

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

S3820	<PA 768>	1969
hearing ^{tr}	transportation 148-166, 245	19
Senate	2134-2139, 2191, 3040-3045	13p.
House	4273 -4303	31p.
		43p. 62

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

TRANSPORTATION

1969

TRANSPORTATION

148

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 5, 1969

Senator Harry Burke, Presiding

Members present: Senators: Harry Burke
Representatives: Bonetti, Martin, Pac, Gormley,
O'Dea.

Chr. Burke: Good morning, now we are going to start the Transportation Committee hearing. Are there any legislators here who wish to speak on any of these bills?? If not, we'll start with

S.B. No. 79 AN ACT CREATING A DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Anybody wish to speak in favor of that? We might as well group all those bills, save time and expedite matters to hear all the transportation bills.

S.B. 586, 820 H.B. 5927, 7061, 7082.

Mr. Frank M. Reinhold, Chr. Conn. Transportation Authority: Chr. Burke, Chr. O'Dea, I am Frank M. Reinhold, Chr. of the Conn. Transportation Authority. I appear on behalf of the Authority in support of S.B. Nos. 79, 586, and 820, and H.B. Nos. 5927, 7061, and 7082. All of these bills would establish a Department of Transportation in accord with the recommendation of the Legislative Council. The Authority supports the concept of a Department of Transportation that would coordinate the work of all state transportation agencies, to insure that we have a balanced transportation system to serve the needs of our state. I believe that all of the bills now before this committee would achieve this objective. I understand that other bills are pending before other committees which would consolidate, rather than coordinate, agencies of the state that are concerned with transportation. I oppose the concept of wiping out the identity of the Connecticut Transportation Authority, the Department of Aeronautics, the Commissioners of Steamship Terminals and the Highway Department, and establishing a large and unwieldy Department of Transportation. Now that we have accomplished our primary objective, the preservation of our vital rail system by the inclusion of the bankrupt New Haven Railroad in Penn Central, we do not believe that our Authority should be eliminated and our functions transferred to a large agency. We believe that we should continue our work to modernize commuter facilities and bring high speed train service to Connecticut. The bills before this Committee would establish a Dept. of Transportation which would act as a coordinating agency. Such an agency would operate at the least possible cost to taxpayers. For example, the work now being done by the CTA is carried on by four people; our Director, our Asst. Director and two secretaries. I believe that the

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 5, 1969

Dept. of Transportation should have a small staff and should be operated in the manner similar to our CTA. The staff of the new Department would review plans of the Highway Dept., the Dept. of Aeronautics, the Commissioners of Steamship Terminals and the CTA, to insure that programs are properly coordinated. For example, new highways should serve railroad stations, rather than cut off access to stations. New mass transit systems should provide direct connections between airports and urban centers. Both highway and mass transit planning and construction should be coordinated that people would be encouraged to leave their cars at convenient parking areas and use mass transit facilities. We cannot afford the luxury of converting downtown areas of our cities into parking lots. I think it is obvious to everyone how much less space is required to transport large numbers of people by mass transit systems, in contrast with the space required to build superhighways for motor vehicles. But we must make mass transit facilities attractive and convenient. We need rapid, comfortable and on-time train service. We should revitalize our urban bus services and develop faster bus service by express bus lanes on highways and along city streets. I believe that a properly constituted Dept. of Transportation, established along the lines proposed in the bills before this Committee, will be of tremendous benefit to the present and future development of our state. We cannot afford to continue to plan highways, airports and rail improvements without assuring that such improvements are part of an integrated, balanced transportation system. I ask your favorable action on these bills which would establish a Dept. of Transportation to coordinate the activities of all state agencies charged with the responsibility for planning, constructing and maintaining transportation facilities. Thank you.

Chr. Burke: Thank you, Mr. Reinhold. Anyone wish to speak in favor of any of these Dept. of Transportation bills?

Mr. Donald Potter, Research Dir. of the Legislative Council: It has already been noted, the Legislative Council made a study of the establishment of a Dept. of Transportation and as a result of the study, introduced S.B. 820 and H.B. 7061, which are identical. The reasons for recommending these bills are contained in our thirteenth bi-ennial report on pages 66 and 67. Mr. Chairman, we would like it noted for the record that the recommendations of the Council are contained in this report and ask the perusal and study of your Committee of our recommendations.

Sen. Burke: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Edmond Burdick, Executive Secy. Conn. Road Builders Assoc., Inc.: I would like to speak in general on the various bills creating a State Dept. of Transportation. The Conn.

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 5, 1969

Road Builders Assoc. has neither endorsed nor opposed those bills before the Transportation Committee concerning the creation of a Dept. of Transportation. These bills include numbers 79, 586, 820, 5927, 7061 and 7082. I learned this morning when I got my mail that there are several other bills on the same subject. However, there is concern on the part of many motorists and those engaging in highway transportation that by the creation of a Dept. of Transportation, funds derived from highway users will be diverted to other purposes. We suggest and propose that each of the bills enumerated above be amended by the inclusion of the following, or similar language. "No monies derived from fees, excises or license taxes relating to registration, operation or use of motor vehicles on public highways, or to fuels used for propelling such vehicles, shall be expended for other than cost of the the administration of the laws relating thereto, statutory refunds, and adjustments allowed therein, payment of highway obligations, costs of construction, reconstruction, maintenance and repair of public highways and bridges and expense of enforcing state traffic laws." I might add that the language which I have just quoted is identical to that in joint house resolution 36, which would create an amendment to the Constitution, prohibiting the diversion of our highway funds.

Chr. Burke: Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in favor of any of these transportation bills? Excuse me, are there any legislators who wish to speak. We started on time and there were no legislators here, but we'd be happy to hear them now.

