

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

---

HB 3998	PA 723	1967
House	4486-4487, 5410-5411	(4)
Senate	2339-2340	(2)
Judiciary	385-387, 392-393, 398-400, 402-404	(11)

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE  
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

Total-17p

---

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

Connecticut State Library  
Compiled 2012

H-93

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1967

VOL. 12  
PART 10  
4448-4936

MR. ROBERT D. KING, 48TH DISTRICT:

Mr. Speaker, move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the act.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. ROBERT D. KING, 48th DISTRICT:

Mr. Speaker, this bill is permissive in that it would allow the state to transfer any abandoned jail facility to the municipality in which the facility is located. It would also provide that such abandoned jails may be used as historical museums and the municipalities may charge for the services that they may extend to the public. I think it's a good bill, Mr. Speaker, and I recommend its passage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage of the bill. All those in favor will say aye. All those opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1259 Modified House Bill No. 3998. AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS.

MR. WILLIAM E. STRADA, JR., 156TH DISTRICT:

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WILLIAM E. STRADA, JR., 156TH DISTRICT:

Mr. Speaker, this bill amends Section 119 of the General Statutes. It makes it mandatory that executive administrative legislative and judicial

Monday, June 5, 1967 40.

bodies, agencies and commissions shall keep and maintain a record of the proceedings of their meetings. It also excludes certain memoranda, letters, viewing solely with matters of law policy, personal and medical files and similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute invasion of personal privacy. It also amends Section 121 and provides that these executive meetings shall be closed to the public when, in executive session, the majority of the members vote so. I move adoption.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage of the bill. All those in favor will say aye. All those opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1260 House Bill No. 4000. AN ACT CONCERNING PROCEDURE FOR CONDEMNING LAND FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES OR OTHER MUNICIPAL PURPOSES.

A. LUCILLE MATARESE, 3RD DISTRICT:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

A. LUCILLE MATARESE, 3RD DISTRICT:

Mr. Speaker, this bill amends the statutes insofar as the procedure for condemning land for school purposes or other municipal purposes are concerned. Under the present law, if a municipality proceeds to condemn land for either school or other municipal purposes, title does not pass to the municipality until after the amount of the judgment has been satisfied and paid, even though the municipality may have gone into possession of the premises under another statutes subsequent to initiating the condemnation

H-94

CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1967

VOL. 12

PART 11

4937 - 5501

24-4

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

itself, but the small loan bill. The small loan bill provided before the amendment that any small loan in an advertisement would have to indicate the rate of installments in repayment. Under this amendment it would provide that any company or any person could advertise and not disclose the rate if it only advertised its name and the fact that it made loans. But if any company did advertise and also indicated a rate of repayment, it would then have to come under the truth in lending bill and disclose the true rate of interest.

MR. LENGE (13th):

A question to the gentleman. Has the formula  $r=2pc$  over  $a(n+1)$  been impaired in any way?

MR. LASSMAN (46th):

The answer is no.

THE SPEAKER:

All those in favor? Opposed? The amendment is adopted. The question now is on acceptance and passage as amended. All those in favor? Opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1259, Modified H.B. 3998. An Act concerning Access to Public Records and Meetings (As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule A)

MRS. MATARESE (3rd):

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

THE SPEAKER:

24-5

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

The question is on acceptance and passage as amended.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule A. In section 2, line 21, delete the word "unless" and insert in lieu thereof the words "sooner than 30 days after".

MRS. MATARESE (3rd):

I move adoption of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on adoption of the amendment. Will you remark?

MRS. MATARESE (3rd):

The purpose of the amendment is to cover situations where for some reason the schedule of the regular meeting are filed later than the January 31st deadline provided in the bill. Under the amendment the meetings could still be held as long as it's not prior to 30 days after the late filing. It's a good amendment. It improves the bill and I urge its passage.

MR. LENGE (13th):

I support adoption of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Those in favor of adoption? Opposed? The amendment is adopted. The question now is on acceptance and passage as amended. All those in favor? Opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 3250, Substitute for House Bill 3250, An Act concerning the Right of Certificated Professional Employees to

S-67

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1967

VOL. 12

PART 5

2036-2530

2319  
June 6, 1967

139

passage of this bill, signify by saying Aye. AYE. Opposed?  
The bill is passed, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1500, file 1435, modified HB 3998, An Act concerning Access to Public Records and Meetings. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Judiciary. The Clerk has an amendment.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, will the Clerk please read the amendment?

