

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 4852	PA 902	1967
House 3120-3132		(13)
Senate 2130		(1)
Elections 211-212		(2)

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

total 16p

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2016

H-90

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1967

VOL. 12
PART 7
2719-3267

May 27, 1967

75

report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

DS

MR. RICHARDS (50th)

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 3387 will authorize the Trustees of the University of Connecticut, with the approval of the Governor, to lease state owned land to private developers to develop for rental housing and commercial establishment, a shopping center. The university may provide heat, water, waste disposal services, and designate the type of business to be conducted as a part of the terms of the lease. Plans for such construction also must be approved by the university trustees. This bill further provides that such land shall be removed from the property included in Section 12-19 of the General Statutes, that is the Grant in Lieu of Taxes Section, and that such land together with any buildings and improvements thereon, shall be included in the grand list of the town where it is situated.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor signify by saying aye. All those opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 831 Substitute for House Bill No. 4852. An Act concerning Dropping Persons from the Rolls of a Party Because of Candidacy for Office Without Party Endorsement. Favorable report of the Committee on Elections. File #968.

MR. LEARY (43rd)

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

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable

May 27, 1967

76

report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

DS

MR. LEARY (43rd)

Mr. Speaker, under our present law if a registrar of voters, or deputy registrar in certain cases, is of the opinion that an enrolled member of his particular political party is not truly affiliated with that party or in good faith a member of that party, and does not intend to support its principles or its candidates, then the said registrar may cite such a person to appear at a hearing before the registrar and before the town chairman of that party, or a party member in certain cases, to show cause why his name should not be erased from the enrollment list. Mr. Speaker, if it appears that as a result of that hearing that it is the intention of such a person not to support its party, its principles or its candidates, then his name may be erased from the enrollment list. This bill before you, Mr. Speaker, would change existing law in that if a registered member of a party, if his name appears on a ballot label at an election only under a party designation other than that of that party, then his name will automatically be erased from the enrollment list. Basically, Mr. Speaker, what the bill does. If a member of a party runs on another party's label, or whether it be a major party or a minor party, and not his own party label, then his name is stricken from the enrollment list of that party. So it doesn't prohibit a person running under both his own party label and that of another party. It is a good bill Mr. Speaker, and I urge its adoption.

MR. BOYD (144th)

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman of the 43rd whether there is any particular person he has in mind with respect to this general bill, through you Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 43rd wish to answer?

May 27, 1967

77
DS

MR. LEARY (43rd)

Through you Mr. Speaker, I have no particular person in mind. I do not believe the Election Committee did.

MR. BOYD (144th)

Mr. Speaker, I think that this bill is unnecessary in terms of the general concept of law which is intended to be amended. I can understand if there were a particular object that the sponsor of the bill, which he intended to knock off. I don't feel that the bill is necessary and I shall vote against it.

MR. TORPEY (15yh)

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is difficult enough for a person to run for office and to get support, and if he is standing for a principle which he believes, it could very well be that he feels in his mind he is standing for the principles and representing the principles of his party better than another candidate. I don't feel that the threat of dropping him from the role should be hanging over his head. If he feels he wants to run he should be given this privilege to represent the party as he sees fit. I would urge the rejection of this bill.

MR. LEARY (43rd)

Mr. Speaker, speaking for the second time, Sir. Mr. Speaker, in reporting out the bill I neglected to mention that such a person would be removed from the enrollment list only for the period of the term of office for which he ran on another party's label.

MR. DOWD (125th)

Mr. Speaker, speaking strictly as an individual and in no way trying to associate any of my colleagues on this side of the aisle with my personal feelings on this bill, I rise to oppose this bill. It seems to me that one of

May 27, 1967 78

the great tragedies in Connecticut life and in American life generally, is the indisposition of the average voter to join a political party. In so doing they find themselves being just half participants in our political process. It seems to me that laws such as this which give the connotation or the impression to the average voter of requiring some kind of lockstep loyalty to a party, are precisely the things that dissuade people from joining a political party. It seems that it further convinces the average voter of the undesirability pertaining to party membership. I think at this time we should be putting in our laws things that would encourage people to join parties, to take the full step in the political process so that they are not faced on election day with the choice of just choosing between two candidates that somebody else chose for them.