Rep. Pearson, 128th. Dist.: Thank you. I'm sorry I'm late. I'd like to speak in regard to 7339, the reporting of transportation of dead, maimed or sick animals. My purpose in this was something that I think I did eliminate, which was what I would like to do, would be to have no shipments out of Connecticut or in Connecticut of dogs under the age of 7 weeks old. It's been brought to my attention that it's very difficult for a dog to survive traveling, especially at that age. I don't know if this is something that perhaps the Committee might want to consider and put in this, to help the small dogs. There are regulations through the transportation companies, the Railway Express, I believe, and they do have some regulations on feeding, housing and watering of animals during transportation. I do believe they mark the crates as to the time when they do feed the animals, the dogs especially. I saw nothing in the statutes where this was actually spelled out, as a regulation for the state, and that was the main intent of my bill so that perhaps this could be incorporated. I did find one section but it wasn't really complete enough, I didn't think. So I don't know if perhaps this

Committee would like to consider incorporating all of that or if just the fact the way the bill is, that if something does happen to an animal, often the animals are shipped by air and I realize they try to do this just during the beginning of the week and not on the weekends because when it gets toward the weekend, there is a great chance that the crates would be lost, and this has happened, where a shipment has been sent up say, from Florida to perhaps to Kennedy Airport and arrived in New Haven somewhere and was missing a day or two, and by the time the animals and the crates did arrive, the dogs were dead. So I didn't want to put in really rough restriction on the transportation company, but I thought perhaps this here might give the dogs a better chance. The fact that they knew that this report had to be filled out, they might be a little careful. I realize that these things do happen and shipments are misplaced often, so I don't know if there's anyone that has any question that they'd like to ask me about it. I think perhaps the fact of a dog going in or out of Connecticut, not under the age of 7 weeks would probably be a real good point to bring out and perhaps you might want to consider this. Is there any question or anything that you might have? I know there is a gentleman here who, from one of the societies that does have some more information in regard to this. I was made aware of it, the fact pet shops also have a problem where when crates, say they order 11 crates and the shipment comes in, they have to sign for the full shipment, even if only say 7 arrive. And if they never ever get the other 3, they still have to pay for them in order to pick up the 7 crates that do get there. So that's why I got involved in this, to check into this.

Sen. Burke: You plan on adding a little work on the Conn. Transportation Authority, don't you?

Rep. Pearson: Well, maybe, I suppose maybe I am. My intent wasn't to cause any problem for them, but to save the lives of little pups. Thank you.

Sen. Burke: Thank you. Any other legislators?

Rep. Mayer, 46th Dist.: I am here to also comment generally on the Dept. of Transportation bills that appear before you. The, I do not believe any of the bills suggested offer a high enough priority to establish another bureaucratic department in the state of Connecticut. Unless a department is established that would have full control over all departments of transportation beneath them, there is little need to set up a department. At the present time I believe that the leadership of the state of Connecticut should have control and guidance over the various highway departments, aeronautics

commissions and so forth, that exist in the state of Connecticut. I believe unless you set up a department with the full authority to direct and fully implement coordination between the rail, air and highway transportation that it's an exercise in futility and a waste of the state's money. The problem that I see and I'm very close to, is the coordination of the expansion of Bradley Field, Bradley International Airport, and the road system around it. In our discussions with the Aeronautics Commission, they have said that there is no need, they are not responsible for the road networks to the airport, and this is true. The Highway Dept. has the problem of coordinating traffic and roads with the Aeronautics Commission's plans. At the present time, no one can direct them to get together and to come up with a plan. When Bradley Field started up there about 1948, '50, Bradley was started as a commercial airport. The roadwork came in very late and the towns around Bradley Field were deluged with traffic to and from that terminal building, and the connector to I-91 wasn't built until long after. The problems of Windsor Locks and the surrounding towns with that traffic were almost unbearable. I believe that these should be coordinated, but it should be a forced coordination upon the departments of our state to make sure that the towns are properly taken care of when the state plans an expansion such as Bradley Field. At the present time I doubt that there's little coordination going on between the Highway Department and the Aeronautics Commission. I also am concerned with the possible change in the present condemnation rights under a Dept. of Transportation Act, which would affect the present procedures installed in the last Assembly for condemnation of land for airport expansion. I believe everyone of you, the representatives here should be concerned with this because it will directly your community in the future. You should be aware of any condemnation procedures enacted in a Dept. of Transportation bill. I do not feel that this is a high-priority item, however, and if money is to be saved in the budget of this year, this might be a way of saving a few thousand dollars. Thank you.

Sen. Burke: Thank you. Any other legislators?

Rep. King, 37th Dist.: I want to speak with regard to 5927 which is the only one of these bills that I have examined although I suspect that there may be others to which my remarks would also be applicable. I am concerned essentially here with the fact that this statute would give quite massive eminent domain powers for the purpose of mass transportation service. The statute is, as the one that is presently on the books except it's amended as regards the eminent domain procedures so as to include mass transportation, and it's my feeling that these eminent domain powers may well have been alright for the purposes of acquiring land for rail,

but are entirely too broad, perhaps to encompass such matters as mass transportation. As I understand the matter, the present statutes which are on the books, relating to acquiring land for use of airports would require a public hearing in the town and what is tantamount to a town meeting approval and if such approval is not obtained, it would require the state to take the matter to Superior Court and there justify the taking, and it would seem to me that matters of mass transportation are entirely analogous here. The consideration should be given to make a proper provision to protect the rights of various towns which would be affected by this type of statute. I must admit also that I've only casually glanced at this, looked at it in a very superficial manner, but I suspect that there are other areas of this statute which need to be re-examined in the light of the fact that mass transportation is involved as compared to the present statute which relates only to rail. Thank you.

Chr. Burke: Thank you. Any other legislators?

Rep. Cutillo, 88th Dist.: I'd like to refer to bill 7341, which is my own, and also I'd like to speak on behalf of all other bills referring to this matter and they are, of course, 7627, 7080, and 7222. This very simply, gentlemen, I'm sure you heard of this one before, is to make a drivers' license embossed with a photograph in it. I'm not too concerned actually if it stays at age 25 or age 27, but I think as a practical matter, for the convenience of identification in many phases of our life here in Connecticut, it is a well worth it and practical endeavor. Now, it has been brought to my attention that the cost initially to the state of Connecticut may run somewhere in the area of one million to two million dollars in setting up the machinery herein. In my bill I have stated that I think the person whom the photograph is being taken of should defray the cost. Now, this could be anywhere from two to four dollars and considering this machinery is going to be in operation for many years to come, it will very easily defray the cost to the state of Connecticut. Thank you.

Chr. Burke: Any other legislators? Rep. Oliver?