THE CLERK:

In section 2, line 21, delete the word, unless, and insert in lieu thereof the words, sooner than thirty days after.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, the amendment is self-explanatory. I move its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment, signify by saying Aye. AYE. Opposed? The amendment is adopted. The Chair will rule it is a technical amendment. You may proceed with the bill as amended.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended. This is a very important bill for the news media of the State of Connecticut allowing them to have access to public records and meetings. I feel that this bill should be adopted unanimously.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks? If not, the question is on passage of the

June 6, 1967

bill. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. AYE. Opposed?

The bill is passed, as amended.

The Senator from the Thirteenth, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. President, I rise to refer to file 1364 on page 26 which we just passed. May I for the record just indicate that this bill is now under disagreeing action and is to be sent immediately down to the House.

THE CHAIR:

I understand that there will be a motion to transfer all business to the House at the conclusion of our session. Unless the Senator wishes to make a special motion on this one?

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

I would just like to be sure that it doesn't get lost.

THE CLERK:

Page 8, calendar 1267, file 1062, modified HB 2947, An Act concerning the Filing of Pleadings in the Superior and Common Pleas Courts. The Clerk has an amendment.

SENATOR PICKETT:

Mr. President, I move that we waive the reading of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection, the reading of the amendment will be waived. Will you remark on the amendment, Senator?

JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

JUDICIARY  
PART 2  
382-664

1967

JUDICIARY

TUESDAY

MARCH 14, 1967

Senator John F. Pickett, presiding

Members:

Senators: Pickett, Fauliso, Barry, Jackson,  
Caldwell, Hickey, Lyddy, Hull, Barnes,  
Finney

Representatives: Carrozzella, Kennelly, Murray,  
Morris, Matarese, Bradley, Healy, Caplan,  
Mahaney, Tierney, Strada, Shapero, Ajello,  
Gillies, Oliver, Papandrea, Boyd, King,  
Barringer, Brinckerhoff, Crouch, Rand,  
McCarthy, Gaffney

Chr. Pickett: Concerning bills being heard here today, registration forms are in the back of the room. I hope that you will all use them. Copies of today's bulletin as well as the bills being heard, also are in the rear of the room. Please consult the order in which bills will be heard. These remarks do not apply to legislators, I realize they will be speaking on various bills. If you have a prepared speech, please leave it with our Secretary over here and give us the highlights. We will read it. We again repeat. We accept speakers from the speaker's list only. We are in the midst of a Judiciary Hearing only. The Public Health and Welfare Committee meeting has been adjourned to their regular hearing room. This is a meeting of the Judiciary Committee. The groupings of today's bills are shown on the index. A copy of this index is here. A copy will be placed on that table. We call from the index and the speaker's list only. When the legislators get through, we will hear testimony concerning two bills first and these are out of order. These are H. B. No. 3998 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS and H. B. No. 4009 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING REGULATION OF BROADCASTING OF PUBLIC MEETINGS the right to know bills and I do have a list of people speaking. They will be Mr. Hartford, Mr. White, Mr. Rice and Mr. Clemow. We now will open the hearing from legislators only. Mr. Crombie, Mr. Lenge, Sen. Ives, in that order.

Rep. Crombie, House Majority Leader from the 44th Dist.: I'd like to speak in favor of 3998 H. B. No. 3998 (Rep. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS which Rep. Lenge from the 13th and I put in. The purpose of the provisions of the Statute relating to freedom of information by requiring the keeping of records, eliminating certain confidential records from inspection by the public, providing for a schedule

TUESDAY

JUDICIARY

MARCH 14, 1967

Rep. Crombie: for meetings of executive and administrative boards and regulating executive sessions. The details of it will be explained by others that will follow. I'd also like to speak on H. B. No. 4009 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING REGULATION OF BROADCASTING OF PUBLIC MEETINGS introduced by myself and Rep. Lenge of the 13th. This draws up rules and regulations regards to T V broadcasting at public meetings. The details of the regulations will be explained later.