MR. RATCHFORD (167th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support this bill. Mr. Speaker, I am a strong believer of the two party system, I'm a strong believer of a strong minority party. I welcome a strong minority party in this House and we have one. I think it is only appropriate that we have one. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that without this bill we are inviting the person to have the best of both worlds to carry a party label, but to run on a ballot at the same time and slam the party whose label he carries. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do think a party label means something and I don't think a person should enter into a party enrollment lightly. I think nothing is more meaningful in party work than voter registration because we are encouraging people to join our party or the other party because of a firm conviction, a firm political belief, a belief that the principles of a particular party warrant enrollment. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we then say to that individual, we believe strongly in our principles, we support our party label and run against us, I think we are discouraging a strong two party system in the State of Connecticut. I believe in this system. It

May 27, 1967 79

has brought good results. It has brought good government. This bill will bring better government and better party politics in the State of Connecticut.

MR. KING (48th)

Mr. Speaker, through you a question to Mr. Leary who introduced the bill. I do not find clearly spelled out in the bill what happens in this situation. A man, a candidate, for a particular party is endorsed by the other party, and in some instances the endorsing party may actually carry his name on its ballot, so that he is a candidate for both parties without any effort on his part to become a candidate for the endorsing party. Now as I read the bill, he would be subject to the restrictions, penalties if you will, carried in this bill. If I'm incorrect, perhaps Mr. Leary can straighten me out.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman of the 43rd wish to answer?

MR. LEARY (43rd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Through you Sir, if the gentleman of the 48th would look at line 11 of the bill, the new language that is being incorporated in this bill. I'll quote from it. Except in the case where the name of any elector appears on the ballot label at an election only under a party designation other than that of the party with which he is enrolled. So if in effect if the candidate is endorsed, endorsed by another party, then this act would not apply.

MR. MC KINNEY (141st)

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I think that probably the gentleman on the other side of the aisle would want the republican party to keep this bill because this sort of bolting has seemed to cause us a great deal of problem over the last few years. However when I listened to this bill I wondered whether we were talking about the nazi party or the communist party or what. This is a democracy and I don't see how you can take the right of a

May 27, 1967

80

man to express his political disfavor with his party away from him. In many

DS

cases in this country of ours we have candidates who are either out of favor with their party's leadership or who disapprove of their party's leadership and they should have the right to try and change their party if they so wish. I'm violently opposed to this bill.

MR. COLLINS (165th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. Like my friend from the 167th, I'm a firm strong supporter of the two party system, but I am also an advocate of free thought. This bill is strictly tailored to keep the party people in line and the price that you pay for getting out of line is a loss of party enrollment for the period of time equal to the office for which you attempt to run on another ticket. There is provision in existing law for the removal of people from the party if they do not believe in party principle, if they fold or in some other way. This provision has been used in many instances. It is available when a situation arises and there should not be a mandatory exclusion such as this in any of our registration laws. I believe as Mr. Boyd does, it is totally unnecessary. I urge its rejection.

MR. PAWLAK (95th)

Mr. Speaker, I heartily support this bill. I think its within the individuals right to belong to a party, to express his views, and also a responsibility to be a member of the party in fact, not only in name. If I have any objections to the bill it is that the bill does not impose too stringent a penalty for one who, in my estimation, acts in the form of a traitor. Each party has a set of principles by which it operates, and a man has a choice, not an obligation. He is under no compulsion to join either party. He can form his own party. I don't think he can wear two hats. I think that if he wishes to be a candidate for a party other than that to which he originally enrolled, let him

May 27, 1967 81

voluntarily remove his name from that party and then be whatever he wants to be. I think that there is such a thing as responsibility and I heartily enforce this bill.