Rep. Oliver, 104th Dist.: Mr. Chairman, very briefly speak to HB 5927 and the other bills concerning the creation of a department of transportation. I feel very strongly that Connecticut must at this session create a strong Department of Transportation to coordinate and direct the total state endeavor in all fields of transportation. I think it's absolutely clear the continuation of the current situation where we have uncoordinated development and operation of rail, highway, air and sea modes of transportation is incompatible with the best interests of the state. I say briefly, where my bill differs from most of the other bills - 1. I have

included at the start in section 1 a very thorough statement of purpose and legislative findings which unmistakably recognize the need for this department. 2. In section 5 I have given the new commissioner comprehensive powers and duties including duties to advise municipal and regional officials, to review utilization of state resources toward transportation problems, to prepare studies, to encourage intergovernmental cooperation, also investigatory powers. 3. I suggested that social, economic and environmental factors must be taken into consideration by a new department in the preparation of the long range, comprehensive, integrated transportation plan which is to be developed on or before Jan. 1, 1971 and which would thereafter guide the total future state transportation complex. That's in sec. 6. Also in section 6 I would require the commissioner to get particular consideration in the development of long range plan to a special transportation problems of elderly persons, young persons, persons with incomes near poverty level and physically and mentally handicapped persons. 5. In section 6 I would require again, a biennial public hearing in each planning region of the state to permit public participation in the long range planning process. I think this is very very important. From the 6th area I think of important difference is in Section 8 I would grant the Commissioner power to direct the initiation of transportation projects by any of the constituent agencies of the state as well as power to modify any projects presented to him. These powers would, of course, be exercised in line with that comprehensive long range transportation plan on or after Jan. 1, 1971. But perhaps most important of all, and I know I don't have to stress this to my colleague from New Haven, in Sec. 11 I would create a state program for grants in aid to municipalities, regional planning agencies, transportation authorities or other appropriate local agencies for state financial assistance for programs to develop or revise municipal or regional comprehensive transportation studies, plans and recommendations. This latter is absolutely essential, I feel for under the existing state of affairs, funds are simply unavailable to local municipalities or regional planning authorities for such study. And as I understand, the governor's budget request in the inter-regional planning area, does not provide significant new funds. In New Haven we are currently about to hire professionals skilled in transportation planning to begin to collect data in the city on mass transit needs. But we're just beginning and no money can be found to undertake the regional survey of the total movement of people, goods and services in the metropolitan area, without which city surveys alone are futile. Enactment of Section 11 in particular and H.B. 5927 in general, will constitute legislative recognition of the solutions of the problems of adequate public mass transportation can only be achieved on a regional and statewide basis and absolutely requires!

state financial assistance. I urge swift action. Your Committee must do '69 what we should have done in 1967 - improve and modernize Connecticut's approach to urban transportation systems and inject the elements of balanced, overall state coordination into the presently disjointed state transportation endeavors. The cities of our state can no longer afford delay. Thank you very much.

Chr. Burke: Are there any other legislators who wish to speak in favor of any of these transportation bills? If not, we'll go back to the public again. Mr. Blasko?

Mr. John E. Blasko, Gen. Mgr. Motor Transport Assoc, of Conn.: I am here to speak in behalf of the trucking industry. First of all let me make it clear whole heartedly with the intent set forth in the bills promulgating a department of transportation. To the degree that these proposals will accomplish the goals set forth, we are in complete agreement with the stated purpose. However, we wish to raise a few questions which we hope will be helpful to this committee in its deliberations concerning these bills. Most of the bills provide quote "That all studies pertaining to transportation, planned or undertaken by any agency of the state, shall require the prior approval of the Commission." My question here concerns the hundreds of hearings held by the Conn. Public Utilities Commission on relatively minor matters which would require a substantial staff for review. Specifically the PUC issues findings daily on taxicab certificates, livery permits, certificate transfers and since its inception has done an excellent job in the area of highway transportation regulation with which I am most concerned. The PUC's obligations and authority are firmly established by statute. My question here is whether the statutes pertaining to the PUC should be reviewed and revised as have those of the transportation authority concurrently with the consideration of a Dept. of Transportation? Let me make it clear that the PUC has done an excellent job in the field of highway transportation and in our opinion leads all states in this area of regulation and has given this state one of the best and most able highway transport facilities in the nation. I merely question the need for and the degree of review of its activities and whether concurrent changes in statutes must be made? Same question may be raised in connection with planning program of the Highway Dept. and I raise this question at this time because of the tremendous furor that was raised by the governors and highway officials of all of the states when similar proposal for additional hearings were submitted by the Federal Dept. of Transportation. Will this also require changes in statutory requirements for highway department's established procedures? Just a question. Another section in almost all bills require s review by

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 5, 1969

the Transportation Commissioner of all matters pertaining to motor bus franchises and routes. Must the PUC statute concerning bus franchises be changed at this time. One bill, HB 5927, on which Rep. Oliver just spoke, provides "Advise and inform municipal officials, regional planning agencies and transportation authorities about transportation programs and problems and shall collect and disseminate information pertaining thereto, including information about federal state and private assistance programs and services pertaining thereto." Such a program is highly desirable and should be planned for the future, without question. However, it represents a formidable undertaking and I question that this service along with the many others proposed, is possible of accomplishment within the recommended budget allotment of \$200,000. This same bill provides "No project for the construction, alteration or expansion of transportation facilities planned by any agency of the state shall be undertaken without a finding by the Commissioner of Transportation that the planned project is consistent with the transportation plan developed in accordance with section 6 of this act." Again, my question here is merely one of probing. This is a desirable goal and if the Dept. of Transportation is to achieve its intended purpose, it must be followed. However, may I point out that the PUC alone in 1967 considered 73 bus applications and 318 truck applications 24 taxicab applications and 19 livery applications, many of a minor though important nature, and review of all of these applications represents a considerable undertaking. I would suggest a refinement of those matters which would effect the transportation system as a whole for review by the Transportation Dept.. Section 27 of this same bill provides for, and again, I'm not being critical, I'm just raising questions concerning the provisions, Section 27 of this bill provides for a state council on transportation which we believe to be an excellent proposal. However, excluded therefrom is the PUC, the agency most directly concerned with truck, bus, taxi and livery service, as well as economic regulation of rail transport. I am certain that the omission of the PUC from this transportation authority is an oversight and not intended to slight the PUC or relegate it to a minor role. However, from the trucking industry standpoint, as well as bus, this committee should bear in mind that the economic regulation of these facets is a billion dollar business today and thus somewhere should be included in the overall planning of the Transportation Department. Establishment of state departments of transportation is a relatively new development in state government and as I said at the beginning, of my remarks, a highly desirable and essential undertaking. We must come to it. The federal department is just an infant of about 3 years of age and comparable state agencies exist only in the states of California, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, New Jersey, New York and Wisconsin. Colorado, Maryland, Massachusetts, Oregon,

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 5, 1969

and Washington, in addition to Connecticut, are considering such legislation. It is my recommendation that Connecticut plan wisely in this direction and that all facets of the proposed legislation be investigated thoroughly before any action is taken, only to see that the work of the Transportation Dept. will be integrated and correlated with existing departments that are now regulating transportation facilities in Connecticut.

Chr. Burke: Any questions from the committee?

Rep. Morano: Legislators may speak now, Harry?

Chr. Burke: Yes.