Nicholas Lenge: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. My name is Nicholas Lenge, House minority leader, Representative from the 13th District. It's good to be back with this augur group, my alma mater, so to speak. I'm here to speak in favor of H. B. No. 3998 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS and H. B. No. 4009 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING REGULATION OF BROADCASTING OF PUBLIC MEETINGS. Knowing your procedure and knowing how you'll work on these bills in your Executive session, I'm not going to take your time today to explain in detail what these bills provide. I would call to your attention, however, that there are some aspects of this bill that would require some clarification of language. I think the purpose is clear. You know and are familiar with the purpose of the so-called, right to know bills and, at this late stage, it need not be emphasized by me how important this is to us in the legislative process and in the general matters of conducting the public's business. Certainly the press, and certainly the broadcasting system ought to have full access where it is consistent with the public's business. Now I would like to point out though, members of the committee, that in reading this bill after it was prepared and introduced, that there may be something that you yourselves would like to consider and that has to do with the matter of maintenance and keeping of records. There has come to my attention, a situation where a letter which was considered by a Board of Education and where the Board of Education actually at a meeting took action on this letter and the minutes made reference to it and after the meeting, when a member of the public asked to see it, the letter, the letter was not available and, in fact, at a later date, it appeared that there was a possibility that there was technical compliance with the law in that the original letter was returned to the sender which means that it was not prepared by the Board itself, kept or maintained. It seems to

TUESDAY

JUDICIARY

MARCH 14, 1967

- Rep. Lenge: me that you with your background ought to be able to handle this type of situation and protect the public. There is also reference in this bill H. B. No. 3998 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS about executive sessions. Under the present law, an executive session is open to the public when it's declared to be open to the public by the body concerned. This would require them to close it to the public. There's another aspect of requiring immediate action and on that I would ask you to consider the language again. I would be glad to join with you in your executive session, gentlemen, rather than take any more of your time today to discuss the specific language that I think ought to be clarified but I urge you most strongly, most strongly, to consider the principles involved in these two bills and to come out with a favorable report. Thank you very much.
- Chr. Pickett: There has been some confusion. May I have your attention just a minute, please. This is a hearing of the Judiciary committee. There was a hearing of a different committee but this is Judiciary and we are taking bills today, plus testimony from the legislators, thereafter we are taking testimony only from the speaker's list. I realize some of you just came in. If you wish to testify about today's bills before the Judiciary committee, please register to speak. If you want copies of the bills, they are in the rear of the room. If you merely wish to register pro or con, registration forms are there. Senator Ives.
- Sen. Ives: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Ives of the 32nd District. Appearing in support of S. B. No. 1508 (Sen. Ives) AN ACT CONCERNING REQUIRING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO RENDER OPINIONS FOR MUNICIPALITIES which requests that the Attorney General render opinions for municipalities. Under present practice and dealing with different sections of State Government, the common word from these Departments is to consult your own attorney, but what in effect happens, is that the towns or the chief executive officer write to these departments asking departments submit a request to the Attorney General and they get a ruling. So this would eliminate the going through the department and would ask for any chief executive officer to render a (inaud) to a town, city or borough, and I believe this is only right as the towns are instrumentalities of the State and should receive the service of the Attorney General. Secondly, in favor of