MR. RICHARDS (50th)

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the reasons why we've had such a stable government in this country is because of the strong two party system. It seems to me this bill would encourage permanent splinter groups, and I go along with the gentleman from Westport. I think we should encourage people to join the two parties rather than to encourage more than the two.

MR. GAFFNEY (29th)

Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken, I would ask that it be taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on a roll call vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye. All those opposed? In the opinion of the Chair the necessary 20% have voted in the affirmative. The Chair will order a roll call vote.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. LAVERY (136th)

I rise to support this bill. The reason I rise to support this bill is we are discussing politics. If a person in a political party disagrees with either the leadership or the principles of his party and desires to see a change, then he has the route to which it can be done. He should take to the primary route, he should work within his own party to change it. So often when there does need to be a change of principle and leadership, the people who wish to see this done go outside their own party. I think this is a necessary law to have a flexible and strong political party system. I think to reject this law

3127

May 27, 1967

82

would hurt our political system and I hope that this House passes this bill.

DS

THE SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR

MR. GAFFNEY (29th)

I would ask the gentleman from the 136th if a member of his party in a convention does not get 20% of the delegates, what other choice does he have?

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

MR. LAVERY (136th)

I do. He has the way the present law is, he has no other choice but to go along with his party, the majority of his party. But he should have spent the time prior to it in being at the primary route trying to get the sufficient delegates grant to give him the right to do it. It is a hard job, politics, and it should be done. If people are afraid to shirk the work and take to the road, then they shouldn't participate in the game.

MR. GAFFNEY (29th)

I rise to oppose this bill because I would never discourage anyone to run for any office. I think this is how our country was built. There have been many parties in this country through its many years of history; the democratic and the republican party have evolved. That doesn't mean in the next century there won't be many other parties. I think if somebody wants to run as an independent democrat, or as a democrat on another line, he should be so entitled to do that. I have a sneaking suspicion that this is pointed at people like Mr. Cook in New Haven, Mr. Miner in Litchfield County, and I think that is what you are afraid of. But I don't think the law should be built out of fear.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. PROVENZANO (127th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill. I think it's about time that we endorse the two party system. What are we talking about here now? We're talking about a particular person on the democratic rolls may it be, running as an independent or a republican and still keep his name on the democratic rolls. We're talking about the man who is a republican who can't seem to get the nomination who's mad at the republicans in his district, keeps his name on the republican rolls, and runs as an independent republican. No one denies this person the right to run as an independent republican or an independent democrat. But certainly his name should not remain on the rolls in which he doesn't wish to support. This is what we're talking about now. We've seen it, you've seen it in your town, I've seen it in my town. I think it is about time that we took a step forward to preserve the two party system. As Harry Truman said, if it gets too hot in the kitchen, get out.

MR. LA GROTTA (170th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill. I rise to oppose it particularly because I think what the process of our democratic elections is trying to achieve would be stifled by this. In our last election there were people that did jump the party line. They did run on another label. But believe me ladies and gentlemen there were many thousands of people that supported them and this is a point of view. Maybe it's contrary to our two party point of view, but it is a point of view which should be figured in the cauldren of our democracy. I think this would stifle an expression. When we as a democracy pass a law to stifle some of the expression of anyone, we have stifled some of our own expression. I ask you to look well at this and to forget the political ramifications. When the bell tolls, it might well toll for us.

May 27, 1967

84
DS

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th)

Mr. Speaker, through you to the gentleman of the 141st if he cares to answer.

THE SPEAKER:

You may proceed.

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th)

I wonder whether Mr. Speaker to the gentleman of the 141st, if he were to elect to run under a democratic label two years hence, whether he would still wish to carry the republican party label and be a member of that party on their enrollment lists.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

MR. MC KINNEY (141st)

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I would live long enough to run under the democratic ticket.