Rep. Morano, 151st Dist.: I'm speaking to my HB 7082, and act concerning a department of transportation. While I believe a department of transportation is very important, to our state, I believe in light of the deficit that we face that any monies that could be saved at this time, should be saved and I believe, in my view that this department of transportation can be acted upon another time and for that reason I would like to withdraw my bill, HB 7082. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chr. Burke: Isn't it in the Republican platform, Mr. Morano that.....

Rep. Morano: Mr. Burke, you're absolutely right, the Republican platform is in favor of many things, but the Republican party's also in favor of cutting back on spending and cutting back on taxes.

Chr. Burke: In other words, you're withdrawing all your money bills?

Rep. Morano: I'm not ignoring all my money bills, because I only have two and I'll speak about the other one later. I have some money bills of my own that I'd like to ignore.

Chr. Burke: Thank you. Mr. Alcorn? You've been here for quite a while.

Mr. Mead Alcorn, representing the town of Suffield: That's alright, I've enjoyed every minute of it. We take no position on the fundamental question which has been raised rather dramatically by the last preceding speaker as to whether or not this is the time to create a department of transportation. I think the idea basically makes some sense, but that is not the purpose of my appearance here today. I'm here to express opposition of the town I represent to any sections of any of these bills which vest in a department of transportation, if created, the power to take land by the exercise of the power of eminent domain. I'm concerned particularly with section 20 of H.B. 5927 and there are other sections in some of the other bills which refer to the exercise of the power of eminent domain, and I would respectfully suggest here

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 5, 1969

to your committee that the kind of agency which these create design to bring about the very desirable objective, namely some coordinated planning in the development of a transportation system, would not necessarily require that such a coordinating agency have the power to take land. I think any of us who had any experience in handling law suits for private parties and for towns and for municipal agencies are aware of the fact that this is one of the most awesome powers which government possesses. And when used against the individual as it is by various state agencies, it can become a truly fearsome thing. We suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Committee that these bills be examined for the purpose of determining whether or not it is necessary to grant to any other state agency the power to condemn land in view of the fact that the various agencies which this new one, if created, would attempt to coordinate. In view of the fact that all of those agencies themselves possess that power. As I read the language of the bills, and particularly of 5927, I'm impressed with the fact that the power of eminent domain which appears to be extended in these bills is in addition to the powers already possessed by the Highway Dept., already possessed by the Aeronautics commission, already possessed by various other state agencies and we appear here to oppose the granting of that power to any agency created under the authority of any of these bills. We do that without any way suggesting any opposition to the purpose of the bills themselves. I might say, just by way of digression that I was interested in the comments of Rep. Oliver. As I read it, his bill is in a sense broader than most of the others, and I raise the question with you, Mr. Chairman, and with the members of your committee, to whether or not if a super agency of this kind is to be created, it should itself, in its grant of power be limited solely to looking at facility of transportation because all of us I think are aware that, of the fact that there are other agencies of the state which become intimately involved in the extension of our transportation facilities. For example, the various state agencies that are interested in conservation and in the preservation of our natural resources, our fish and game department, various state agencies which have under the law the responsibility for maintaining certain state facilities for the benefit of the public, ought it seems to us, to be likewise consulted and their objectives considered by some such broad based agency as we're talking about here. But except for that, I would leave on the record the objection which we have to the eminent powers. I would call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that there appear to be other Dept. of Transportation bills before this assembly, but before other committees of the assembly. For example, Sen. Amenta, I believe has a bill creating a Dept. of Transportation known as S.B. 306 and I think there are one or two others which presumably your committee will consider unless

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 5, 1969

they are separately assigned for hearing. Thank you.

Chr. Burke: Anyone else wish to speak on these bills?

Mr. John B. Zellers, Asst. V.P. of People's Savings Bank, Bridgeport:
Chr. Burke, Chr. O'Dea, other distinguished members of the Transportation Committee, I appear before you as Chairman of the Transportation Committee of the Conn. state Chamber of Commerce, to speak in connection with the Dept. of Transportation bills. In view of the several bills concerning this matter which are before your committee, we do not feel qualified to favor one as against the others. However, we do want to express our State Chamber of Commerce philosophy which has been approved by our directors and membership. It is publicly recorded in "Focus" which is our official report to the people of Connecticut. I have a copy here, in case you'd like to have it in the record. We say there "The economic health of Connecticut is dependent upon the swift and safe movement of its people and goods. Long-range planning is necessary to coordinate our state air, water, rail and highway facilities. Accordingly, we recommend - appointment of a State Transportation Director who shall, study, plan and coordinate the implementation of a balanced state-wide transportation system making full and effective use of existing agencies, departments and bureaus. One of the initial objectives should be the development of a comprehensive transportation system for southeastern Connecticut." That's the end of our recommendation as stated in Focus. Now there are two key opinions in this statement, 1) the responsibility of the Transportation Director ends with the coordination function. 2) It remains for existing departments to implement actual construction or agreement negotiation. Now a word of explanation. Our Transportation Committee recognizes the desirability and necessity of inter-modal planning. An airport needs adequate access highways. Over-saturation use of turnpikes requires the siphoning effects of mass transit. The Southeastern Connecticut comprehensive transportation system requires abbalance between air, highway, mass transit and perhaps, water. Our state Chamber wants this studied, planned and coordinated on an overall basis. Beyond that, we believe existing agencies can carry out the decisions made. We do not want to see, nor do we believe that the state, at this juncture can afford, another layer of governmental office workers added at considerable cost and with doubtful additional productivity. It is for these reasons that the Dept. of Transportation which we recommend should be a streamlined, small executive department making full use of the talents in existing agencies, departments and bureaus. Thank you, very much.