TUESDAY

JUDICIARY

MARCH 14, 1967

Rep. Donnelly: of the other towns in the state. We have it-- blighted areas, slum areas, and we are in the process of urban renewal and great tons of money, federal, state and local money is being spent on these urban renewal programs. However, it is my opinion that these urban renewal programs can be a failure, this money can be wasted, if all we achieve is moving the slums, the people from the slums from one section of town to slums in another section of town and I say, make no mistake about it, there will be more slums. There will be new slums because unfortunately there are people in our state who find slum lording profitable. Now my bill is designed to meet just this problem, and only this problem. If you read the bill you'll note that it states in the bill that this applies only to rent paid more frequently than every 30 days. So this would in no way have any threat to the decent landlord in the good rental properties of our State. This rental commission that I propose would in no way have any effect over these rentals. It would though, have control over the rents paid more frequently than every 30 days and the only rents that I know of that are paid more frequently than every 30 days are in our slums. In fact, most of our slum rents are collected on a weekly basis. These rent gouging slum lords can only get their money if they send their collectors out on pay day and they collect their rents on a weekly basis because these poor people of the lowest strata of our economy could not possibly hope to accumulate money over a four week period to pay these very high rents on a monthly basis. Now, members of the committee, I do not stand here before you and say that this will be a panacea to the problem of the slums nor a cure-all but I say that it's just one more tool, one more weapon with which we can fight the battle of the slums. And before someone suggests that we throw it aside, say it's unconstitutional because it's rent control, I ask you to examine the bill thoroughly, give it your full consideration because it's designed to meet one emergency but I think we, of the big cities, know does exist. Thank you very much.

Chr. Pickett: Mr. Ring. Just a minute now. Again for those of you who have just come in, we are in the middle of the Judiciary Committee hearing. We are hearing the representatives and senators only, thereafter we will hear the "right to know" bills. Mr. Ring will be followed by Mr. Siry, Newman and Neiditz.

Rep. Ring, 79th Dist.: Senator Pickett, Rep. Carrozzella, members of the Judiciary Committee, I want to go on record in favor of H. B. No. 3998 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC

TUESDAY

JUDICIARY

MARCH 14, 1967

Rep. Ring: RECORDS AND MEETINGS; H. B. No. 3118 (Rep. Ring) AN ACT CONCERNING COUNSEL FEES INCURRED IN SUCCESSFUL APPEALS FROM THE BOARD OF TAX REVIEW; H. B. No. 3444 (Rep. Ring) AN ACT CONCERNING THE FOSTERING OF GROWTH OF AMATEUR ATHLETICS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT; 4891 Thank you very much.

Chr. Pickett: Thank you.

Rep. Siry, 33rd Dist.: Sir. I have two bills I would like to bring to your attention. One is quite perennial, I think in nature. That's the qualifications of Justice of the Peace. These are the people who unfortunately forgot that Jan. 4th was the deadline to be sworn in and I would appreciate if you would give this bill a maximum amount of your consideration so that these people can serve in that capacity. Secondly I would like to refer to H. B. No. 2145 (Rep. Siry) AN ACT CONCERNING MUNICIPAL HOME RULE which basically is home rule. I'm cognizant of the fact that you are indeed in the next and in this General Assembly going to consider home rule. The reason for putting in the bill is because the bill put in four years ago and it pertains to a famous case in the Town of Plainville about planning and zoning and the jurisdictional authority between that body and it's local town government. We introduced legislation here which was killed in the last day of the General Assembly unfortunately in the Senate. It had passed the House which meant that the Town of Plainville could determine by it's own home rule that it had the right to set up the structure of its government. Basically, I believe in the principle wholeheartedly and I think more people and more legislators should because it would omit much of the typical problems we have coming into the house of representatives. I happen to be on the Cities and Boroughs committee and I listen to all the problems of all the towns and the very little picayune little things that could very readily be settled right there in the home town and the charter revision authority that's granted by the home rule act could resolve all these problems. This particular bill on home rule means that there are only 57 or 8, 57 rights granted to a town. Well they should be all exclusive under the town/structure and it's dealings with the state and therefore we hope that you will give this some thought or initiate the proper procedure to establish home rule. Let's have home rule say what it means, and means what it says. Thank you.

Chr. Pickett: Mr. Newman here?

Rep. Newman, 146th District: Rep. Howard Newman of the 146th District. I speak in favor of H. B. No. 3438

