

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 2847	[PA 59-1213]	FAY 13000	1959
State Development:	pp 102-105		4 p
Senate	: pp 1516-1517		2 p
House	: pp 1603-1607		5 p
<b>LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY</b>			
			11 pp

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

Connecticut State Library  
Compiled 2015

STATE  
DEVELOPMENT

CONN.  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY  
1959

Thursday

February 26, 1959

and as we thought this river was possibly the main source of spawning oysters. He asked me to get together with the other private growers in Connecticut and see if we couldn't put some oysters back in that river for spawning purposes. We asked the state Shell-Fish Commission if they would be agreeable to set aside a small area in the river for that purpose. The Shell-Fish Commission did and through the cooperation of six other companies we put about 200 net bushels apiece of mature oysters on this bed along with possibly three or four times that much of shells. In other words we put about 1200 net bushels of oysters and possibly 3600 bushels of shell on this small bed in the Housatonic River opposite Bomstock in Stratford. The following year we got an excellent set off Bridgeport on our private beds and also the Housatonic River got a quite nice set too which the natural grocers have been harvesting. So we believe the oysters should be in these rivers and harbors and we hope that this bill will provide for that. Thank you.

Sen. Burns

Any further questions? Anyone else wish to testify? I'll declare the hearing closed.

We'll open the hearing on H.B. 2268 (Mr. Kielwasser by request) AN ACT CONCERNING COUNTY AID FOR HOSPITALS, PARKS AND OR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES. Does anyone wish to speak in favor of this bill? Does anyone wish to speak in opposition to this bill? I'll declare this hearing closed.

We'll open the hearing on H.B. 2700 (Mr. Wood) AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF LAND OWNED BY THE MYSTIC ORAL SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF. Does anyone wish to speak in favor of this bill? Does anyone wish to speak in opposition to this bill? Hearing none, I'll declare this hearing closed.

We'll open the hearing on H.B. 2847 (Mr. Padula) AN ACT CONCERNING NAMING CONNECTICUT THE CONSTITUTION STATE and also H.R. No. 23 A RESOLUTION TO BRING ABOUT THE DESIGNATION OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT AS THE "CONSTITUTION STATE", since both the bill and the resolution deal with the same subject. We'll hold the hearing on both at the same time.

15  
C.D.

Thursday

State Development

February 26, 1959

Carleton D. Blanchard, New London. I would like to speak definitely in favor of Rep. Padula's bill no. 2847 supported by H.R. No. 23 of which I am a co-author. There is much that could be said about this wonderful state of ours and I would like to read the resolution but in as much as it is before you I will hand that to you. You have I believed received resolution from the State of Connecticut Development Commission, Mr. Sidney Edwards in which the Development Commission definitely is for this bill. You will also receive letters asking for your favorable report to our Assembly from the Conn. Well Drillers Association, from the Conn. Town Clerks, from the Conn. Assessors Association, from the Conn. Road Builders and from many other organizations when it becomes known to them what the purport of the bill is. In the company or individual which has the good product or bonifide service to offer to the american people should be definitely in favor of this bill. The word Connecticut itself symbolizes an Indian language, a long river. Connecticut was known as the Saybrook River many years before it was known as the Connecticut River. Our wonderful state has other symbols as the American Robin, symbol of industry as the Mountain Laurel, symbol of beauty, the white oak, symbol of strength. Not to be confused with the wonderful charter oak because white oak was used against the waves of the whaling days. I would like to refresh our memory of the wonderful goings on at the Constitutional Convention 1787 and I took a little pride remembering Benjamin Franklin was born in the bay state, Ripley had it wrong that he was born in Philadelphia, he was born in my native state, the bay state in 1706. So in Philadelphia the good man was 81 years old and he could have been the father of George Washington who was then 55. A very wonderful brain from Connecticut was in Philadelphia named Roger Sherman from New Haven aged 32 that if you please, the good man by the name of Ben Franklin and George Washington listened to a man on the threshold of life who offered to the world Connecticut's fundamental orders and the wonderful thought that you have exhibited here the democracy of two senators for each state and representative government in the house for each state. I would like to exhibit this plate which I hold is a travesty to the Consitution. It was purchased for 79¢ in a restaurant on the Conn. Turnpike which cost the taxpayers \$479,000,000 and for which we recieve due value in my opinion and I think no one of us thought for a moment that we were going to have to advertise our state to citizens from California and Texas and Ohio that a few of our ancestors stuped to the fraudent and disgraceful gyping of housewives as penniless---

Thursday

February 26, 1959

The children know that we do not raise nutmegs in Connecticut. It can only refer to wooden nutmegs which was a phoney a gyper and a humbug. Some have said that nutmeg has two syllables therefore it's easier to shout at an athletic contest. I think that is an asinine argument. We have constitution, four syllables We have Connecticut, there is a euphony and as a former teacher and athletic coach for over 25 years at the Norwich Free Academy and as a citizen and a taxpayer of New London County I speak with scores of solid citizens all over the state and ask you gentlemen our duly elected representatives to report this favorably to our Assembly. Thank you sir.