Mr. Dana Hanson, Dir. Capitol Region of the Council of Elected Officials, representing 26 of 29 towns in the capitol re-

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 5, 1969

gion: I would like to go on record as for, have my organization go on record in support in principle of the various bills, particularly 5927, 820 and 7061, creating a department of transportation, for comprehensive planning and coordination. I'd like to make 3 points, if I may, concerning these bills, that I think it's important that either in this Legislation or in other legislation that some agency and most probably the CTA be given the power of eminent domain for acquiring rights of way, particularly abandoned railroad rights of way, which are presently under consideration, by the Penn Central. I think it's important to preserve these for future possible mass transportation or other transportation uses. It is not clear to me that there is any agency within the state that has this kind of clear authority at this time. I think it's not only important, but it's very current, because Penn Central, as you know, has applied for abandonment of several of their short lines in the area, the junction lines. The second point is that I would hope that in consideration of this legislation that the Committee would recognize and it may be stated in here but in one of the bills it recognizes transit districts and in Rep. Oliver's bill it recognizes regional planning agencies or other agencies. I would hope that it would be clear that this legislation would recognize regional councils, particularly because we have legislation also under consideration by the General Assembly to expand the powers of Regional Councils to authorize them to enter into urban mass transportation demonstration programs. We have sent down our existing enabling legislation plus this proposed bill to the Dept. of Transportation in Washington. They referred it to their legal counsel and I just received a letter which I'll send you with a copy of our bill stating that we clearly, that if this legislation is passed, that this regional agency and other regional council so formed within the state would meet all of the federal requirements for mass transportation, for federal grant funds for both capital grants, research grants, and demonstration grants. And those are all 2/3 - 1/3 funding programs. The third point that I would like to make is if we are seriously serious about considering the improvement, significant improvement of mass transportation in our metropolitan areas in Connecticut, we're talking about some sizable outputs of funds, and the federal government is willing to put up 2/3 of this on a demonstration basis. I think it's unrealistic to expect some of our smaller communities and even our metropolitan areas to come up the whole of the 1/3. We can get some of this possibly in some instances from private entrepreneurs who might be interested, but I think they should be built into this legislation or some legislation, the clear authority for either the state department of transportation, if passed or the existing Connecticut Transportation Authority or the State Highway Dept. an appropriation earmarked for supporting the local 1/3

match of federal urban mass transportation programs.
Thank you.

Mr. August Helberg, Dir. Conn. Humane Society: We were quite interested to see this bill 7339 come into being. I have for your review this morning several photographs which were taken at a Bridgeport airport in regards to types of crates that are used by agencies in shipping animals. We on a number of occasions have received complaints from various individuals as to the manners in which these animals have been shipped and we would favor any legislation along these lines. As you can see in these photos, these crates and manners in which these animals are handled are very flimsy and of course when exotic animals and dangerous animals are being shipped under these adverse conditions, this is very dangerous. The consumer is not receiving the protection as well as the animal. We have many occasions where there are sick animals that are being brought to these pet shops and are being sold to the consumer. So any legislation in regard to the shipping of animals we would favor very highly. Thank you.

Chr. Burke: Anybody else wish to speak in favor of any of these transportation bills ?

Mr. Adam Knurek, State Highway Dept.: First and above all, let me make it crystal clear that the Highway Commissioner and the Highway Dept. are in favor and support the creation of a Dept. of Transportation, however, in regard to SB 79, 586 and 820 and HB's 5927, 6379, 7061, 7082 and 8267 which is not being heard today, but's assigned to your committee, I wish to state that while we believe in the concept of a Dept. of Transportation we cannot support these bills since we believe that SB 306, introduced by Sen. Amenta and assigned to the Roads and Bridges Committee, has greater merit and should be the bill that ought to be supported and enacted in to law. At the time that SB 306 is heard, our Dept. will have a detailed statement to make on SB 306 and the concept of creating a Dept. of Transportation. We will be happy to furnish the Chairmen of this Committee with copies of our statement at that time, or if it should be transferred to your committee, of course we will make our statement when you have that hearing. Until then, our Dept. has no further comment on this subject. Thank you.

Chr. Burke: Anyone else wish to speak in favor of these Transportation Dept. bills?

Mr. John Hanlon, West Haven: I am simply here as an individual. I wish to register support for these bills that would create a Dept. of Transportation. I feel that it is long overdue, that we are reaching the point where we are going to strangle ourselves with highways, exit ramps

what have you and then going to suffocate from the monoxide gas which the automobiles driving the highways pour out. I am concerned when I read in the paper that a turnpike which we built from one end of the state to the other at a cost of many million dollars is now considered to be ill conceived, ill designed, that it does not tie in with the mass transportation facilities offered by the Penn Central Railroad. That there is no easy way for people traveling on the Conn. Turnpike to get to one of the railroad stations, park their car and use the rail facility to get into New York or to New Haven. When I hear a legislator here say we should hold off on the creation of this department to save money, I can't help but think how important it is that we spend a little money to create the department to prevent the recurrence of a situation like this, where we have this multi-million dollar not properly designed. I'm also concerned when I read in the paper that one state agency, the PUC is chastising another state agency, the state Highway Dept. for taking railroad land for highway purposes without consulting with the Commission first to find out what effect there may be. Here definitely is a need to have some organization leadership. I'm also concerned when I hear legislation being discussed that would put an economic burden on private industry to abate air pollution, when at the same time, the state Highway Dept. is planning ways to get more automobiles into the urban centers where they now contribute over 60% of the air pollution and contribute factors to air pollution which make the industrial pollution more dangerous. I'm concerned too, when a chief planner of the State Highway Department reportedly tells a group of New Haveners that no mass transportation facilities will be built because it isn't profitable enough and he uses as a quotation source the president of the Connecticut Co.. My thought is that this is not the problem of the Connecticut Co.; I would agree that it is not profitable for them, but it becomes a social question that we may decide that we would rather have cleaner air, we would rather have less traffic congestion, we would rather have less land removed from tax roles, and for that we are willing to pay to have mass transportation built and operate or subsidize by state or municipal agencies. I'm concerned too when a city the size of New Haven has as its only mass transit study plan, which to build, one prepared by the automobile manufacturers association, which quite naturally says that the automobile and the motor bus are the only answers to the problem. I'm also concerned that in the Kerner report, for instance which considered the violence in our city, they made the point that one of the corrective actions that had to be taken was to provide better transportation links between the ghetto and the job market and at the moment I see no organization in the state that is prepared to effect such a thing. I'm also concerned that at this time,

when we're trying to get people to leave the highway and go on to mass transit, that we have in the last two months seen 100% increase in the train fare between New Haven and New York on a round trip basis. This certainly is not something that is going to get people on there. We're paying somewhere, I think in excess of 3 million dollars in tax money to keep the railroad going and you begin to wonder, where is the organization here, the fares go up, the tax money keeps going in, and we're not accomplishing what we set out to do. I'm also concerned, like everybody else about the need for the state government to step into another area, which more properly is maybe a local function, or a district function. But, as is the case in many instances, you can prove need for the federal government to step into the state level or the state to step into the local scene and in the city of West Haven, where I come from, we have now a classic example. When New Haven, as Rep. Oliver mentioned, began to get concerned about mass transit, the city council in West Haven began to look at it, too, that was last May. In August, we authorized the appointment of a study committee to look at the local picture, from then until now, 7 months, the administration has delayed appointed the study group. The mayor has refused to make any comments to the press on mass transit and the local Chamber of Commerce has rebuffed their own president because they're afraid that mass transit might backfire and hurt their business. Now all of the transit lines into West Haven come out of New Haven, New Haven can't do any planning really, without giving some consideration to West Haven, but you have a city that doesn't want any part of this, and I think here is a case where there has to be some leadership from the top, the state through some agency must step in and give some guidance. I can't offer any specifics on these bills, you gentlemen have a superior background, you have a group that's done considerable study. I would hope that you come up with some kind of a product that will meet the needs and that won't be postponed again another two years. In closing, one subject not covered by my remarks, is that raised by the representative from the Regional Planning Agency here in Hartford, the need for eminent domain for transit districts. Now you gentlemen heard bill 243, the PUC heard bill 239, and 240 which dealt with the same thing, and this was one aspect of the field of possibly having something other than the motor bus, maybe rail rapid transit, or a bus travelling on a private right of way, but there was no provision made for these transit districts to acquire these rights of way by eminent domain, and I would ask that you also include that in your considerations.