TUESDAY

JUDICIARY

MARCH 14, 1967

- Rep. Hannon: Mr. Chairman, I beg your indulgence. Rep. Hannon from the 16th District. I should like to address myself to H. B. No. 2922 (Reps. McCarthy, Truex, and Dunn) AN ACT PROVIDING FOR THE ELECTION OF THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS In 1963, a bill very similar to this was submitted to the General Assembly. In their wisdom, they saw fit not to adopt it and as my predecessor Mrs. Dunn from the 17th district has said, there are those in East Hartford certainly that feel strongly that they are being taxed without proper representation. Let me state for the record that I adhere to the basic philosophy of election where possible. I don't think all the dirty laundry that has been wrung out with the MDC all belongs to them. I think much of it does and I would hope in your wisdom you would come out with a favorable report on this bill and that in the 1967 session it could be enacted. Thank you.
- Chr. Pickett: Thank you for your brevity. Representative Keilty.
- Rep. Keilty: Rep. John Keilty, 171st District. On S. B. No. 62 S. B. No. 2834 (Rep. LaGrotta) AN ACT CONCERNING THE PUBLISHING OF ANNUAL TOWN REPORTS I am opposed to both of them. I think that the town should report in detail and I don't think this is good legislation. Thank you.
- Chr. Pickett: Thank you. Senator.
- Sen. Burke: 3rd District. Mr. Chairman, members of your own committee. I appeared before you today in support of H. B. No. 2922 (Reps. McCarthy, Truex and Dunn) AN ACT PROVIDING FOR THE ELECTION OF THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS I supported the same legislation in 1963 and 1965 and I am still in favor of it and I respectfully urge and request your committee for a favorable report. Thank you.
- Chr. Pickett: Thank you, Senator Burke. Rep. Cairns has asked me to announce the fact that he is in favor of H. B. No. 3801 (Rep. Cairns) AN ACT CONCERNING TOWN BOARDS OF FINANCE We will now open the hearing on two bills in particular H. B. No. 3998 (Reps. Lenge and Crombie) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS and H. B. No. 4009 (Rep. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING REGULATION OF BROADCASTING OF PUBLIC MEETINGS the "right to know" bills. We are taking these up out of order because the speakers have requested that we do so because of an event they must attend later on this afternoon. The speakers will be, first, Mr. Carter White, Mr. Herbert Rice, Robert Hartigan. Is Mr. White here?

TUESDAY

JUDICIARY

MARCH 14, 1967

Carter White: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee. My name is Carter White, the publisher of the Meriden Morning Record and the Meriden Journal, two daily newspapers in Meriden. I'm speaking today in behalf of three agencies. One is the Sigma Delta Chi, the journalistic society in Connecticut and another is the Connecticut Editorial Association which consists of all the weekly newspapers in the State and thirdly, the sponsor of this bill H. B. No. 3998 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS and H. B. No. 4009 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING REGULATION OF BROADCASTING OF PUBLIC MEETINGS. The Connecticut Council on Freedom of Information. This group is composed of all the media of the state, all the daily newspapers, 25 of them, all the weeklies, over 55, and all of the television and radio broadcasting stations, well over 40 members. We sponsored the original legislation ten years ago and we have seen some changes during the past decade. We're very happy at the reception that has been received over the years in the legislature, both this committee and I think in previous sessions, the General law committee, were both very cognizant of the problems that were discussed, in connection with these bills. We have learned to live with these bills. The public has learned to live with them and they have been reasonably successful. We can point to many instances which we won't take the time of your committee, to indicate that the need has been well demonstrated over the past ten years for such legislation and it's the public's right to be informed about it's own business has been a..has profited thereby. Today we have before your committee, two bills which were prepared after considerable thought in order to strengthen the existing "right to know" laws. The H. B. No. 3998 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS attempts to clarify and to strengthen in several aspects, I'll just go over them briefly with you. The first change that is recommended, is in Sec. 1-19 of the General Statutes with reference to public records, and, strange to say, there's no requirement at present in the statute law that any governmental bodies keep and maintain adequate records of it's proceedings. It's just been assumed over the years and we would like to clarify this, to include in the law, that there is a requirement that any governmental agency or board should keep and maintain adequate records of their own proceedings. It would seem to be elemental but it is not at present spelled out. Secondly, just to show you that this is not a one way street by any means for the media or the public we do believe there are certain areas that should be excluded, also to afford reasonable protection to reputation or character of an individual.

