the neighboring states where there are strong gambling interests. This whole situation has been likened by someone to an eel. I would call it the first hole in the dike no bigger than a finger, perhaps, but it will take much less effort to prevent that hole from getting bigger than to try to block up a whole as big as a barn door. Gambling is like a drug and housewives gambling which this particular bill encourages and fosters is a very dangerous thing. I oppose it.

MR. HOLT (NEWINGTON):

Mr. Speaker, I have been tempted to offer an amendment to this bill but on further consideration have decided not to dignify the bill to that extent. The amendment I would have offered would have

May 31, 1955

MDA
8-0

AGM
C-7

removed the religious organizations which are so much opposed to this bill; it would have removed them from the bill. However, I feel the bill should not be amended but should be defeated. I think it would be unenforceable and discriminatory and to say the least, would be very expensive to enforce. I hope the bill will be defeated.

MR. WILLIAMS (GLASTONBURY):

I have a question on this bill. It is not the moral issue, but the amount of money needed, whether it is to be enforced and during these past weekends and previous to that when the first bill came out I talked with our local police chief who is a man that has given his entire life to police work before he came to Glastonbury to reorganize and head our department was a member of the F.B.I. He has done a good job with us in our department which needed a good overhauling and before that I believe he did excellent work with the FBI. He tells me that a bill of this kind would greatly add to his problems, that he has talked to other men in similar positions as his, that is, heads of police departments in comparable towns and that they are opposed to this bill on the grounds that it is not enforceable and would add greatly to police work and police expense if it is passed. For that reason I have changed my mind on the bill and will vote against it.

MR. CONARD (WEST HARTFORD):

Mr. Speaker, pardon my presumptuous in answering when you first spoke to the Gentleman from West Hartford. The Gentleman on my left raised a question as to the service clubs tying them up with

May 31, 1955

MDA
7-0AGM
C8

my remarks about their not being worth their salt. My only point on this is that I believe service clubs should be for service and not for teaching people that they can get something for nothing.

MR. BROWN (GROTON):

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say the first section of the Connecticut Constitution which says "we declare that all men when they form a social compact, are equal in rights; and that no man, or set of men are entitled to exclusive public emoluments or privileges from the community." Now, Mr. Speaker, it is safe to believe and it has happened in the past, where men have been killed that have left mothers and children behind. The neighbors have banded together and have raffled off a turkey or have raffled off something they made in order to make money to help the widow and children. Mr. Speaker, this bill prohibits that. This bill denies the people of Connecticut the basic fundamental rights guaranteed in the law of this state that ^{no set of men} men are entitled to exclusive public emoluments or privileges. Mr. Speaker, this bill is so bad, it is so bad that they cannot even advertise it on television. This bill is so bad that if a radio station accepts an advertisement it will be subject to losing its license and banished from the air. This is a bad bill. We are inconsistent with the federal statutes. Mr. Speaker, this is a careful decision that we have to make here this day. This bill in my opinion and in the opinion of Superior Court Judge House violates the basic law of this State and I hope it is defeated.

of this house there's nothing wrong in gambling if the people who

May 31, 1955

MDA
83AGM
C9

MR. KIRKER (NORWICH): Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot today about gambling and what it is going to do. Let me say to each and every member of this House, that every two years the people of this State gamble on the men they send to this House and the men they send to the Senate. They take a gamble-- they don't know personally or individually as to what any member is going to do when they come up into this House. Also, we have heard a lot about the moral law and morals. Let me say to you, Sir and every member of this House, there's quite a difference between morals and morale. There's quite a difference between the law of God and the law of man, and that's what we are concerned with today-- it's the law of man. Two weeks ago it was the law of God, and there's no theologian in this State or any other state that can go on record and say that the law of God in any way, shape or form was ever opposed to gambling. God Himself and His people and so, too, Christ, in no way ever say anything about gambling. He threw the money changers out of the temple, true, but why? Because it was a house of God and not a house of man. We in this State and we in this nation know that every day gambling is going on. It goes on in the stock markets in New York and Chicago. It goes on in business daily and no one raises their finger against it because it is presumed that what these men are doing is right for the people that they are selling to, but everyone is afraid because the gambling law is terrible, as we hear it and should be extinguished. Let me say to the members of this House there's nothing wrong in gambling if the people who passed the bill May 23 and the Senate passed the bill as amended by