Chr. Burke: Anyone else to speak in favor of these dept. of transportation bills? Mr. Wetherell?

Mr. H. B. Wetherell, Dir. of Aeronautics State of Conn.: In relation to the bills which are before you people this morning, the Aeronautics Comm. is in favor of the State Transportation Dept., however they did not take an official position on any particular bill at this time. They do feel that an integrated transportation system is urgently needed in the state and they would be in favor of it. They also feel that there is a need for a strong Dept. of Aeronautics, because of the pressing problems that are before the aviation industry today and that they would not like to see the department diluted to any great degree. I think with the problems of mass transportation today, that we certainly need a transportation department for coordinating these problems, and I think that concludes my remarks. If there any questions? Thank you.

Chr. Burke: Any questions from the Committee? I guess not. Any one else wish to speak in favor of these Dept. of Transportation Bills? Is there any opposition to them?

Helen Neal: I don't know whether I'm in opposition or wish to speak. As a private citizen I would like to say that I have attempted or spoken before I think it's 3 agencies or at least 3 public hearings on matters indirectly pertaining to transportation of products and at one hearing, my statements were misread into the record. At another hearing I was asked by a member of the Commission what I was going to speak about before the hearing. I told him that this is a public hearing, I prefer not to do so. He asked me how long I was going to talk, he asked me some very personal questions that were completely out of order. At another hearing outside of the state, I was refused permission to even speak by a gentleman that is sitting in this room now. I agree with Mr. Hanlon of West Haven that the time is long overdue for mass transit, that we could have had it long before now, had there not been complete conflict between, I almost could say vested interest, economic interests, and I think the time has come for us to work together for the public interest and economic returns for those who are working.

Chr. Burke: Are you speaking in opposition to these transportation bills?

Helen Neal: I'm speaking like Mr. Hanlon said, as a layman, I suppose he's a layman; I am interested in a transportation bill, but I wanted to help all the segments of our state and not one above the other because of more power, to get that help for one above the other.

Chr. Burke: Thank you. Is there any further opposition to these department of transportation bills?

Mr. Ed Carroll, MVD: I don't appear directly opposed to any bills, however, we have felt that the Dept. of Motor Vehicles

should not be included in the Dept. of Transportation. We're not actually engaged in moving material or vehicles. Any questions?

Chr. Burke: I don't think there are any questions, Edward. Any further opposition to these department of transportation bills? Did you want to speak on I know you came in late.....

Mr. Henry David, Pres. J. Watson Beech & Co., Real Estate: I represent a group of citizens known as the Western Conn. Citizens Airport Study Committee, in Burlington, Harwinton and one or two other towns that are involved. Our problem and the reason I'm here, sir, is just to inquire from you if bill 5927 embraces right of condemnation by the state of Connecticut for land in any town for an airport without the permission of the legislative body of the particular town where the land is found? And not having been able to read 5927 thoroughly in spite of the attempts to get information on it in advance, I wanted to inquire if this is included in the bill? The right of condemnation by the state of Connecticut to condemn any land in any town for an airport without the permission, we'll say the vote, majority vote of the legislative body of the particular town wherein the land is included. I could give you some reasons for our opposition if that is included in the bill. May I give you the reasons?

Chr. Burke: Go ahead, state them.

Mr. David: The reasons would be that the citizens that I represent, and taxpayers feel that whereas state highways are used by 99% of the able bodied citizens, of Connecticut, whether they drive a car or are being driven by somebody else, that airports and particularly the regional airport, would be used by a small minority of the citizens in the particular area but yet the majority would be contributing to taxes to that airport and would also be the ones who would be carrying the burden of the depreciation of real estate within several miles of the airport embraced. Citizens in the area and taxpayers would not be using the airport or get any, derive any benefit from it, would be on the other hand, getting the adverse effects of a regional airport within 3 or 4 miles of property or real estate that they own. That's the reason.

Chr. Burke: Thank you. Any further opposition to these department of transportation bills? Yes, sir, step right up here.

Mr. Ken Geyer, 441 Church St., Wethersfield: I'm speaking as Chr. of the Conn. Highway User's Conference, an organization of about 26 organizations that are interested in Highway transportation. As a group we have not taken a position for or against highway, a department of transportation

as such. We are, however as highway users, vitally concerned with the dangers of, in creating such a transportation department, of the leaking away of highway user tax money for other uses, such as airports or rapid rail transportation and so forth. So that I would like the record to show that if written to whatever bill might be given a favorable report by this committee, could be a clause similar to the one we have proposed for years with the house in a joint resolution, well, I don't seem to have it right in front of me, but anyway, that no taxes, motor vehicle taxes, gasoline and so forth, levied against the motorist as such, should be diverted to uses of other groups under the head of the department of transportation. Thank you.

Chr. Burke: Any further opposition? If not we will declare the hearing closed on all inter-department of transportation bills. We will take up

H. B. No. 7067 AN ACT CONCERNING ADDITIONAL RESIDENT STATE POLICEMAN FOR THE TOWN OF LEDYARD.

Anybody here in favor of that bill? Is there any opposition? If not, we will take up

H. B. No. 7069 AN ACT CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BRANCH OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE DEPARTMENT IN GROTON.

Is anybody here in favor of that bill? Any opposition? We'll take up

H. B. No. 7080 AN ACT CONCERNING MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATOR'S LICENSES FOR PERSONS UNDER TWENTY SEVEN, REQUIRING PHOTOGRAPHS ON SUCH LICENSES.

Anyone here in favor? Anyone opposed?