TUESDAY

JUDICIARY

MARCH 14, 1967

Carter White: For example, the teacher's character or some other public servant's character being discussed, we feel that body should have freedom to discuss it without the press or the public being present during the preliminary proceedings but obviously, once the decision has been reached, the decision should be made public. We are also asking that the body prepare it's minutes promptly and make them available for public inspection within seven days after the meeting. We've not had access to minutes of public meetings for well over three or four months following the meeting and this gets to be a little bit, a..it gets to be where its rather academic as to what happened three or four months previously. We feel seven days is reasonable. However, if your committee would rather lengthen that to ten or fourteen days, we do feel it should be done before the next monthly meeting if there are monthly meetings. We have suggested seven days. One other point, we feel that no official action should be taken at an executive session unless it's confirmed immediately following an open session or public session. Now, we've said immediately following, however, we do recognize that that might be a little cumbersome, perhaps that should be changed to within a reasonable time or within so many days perhaps within the next two weeks or a month but at least it should be confirmed at a public session so that we know this was done open and above board. Then going on to another strengthening section we ask that it be added to the law that every administrative and executive board place in advance on file not later than Jan. 31st of each year either in the office of the Secretary of State or in the office of the local town clerk the advance schedule for that year of their regular meetings whether, monthly, weekly, bi-monthly, whatever. Now we realize that many times when they might have a special reason for a special meeting so we made provision for the special meeting, with 72 hours advance notice and of course there's always room for emergency meetings which you can't provide for and we have made a provision for that. So we feel that these are reasonable precautions and yet would not be too cumbersome upon the local or the state committees and boards. As I say, we feel that these would strengthen and clarify the existing laws which this legislature passed ten years ago and has amended at least three times in the past ten years all for the view of strengthening and clarifying the language and the execution of the law. Our groups would like to go on record in favor of H. B. No. 3998 AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS and also in favor of H. B. No. 4009 (Reps. Lenge and Crombie) AN ACT CONCERNING REGULATION OF BROADCASTING OF PUBLIC MEETINGS which is designed to clarify the rights of broadcasters to either televise or to record for radio broadcast or live radio

TUESDAY

JUDICIARY

MARCH 14, 1967

Carter White: example, they'll always have a caucus before they go into the public meeting and quite often things are decided in advance. We all know that, but still we feel that the public should know what the decision is and perhaps solve the arguments right after the decision, but obviously you can't expect everything to be disclosed. We just try to make it as reasonable as we can and at the same time making it clear that a decision not taken at an open meeting is not really a decision at all but purely a discussion.

Chr. Pickett: Thank you sir. Mr. Rice followed by Attorney Hartigan.

Herbert Rice: I'm from Willimantic and Putnam and represent the Connecticut Broadcasters Association. Mr. Chairman, I beg pardon?

Chr. Pickett: Spell out your name for the record.

Herbert Rice: Yes. Herbert Rice R I C E as in pudding. Gentlemen, very briefly, The Connecticut Broadcasters Assoc. strongly endorse and urge your serious consideration of H. B. No. 3998 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS for the proposed amendments on the freedom of information. Particularly I would like to draw your attention H. B. No. 4009 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING REGULATION OF BROADCASTING OF PUBLIC MEETINGS and they would be redundant (inaud) community enumerate the items contained in the previous testimony but I would like to add just this general thought. In our communications today, there is an increasing interest by the general public in the administration of their own affairs. In a community the size of one which I reside, the limitations of participation are contained in the town hall and therefore the ability or the opportunity to bring to more people the meetings, the public meetings, will not only increase their interest but will more greatly inform them on their own affairs and I think this is a major consideration. It isn't necessarily our desire to get in there with cameras or with microphones, disturb the proceedings, because the bill specifically states that it shall be broadcast in a manner so as to not disturb the proceedings. I do think the day is coming when electronic communications must have it's place in bringing public affairs to the public and this is the best way because it is witness of actual happenings and they can hear and draw their conclusions of what they hear of the representatives and the administrators that are there and that is why we urge you, as broadcasters, to give serious consideration, earnest consideration to this new trend.

TUESDAY

JUDICIARY

MARCH 14, 1967

Herbert Rice: It is, a, had it's difficulties because of equipment but we go on record as assuring you that new equipment and methods of broadcasting this can be made and made available so as not to disturb proceedings. Thank you very much.

Chr. Pickett: Thank you. Mr. Hartigan.