Wilbur Cross, Jr. representing myself as a private citizen, a resident of Connecticut and a taxpayer. We get letters over in the Motor Vehicle Department wanting this, that or something else and they always come from a taxpayer so maybe if I represent myself as a taxpayer you'll listen to me more closely. I'm fully in accord with what Mr. Blanchard has said and whether or not this should be done, Connecticut should be made the Constitution State by legislation or a resolution, I don't know. I'm in favor of doing it anyway. However, I hope that none of you will get the idea that on a future registration plate you want to put a slogan. Connecticut the Constitution State or something of that kind. At this time it might be of interest to you to know that at the time we designed the plate you are now using there was a lot of activity towards getting us to put some slogan on the plate so we designed a plate which you now know what it looks like, with Connecticut in one inch letters leaving not enough room on any other part of the plate for any slogan. The Governor approved it and we went ahead on that basis. So don't get anything of this kind on our plates.

Mr. VanDeusen, State Historian of Connecticut and a member of the State Historical Commission. This caught me a little unawares I only heard about this thing this morning. It seems to me an extremely good idea and I strongly support it. I also am a professional historian and I've been a little bothered by our unofficial nickname of the "Nutmeg State" because of the slightly unsavory commentation. It may be humorous but I don't think it is quite fair to Connecticut and I think as a historian I would like to point out that the fundamental orders of Connecticut which are mentioned in these two bills were the first written document I think, in America which might be called a constitution. Some 320 years ago and they provided for representative government. Their ideas came from the founder of this colony,

17  
C.D.

State Development

Thursday

February 26, 1959

Thomas Hooker as far as we can tell and we're proudly written by Roger Ludlow the first lawyer in Connecticut. A very able man also. I would also like to say that before coming over here I talked with a very revered man in the field of law and justice, former Chief Justice William Maltbie whose, also an amateur historian and he said that he would was very enthusiastic about the idea of Connecticut having an official name. The Constitution State and I would like to add my very humble approval to that also.

Sen. Burns

Does anyone else wish to speak in favor of the bill? I'd like to note for the record that I received two letters today as Chairman of the Committee. One from the Connecticut Development Commission reporting that they are in favor of this bill and the resolution and also a letter from the Connecticut Road Builders Association indicate that they are in favor of the bill and resolution. Does anyone wish to speak in opposition? Hearing none we will declare this hearing closed.

We will open the hearing on H.B. 3405 (Mrs. Blackman) AN ACT CONCERNING CONTRACTS FOR PUBLIC BUILDING CONSTRUCTION. Does anyone wish to speak in favor of this bill? Does anyone wish to speak in opposition?

James Haran,

I'm with the Public Works Department in the State of Connecticut. I wish to comment first before we go into this bill that a similar bill S.B. 159 was introduced and rather heartily debated at a hearing about a week ago. That affected Public bidding on public structures and required separate bidding on four phases of the work, sorry three. I do not appear objecting to the intent behind the writers of this bill but I would like to point out that in affect this bill would remove the general contractor from the scene and make any administer to bodies, school board or anyone else a general contractor responsible for the construction of a building. States, our state requires no separate bidding. Most states that do enumerate them in the legislation. This bill, my basic objection is, that it sets no limits. What is a portion of the work we might have as many as a hundred and twenty bids on any project. I think it would be in its present form a most difficult bill to enforce and most difficult bill to administer. The problem of separate bidding has been a constant one. We have in public works compromised

S-32

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1959

VOL. 8

PART 4

1408-1875

April 30, 1959

will not be paid this particular pension. It is primarily to consider the possibility of Superior Court or Chief Justice widows who are receiving a pension from the Judiciary Court.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor will signify by saying "aye", those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it. The bill is ordered passed.

SENATOR HEALEY:

Mr. President...

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 10th.

SENATOR HEALEY:

May we turn to page fifteen and with references to Calendars No. 499 and No. 500, may I request suspension of the rules for immediate consideration?

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objections? Suspension of the rules for immediate consideration. There appears to be none. The rules are suspended.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 499. File No. 502. Substitute for House Bill No. 2847. An Act concerning naming Connecticut the Constitution State.

Favorable report of the Committee on State Development.

SENATOR BURNS:

Mr. President...

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 30th.