Mr. Ed Carroll, MVD: We appeared at a prior hearing in opposition to all of these measures calling for pictures or photographs on operator's licenses. I believe at that time I left a copy of our cost estimate and I'd like to leave another copy with the committee at this time. This particular estimate is merely for licenses of those between the ages of 16 and 25, however, if the committee is interested, I could furnish you with figures with regard to any particular bill, but there are a number of these bills. If possible, we prefer to limit ourselves to those that you might be more interested in, as opposed to others. Thank you.

Rep. Pac: Mr. Carroll, has any exploration taken ^{place} with the liquor people, they're interested in this thing, area of purchasing photographs, and it's my understanding that most of liquor permittees would be happy to have this tacked on to their license fees, as much as \$25.00, and

TRANSPORTATION

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 19, 1969

for transportation to Senior Citizens. If I may while I am here I would like to make a statement on 7036. The bill authorizing pilot project on transportation for the elderly. Now we are groping around trying to find an answer to this transportation, and anything that see that might lead to help we hang our hats on. This is a pilot project and we don't know how it will turn out but it was the means of solving the project in any extent then we are for it. The department of transportation could come with something that is more simple or easily provided for then that would be all right. We do not want a free ride. What they want is they want to pay they always have. Within the range that they can afford just as I come from Stratford and if I want to ride one end to the center of town I have to pay 25¢ for the bus take another bus from there back inot town at another 25¢. It doesn't effect me, I drive but there are many who don't drive and have no means of transportation so I say that this here we are not too keen on but it is something to hang our hats on. Thank You.

Stanley Kanell: Director of the Connecticut Transportaton Authority we support the principal of the department of transportation we have testified front of this committee on 820 and 7061 which both ahve been sponsored by the legislata council we are not familiar of course of the contents of the bill (at this point the voice was gone.)

Rep. O'Dea: Anyone elst to speak on 6379. If not the hearing is closed and we will hear house bill 6382, Anyone in favor od this bill?

SGT. Josesh Bohon: My department supports this bill. We need this type of statute for the effect of enforcing the investigating the motor vehicle laws in these areas. Thank You.

Repert Burns of East Hartford and I would like to go on record as being in favor of the bill on controlled parking areas however I believe the bill has some deficiencies in it. This is basically talking about parking areas around shopping centers and theaters and this type of control however there are cases where you may have a private road that might be serving five or more families that is not controlled under the present statute because it is a private road and I feel the bill should have read to include any private road serving five or ;more families that these roads than be subject to the same police powers as the municipal right of way. Thank You.

Rep. O'Dea: Anyone else favor the bill. Anyone oppose the bill?

Paul Siversmith: Mr. Chairman, the state highway department is not opposed to the intent of this bill. However HB7016 which has been heard before the roads and bridges committee is a bill which the department has great deal more of interest in.

S-72

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1969

VOL. 13
PART 5
2032-2564

May 22, 1969

Page 20

SENATOR PICKETT:

Mr. President, I now move for acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill, as amended. As indicated in my previous remarks, the purpose of this bill is to extend from 15 to 30 days of the time for which the Judiciary Committee may conduct its deliberations on the qualifications of Judges. Because of the interviews, that we had earlier in this session, it was quite indelible in our memories and the realization that sufficient time must be given to the committee which has other duties also to perform. To permit the committee to gain information about judges, strictly new appointees, so a more intelligent recommendation may be given to the General Assembly. We must remember that the entire General Assembly is in effect relying on the judgement of the Judiciary Committee who must conduct these interviews and sufficient time must be granted to do so. A good bill and I move passage.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "Aye". Opposed? The bill is passed, as amended.

THE CLERK:

Clerk has returned from the Appropriations Committee. Favorable report on Cal. No. 686. File No. 755. Substitute for Senate Bill No. 820. An Act concerning the Establishment of a Department of Transportation.

SENATOR MARCUS:

I move for suspension of rules for immediate consideration.

May 22, 1969

Page 21

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection, the rules will be suspended.

THE CLERK:

Clerk has received several amendments on the bill.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, as the proposer of Senate Amendment Schedule "A", I would move that the reading of the amendment be waived. There is a copy on everyone's desk.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, substantially this amendment takes out everything after the enacting clause in the bill and substitutes the legislative Council bill. The difference between the two bills is that the Legislative Council bill enacts a coordinating agency and a planning agency rather than an operational agency.

Many of us feel, that some of the state's functions which were proposed to be within the transportation department, such as; aeronatics and rail would be better served as the more fragile elements of the system by being separate entities operational and not being submerged into the highway department. There are the same functions would be served in planning and coordinating as the bill in the file would do, which we are considering today.

May 22, 1969

Page 22

These branches of state government, aeronautics and rail both have trouble. They need the effectiveness of their own action, their own ability to move of course, within the transportation pattern, such as the new department, if this amendment is adopted would provide. We, in this biennium, I don't believe need the bill of bureaucracy. There is no basic need for operational control of each department, if the activities of rail, air and highway are controlled through the coordinating system would be established under the bill, if the amendment is adopted.

It's very simple a question of your philosophy, members of the circle, how the department of transportation should be organized. Do you believe that we need operational department, responsive in the ponderous way that highway is to a central commissioner, who would be involved mainly with highway problems? Or do you feel that, each department could operate effectively by itself with coordination in the form of a general coordinator who would prepare a comprehensive plan by which each department would have to be bound in any of their future actions. Basically it's as simple as that. I think it's a very easy concept to understand. I won't go into this in any greater detail because each member has had a copy of the legislative council report. They have the amendments on the floor, on their desks, before them. Thank you.

SENATOR AMENTA:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment. I can understand the distinguished Senator from the 17th, in some of

May 22, 1969

Page 23

his arguments. I think he stated it well. This is really a difference of philosophy. And we have to determine for ourselves, as to whether we just want to do this job half-way or do we really want to get down and develop a department of transportation that's going to have some meaning.

Taking the same reasoning that the distinguished Senator from the 17th has said, each of the departments that are involved, would probably like to be left out of this bill. I know the Highway Department, who now is a department unto itself, would probably like to continue going it alone. I'm sure the aeronautics department and the water department and the transportation authorities, they would all like to go it alone. But, I think if we pass or consider this amendment, we'll really emasculate the bill. This is not what we should do here, this afternoon. I think we should reject the amendment and actually get on to discussing the bill.

SENATOR MARCUS:

I also rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. President, it seems to me that, the purpose of creating a Department of Transportation is to create a cohesive unit in State Government, which will pull together all of the elements involved in the area of transportation. Including the aeronautics department, including the Highway Department and to subdivide the functions and obligations through sub-commissioners, if you will, I think this is in line with the general feeling that most of us subscribe to, that Government in general, I think that most of

May 22, 1969

Page 24

of the members of this circle, would agree that one of the things we have to do in State Government is to try to cut through the layers of beaucocracy. I agree with Senator Buckley to that extent. I think that's one of the obligations that State Government has. I think that's one of the prime reasons of advocating a new Department of Transportation.