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th)

Mr. Speaker, I think that some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are overstating the case. This bill does not stifle competition, it does not eliminate anyone's right to run. What it simply says is this, call a spade a spade. If you are going to be a democrat or a republican, so be it. If you are not, if you wish to run on another label, or on a minority party label, then you simply must forfeit the right to belong to the party with which you are enrolled. You can run all you want. All this bill says is you know the consequences. No longer will it be sheep in wolfs clothing. I think this is right in line with our truth and packaging laws, Mr. Speaker. If you are a democrat, act like a democrat; if you are a republican, act like a republican. If you are going to be an independent or a third party member, then do so.

May 27, 1967

85

But don't try and play both ends against the middle. I support the bill.

DS

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. BARD (145th)

Mr. Speaker, this bill seems to punish the leader of a particular group but not those who voted for him. It only punishes the man whose name actually appears on the ballot. But there may be those in a democratic or a republican party who voted for these people and maybe in large numbers. Until you are ready to punish everybody, don't punish just one person.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. BOYD (144th)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman of the 170th and after those remarks, I would resign as poet laureate. I would also like to say Mr. Speaker, that we're so tired of the other side having adopted our ideas on running as "wolfs" in sheeps clothing that you know that this bill would help us a little bit.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. BADOLATO (30th)

Mr. Speaker, this is a real good bill. I don't understand why anybody on the other side of the aisle would oppose this. I have an article here that I've been saving for years. 8/31/65. The republican party and the City of West Haven had a problem similar to what this bill is attempting to correct. G.O.P. sources at that time confirmed that the town committee voted, and it happened to be on a Monday night, to seek the removal of a group of people that ran on an independent ticket. They themselves felt that this shouldn't be.

May 27, 1967 86

They themselves felt that if anyone wanted to run on another party label, they should then adopt that party label. I think that this certainly is a good bill. It makes the party responsible and it makes the individual responsible to the party. For many years now we've heard about the party being responsible but never have we heard that the individual should also be responsible. This would also make the individual responsible to the party that he belongs to and that he represents. If he doesn't care to belong to that party, if he doesn't care to represent that party, he should then withdraw himself automatically. It has not happened in the past. This bill will see to it that it does happen.

MR. HOGAN (177th)

I rise to oppose this bill. I think it is aimed at one man who was a very good friend of mine, a very capable gentleman, and a real sterling representative. I oppose the bill and hope it will be defeated.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. MAYER (40th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the bill, and I'm quite surprised at the remarks made here this afternoon in support of this bill. Many people who yesterday voted down a bill that would make a mandatory jail sentence for driving under suspension. I am now calling for a mandatory suspension of any registered voter who does something that you don't like. I guess it depends on whose ox is being gored. It's all right to take an errant politician or person running against your ticket and punish him without a trial, but it isn't all right to punish a driver who has been convicted twice of driving under suspension and give him a mandatory sentence. I think your standards are a little bit haywire. I think this bill should go down in resounding defeat.

May 27, 1967

87
DS

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. BLAKE (53rd)

Mr. Speaker, I consider this bill as an excellent bill and I can't possibly see how anyone who has ever been a town chairman and has had any experience along this line can vote against it.

THE SPEAKER:

Will your remark further on the bill? Will all members of the House please be seated and we will prepare the vote, all other persons will please leave the aisle. The question is on Calendar No. 831, Substitute for House Bill No. 4852. If you favor the bill you will vote yea. If you do not favor passage of the bill, you will vote nay. The Chair will open the machine. Has everyone in his seat voted and are you recorded as you wish? If so the Chair will lock the machine and ask the Clerk to take a tally. The Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Total number voting	142
Necessary for passage	72
Those voting Yea	91
Those voting Nay	51
Those absent and not voting	35

THE SPEAKER:

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 832 House Bill No. 2643. An Act concerning Sworn Statements in Welfare Cases. Favorable report of the Committee on Public Welfare and Homane Institutions. File #969.

S-67

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1967

VOL. 12

PART 5

1967

or buildings under its control to private developers for rental housing and commercial establishments. It also provides what the land that is solely and the buildings that are on it be subject to local assessment and taxation.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on the acceptance of the favorable report and passage of the bill. As many of you who are in favor signify by saying, "aye". Contrary minded. The ayes have it and the bill is passed.