Robert Hartigan: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. My name is Robert Hartigan and I am representing the Conn. Daily Newspapers Assoc. which is an association of the 25 daily newspapers in Connecticut. I shall not attempt to detail the bill which has been covered so well by Mr. White but I would, and I'm speaking now to H. B. No. 3998 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS only. But I would say this generally, that this bill appears to have several virtues. First, it does broaden and strengthen the right of the public to know what is going on in our governmental branches both directly and through the instrumentality of the press. It also gives due consideration to the rights of individual privacy in certain areas which I think is desirable and finally, it clarifies certain areas which have proved troublesome in the past. On behalf of the Connecticut Daily Newspapers Assoc. I would strongly urge you to give your favorable consideration to this measure. Thank you very much.

Chr. Pickett: Mr. Hartford.

Mr. Hartford: I would just like to say that the Connecticut Council on Freedom of Information endorses these bills and I'd like to endorse what the previous speakers have said and not take any more of your time than that. Thank you.

Chr. Pickett: Thank you sir. Clemow.

Brice Clemow: I am a publisher of a weekly paper. My name is Brice Clemow, I come from West Hartford but I suspect with my role of commissioner I'm more sympathetic with these suggested clarifications than as an editor. You were all aware of the fact that nationally and in the state the role of the press in arriving at justice is being examined and we're all groping for explicit attempt to pass as we can find and therefore I urge that you consider the clarifications of an effective law because as a Commissioner I myself know that we quite often grope for what the law really did mean and I think these clarifications are in that direction. I said Miss Matarese and gentlemen.

Chr. Pickett: Mr. Gallagher.

TUESDAY

JUDICIARY

MARCH 14, 1967

Mr. Gallagher: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First I'd like to speak that I approve of the bills written. I am only a citizen from Torrington. I would like you to amend it in one small respect. On the third line of Sec. 1-19--federal or state statute or regulation, all records made, maintained or kept...3998 H. B. No. 3998 (Reps. Crombie and Lenge) AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS..it says that all records made, maintained or kept on file by any executive agency, etc. shall be open to the public. Now I had a very disheartening experience within the last two weeks in Torrington. In the minutes of the July 11 meeting of the Board of Education in Torrington, I wanted to see a letter. I went to the superintendent's office and asked if I might see it. If I had been at the meeting, I would have heard it. I had to leave early. I didn't hear it. I got no result. I wrote a letter then to the superintendent as executive agent of the Board. He wrote back and said that he had never had the letter, it was on his file, he called the Chairman of the Board of Education who had originally received the letter and who had read it. The Chairman of the Board informed him that the letter had been returned to the teacher. This is a letter signed by some 90 to 100 teachers, obviously it had some import. What can I do? Further on in this section it says that you can appeal to the Circuit Court but if this record is made, maintained or kept on file, you are right. What happens if they destroy the record or return it? They don't have it. They don't have it on file. They did not make it. So if you would be kind enough to insert some phraseology that would cover this which is loosely termed a loop-hole, if you would say, for example, received by, referred to in minutes, referred to in proceedings, some phrase that would prevent what happened to a letter signed by 100 school teachers. Thank you.

Chr. Pickett: Thank you. We are now starting the regular hearing order, and Group 1 will consist of bills 2130 H. B. No. 2130 (Rep. Reynolds) AN ACT CONCERNING ADDITIONAL EXPENSE ALLOWANCE FOR ASSEMBLY MEMBERS ELECTED FROM MULTI-TOWN DISTRICTS; 2150 H. B. No. 2319 (Rep. King) AN ACT PROVIDING FOR THE TRANSFER OF ABANDONED STATE JAIL FACILITIES TO THE MUNICIPALITY WHERE LOCATED; H. B. No. 3444 (Rep. Ring) AN ACT CONCERNING THE FOSTERING OF GROWTH OF AMATEUR ATHLETICS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT; H. B. No. 3691 (Rep. McCabe) AN ACT CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SENIOR SERVICE CORPS; H. B. No. 3695 (Rep. Ring) AN ACT ESTABLISHING A COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE CONTROL AND SUPERVISION OF AMBULANCE SERVICES. The first speaker will be Mr. Hegstrom.