April 30, 1959 1483

SENATOR BURNS:

I move for acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

SENATOR BURNS:

Mr. President, in moving for the acceptance of the committee's report and in urging the passage of the bill, I would like to point out that in considering the importance of this bill which would designate Connecticut as the Constitution State; we can take the rest of it from the problems that are facing us today and look back on the contributions that Connecticut has made to the constitutional (indistinguishable). The first written constitution of 1639 in the present United States, the fact that Connecticut was the only one in the original colonies not to surrender its royal charter and the fact that the Connecticut compromise which brought about the Federal Constitution in Philadelphia. I believe that when we consider all of these factors which were considered by our committee, I think that the name the Constitution State is a fitting one for the state of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further, If not, all those in favor will signify by saying "aye", those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it.

The bill is ordered passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 500. File No. 193. Substitute for House Bill

42

CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE  
OF  
REPRESENTATIVES

PROCEEDINGS  
1959

VOL. 8 - PART 4

APRIL 16 - APRIL 28

PAGES 1273 - 1222

328.2s  
C76pr

h.  
Leg. Ref.  
Vault 3

CONNECTICUT

FRIDAY - APRIL 24, 1959

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 332. File No. 300.

H.B. No. 2190. An act concerning use of school grounds and facilities.

Favorable report of the committee on Education.

THE SPEAKER:

Gentleman from Windksor Locks.

MR. BRODERICK:

I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage of the bill. Will you remark:

MR. BRODERICK:

This bill adds to the present statutes concerning the use of school houses for other than school purposes when not in use for school purposes. The local Board of Education will have the authority to grant such permission. I ask that it be passed.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. If not, question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

Those in favor? Opposed? Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 333. File No. 302.

Sub. for H.B. No. 2847. An act concerning naming

FRIDAY - APRIL 24, 1959

Connecticut the Constitution State.

Favorable report of the committee on State Development.

THE SPEAKER:

Gentleman from Guilford.

MR. ORCUTT:

I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage of the bill. Will you remark.

MR. ORCUTT:

Here in Connecticut on Jan. 14th, 1638 there was adopted the fundamental order, the first written constitution known to history that created a government and marked the beginning of American democracy. The spirit of the fundamental order was that of a sermon preached by Rev. Thomas Hooker a short time before their adoption in the course of which he laid down this proposition: 'The foundation of authority is laid in the free consent of the people' and he closed with a challenge that God has given us liberty and let us take it! The people of Connecticut have lived under a constitution longer than the people of any other state. Almost 150 years after the adoption of the fundamental orders of Connecticut's first constitution it was the delegates of Connecticut to the Continental Convention in Philadelphia who revolved the formula for representation of the respective states in the

FRIDAY - APRIL 24, 1959

Congress of the United States based upon the history and experience of Connecticut. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that the State of Connecticut should be dedicated and known officially as the Constitution State. Mr. Speaker, this bill had no opposition at the hearing. It was supported by several historians. It had the unanimous vote of the committee and I urge its adoption.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from East Haddam.

MR. BANNER:

There is another thought in the change of name. You know, Connecticut is known as the Nutmeg State, and many people did not like the name. I hope we adopt the motion.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. Gentleman from Westbrook.

MR. SCHLOSSBACH:

I am also glad that no longer can we perhaps call this the Concrete Nutmeg State!!

THE SPEAKER:

Gentleman from Farmington.

MR. NOYES:

I am glad to support this bill and I hope we give the words in this bill substance by acting as soon as possible to reduce the membership in this ~~the~~ House in line with the Constitutional compromise referred to by the gentleman from Guilford.

FRIDAY - APRIL 24, 1959

THE SPEAKER:

Gentleman from Newington.

MR. SATTER:

The reason I support this bill so heartily is not only because by virtuous history are we deserving of this title but because of our action over the years, and even more recently as last Tuesday or Wednesday in this House when we passed the landmark legislation which we did. Connecticut truly is a state which has respected the Constitution and also respected the essential rights and liberties of our people. I honestly and truly believe we deserve this wonderful title we have given to ourselves, and I'm certain we shall continue to deserve it through the years.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. Gentleman from Westbrook.

MR. SCHLOSSBACH:

If the last speaker is referring to the passing of the Court Bill, I would like to remind him

THE SPEAKER:

I think the gentleman is out of order.

MR. SCHLOSSBACH:

Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I don't think so; he referred to the Court Bill I assumed in his last statement.

THE SPEAKER:

Confine your remarks to the bill under discussion.

FRIDAY - APRIL 24, 1959

MR. SCHLOSSBACH:

Then I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the last speaker was out of order!!

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. If not, question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

Those in favor? Those opposed? Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 334. File No. 303.

H.B. No. 3472. An act concerning destruction of documents.

Favorable report of the committee on Judiciary and Governmental Functions.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from Meriden.

MR. SHEA:

I move the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark.

MR. SHEA:

To be brief I think that the words of the bill will best explain the contents of the bill. Page 2 of File 303 it says that the Town Clerk may with approval from the Commissioner of Documents destroy all documents in his custody which have been recorded in the land records of such town and after a period of 3 years that elapsed from date of such recording,