Cal. No. 1069 File No. 968 Substitute for House Bill No. 4852 An Act concerning Dropping Persons from the Rolls of a Party Because of Candidacy for Office Without Party Endorsements. Favorable report on the Committee on Elections.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill would do exactly what its title states. Drop a person from the rolls of a party because of candidacy for office without party endorsement. This a person who waged a primary and lost, and then sought to run either as an independent or republican or democrat or some such title, would be dropped from the party enrollment list for the length of time as the office would run for which he sought election. It would seem to me, as it seemed to the members of the committee, that this only makes sense, if a person chooses to run other than as a party endorsed member he should be dropped from the party rolls and I urge the passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage, any further remarks, if not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Contrary minded. The bill is passed.

THE CHAIR THEN ASKED THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO TAKE THE GAVEL:

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

ELECTIONS

1967

35
MOC

211

THURSDAY 10:00 a.m.

ELECTIONS

MARCH 30, 1967

Senator Caldwell: We'll pass on to H.B. No. 4852 (Rep. Bodolato)
AN ACT CONCERNING DROPPING PERSONS FROM THE
ROLLS OF A PARTY BECAUSE OF CANDIDACY
FOR OFFICE WITHOUT PARTY ENDORSEMENT.

Rep. Bodolato of the 30th District: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
Committee, representative Bodolato, of the
30th District - I wish to be registered in
favor of H.B. No. 4852.

This bill would give to the party the
necessary tools to work with the people that
are registered within the party. At the present
time there has been a great deal said about
party responsibility and their candidates.
This bill would bring responsibility to the
party. Many candidates affiliated with the
party elect to primary elect - to seek
endorsement - when they fail in both those
cases - they then run as candidates as
independents or what ever they may be.

This certainly doesn't lead to party responsi-
bility nor does it lead to any responsibility
to the party itself. There are provisions
in the present statute that provide for a
method of eliminating people from the party
roles - but it's a cumbersome method and this
would automatically remove them from the
party roles if they run on a ticket other than
an endorsed slate or a party slate - and if they
are endorsed - or if they're selected in a
primary from within their party then certainly
they would have the opportunity to run on any
other ticket. But, if they're not, if they're
denied the right to be represented on the
slate by their endorsement or by the primary -
then they should abide by the decision of the
people of their party and refrain from
running for office. If not, they should
automatically be removed for a term of the office
for which they're seeking.

I think it's a good bill and it would certainly
lead to the responsibility of the party and it's
something that we need. And, we certainly
need party responsibility. I would hope that
your committee would act favorably on it.

36
MOC

212

THURSDAY 10:00 a.m.

ELECTIONS

MARCH 30, 1967

Senator Caldwell: Thank you, any questions?

Anyone else who would like to be heard in favor of it?

Martin Gaffey:

Martin Gaffey, Registrar, representing the Registrar Voters Association, Gentlemen, we think that this is a good bill. We would like to endorse this bill - we have present ways now of removing people from the lists, but it has put our registrars in an embarrassing situation, with court cases, hearings, etc. When it comes time to remove a person from the lists the newspapers cover it very well and we have had cases where our registrars have been embarrassed in removing someone.

But, we feel that this way it will be automatic with no problems - the bill is well written - if the bill is for a term of two years the party is removed for two years - if the term is for four years, the party is removed for four years.

Once again, gentlemen, we would like to go on record as endorsing this bill. Thank you.

Senator Caldwell: Thank you.

Anyone else who would like to be heard in favor? Anyone in opposition?

Pass on to the only remaining bill H.B. No. 4857 (Rep. Barringer) AN ACT CONCERNING ABSENTEE VOTING BY STUDENTS. Now the Committee has already conducted a lengthy hearing on this subject matter, now this is a bill that went into the hopper a little late, and wasn't available at the time of the hearing, however, if anyone did attend this hearing today for purpose of speaking on this subject, we'll be happy to hear him.

If not, the hearing is closed.

Mildred O. Crawford,

Secretary