Were we to enact Senator Buckley's amendment, we'd be faced really with one more unit of government that would have no power, it would have no force, no impact. I think we would be in far worse shape than we are today.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? As many who are in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed? The amendment is lost.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, I question the ruling of the Chair and ask that when the vote be taken, it be taken by standing vote.

THE CHAIR:

All those in favor of the amendment will please stand up. Those opposed, please stand. 16 opposed, 13 in favor. The amendment is lost.

THE CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT "B" OFFERED BY SENATOR AMENTA:

In Section 50, line 7, strike out the words "to the United States".

SENATOR AMENTA:

Mr. President, there has been an error in the wording of

May 22, 1969

Page 25

that sentence and my amendment would read, no such sale or conveyance shall be made to the and it would strike out the word, "United States", without the prior consent of the Commissioner of Finance and Control. This would merely be a check and balance so that the Commissioner of Transportation could not sell something on his own. He'd have to have permission from the Commissioner of Finance and Control.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any further remarks on the amendment? If not, as many who are in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed? The amendment is adopted. I rule it a technical amendment and will become part of the bill. You may now take up the bill.

THE CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT SCHEDULE "C" OFFERED BY SENATOR BURKE:

SENATOR BURKE:

Mr. President, this amendment strikes out section 246, which was a technical change in the New York, Connecticut Transportation Compact. This section is unnecessary because Public Act 46 of this session omitted this compact and the compact should stand as amended by that act. Public Act 46, we now have identical legislation with the State Of New York. I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on the adoption of the amendment? Being none, as many as are in favor signify by saying, "Aye" . Opposed? The amendment is adopted and becomes part of Bill 820.

May 22, 1969

Page 67

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1003. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on General Law. Senate Bill No. 1563. An Act concerning Certification of Deaths by Physicians.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill will amend Section 762 of the General Statutes, to make it very clear that no physician or osteopathic physician shall issue or sign any death certificate unless he is actually viewed the body and has satisfied himself that death has occurred. In too many instances evidence is disclosed that death certificates have been signed and the person has shown up later that he's still alive. I would urge the passage of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, as many of you who are in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed. Bill is passed.

SENATOR MARCUS:

Mr. President, can we go back to the to of page 3 Cal. No. ^{SB 820} 686, that we had before us before. It is my understanding, Mr. President, that the various Senators that were concerned with the interpretation of Section 39 are now satisfied and I would request that we now take up the bill, a gain.

SENATOR PALMER:

I would move, at this time, to withdraw my motion to reconsider Senator Gunther's amendment. I have rechecked the

S-73

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1969

VOL. 13
PART 6
2565-3073

May 30, 1969

Page 151

ing arts under the unfair practices insurance act of the State of Connecticut. At this date it does not include natureopathic and osteopathic physicians.

THE CHAIR:

Are there further remarks on the passage of this bill. If not as many who are in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed. The Ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

The clerk inadvertently skipped over Calendar 1117, File No. 755 on page 23. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Transportation. Substitute for Senate Bill 820. An Act concerning the Establishment of a Department of Transportation. As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "B" and "C" and House Amendment Schedule "A."

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 3rd.

SENATOR BURKE:

Will the Clerk please read House Amendment Schedule "A."

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A." offered by Mr. O'Dea and Mr. Provenzano. Section 37 subsection c, line 10. Strike out the following: determination by the Commissioner. Strike out lines 11 to 14 inclusive and substitute the following: in connection with the purchase or taking by the commissioner of any such property owned by any person other than a municipality, the determination by the commissioner that such purchase or taking

May 30, 1969

Page 152

is necessary shall be conclusive. Such taking shall be in the manner prescribed in section 48-12 of the 1967 supplement to the general statutes for the taking of land for state institutions.

In section 37 make subsection (d) and (e) and subsection (e) and (f) respectively and add sub section (d) as follows:

In connection with the purchase or taking by the commissioner of any such property in a municipality, the commissioner shall file with the chief executive officer or first selectman of such municipality a written statement finding that such purchase or taking is necessary, setting forth the reasons supporting such finding and requesting approval by such municipality of such purchase or taking, which approval shall be by vote of such municipality at a referendum held therein at the next regular election held in such municipality. If the municipality by vote disapproves the purchase or taking, the commissioner may, within thirty days following such vote, appeal to the superior court for the county in which the municipality is located and the appeal shall be accorded a privileged status - perhaps the period is missing here. There is no further writing on this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 3rd, do you wish to move the amendment.

Senator from the 21st.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

The purpose of this amendment is to provide the mechanism that the towns have to require a public hearing, a referendum and an appeal, to the court if necessary, when the commissioner

May 30, 1969

Page 153

of aeronautics decides that he wants to take over a municipal airport in the State of Connecticut. I support this measure and hope the circle will too.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the adoption of the amendment. Will you remark further. Senator from the 11th.

SENATOR MARCUS:

This is basically the ^{same}/amendment that was beaten down in the Senate about a week ago but I think this is really too important a bill to be shuttled back and forth between the Senate and the House. Those report it a basically good bill. The amendment is one I think everyone can live with and as things now stand I would support the amendment and the bill as amended and I would move Mr. President, when the vote is taken, when the debate is completed, the vote be taken by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks on the amendment. Have you exhausted your remarks on the amendment. I will then call for a roll call. The Clerk will call the roll. House Amendment Schedule "A" under the Department of Transportation Bill. Results of the roll call. Whole number voting 26, necessary for passage 14. Those voting Yea 26, those voting nay 0, those absent and not voting 10.

Following is the roll call:

Those voting Yea:

Senators Barlow of the 2nd District

May 30, 1969

Page 154

Burke of the 3rd District
Amenta of the 6th District
Barnes of the 8th District
DiRienzo of the 10th District
Marcus of the 11th District
Hammer of the 12th District
Miller of the 13th District
Schaffer of the 14th District
Verriker of the 15th District
Buckley of the 17th District
Palmer of the 18th District
Stanley of the 19th District
Gunther of the 21st District
Lyddy of the 22nd District
Caldwell of the 23rd District
Hull of the 24th District
Dowd of the 25th District
Lupton of the 26th District
Hickey of the 27th District
Rudolf of the 28th District
Minetto of the 30th District
Dinielli of the 31st District
Barbato of the 34th District
Houley of the 35th District
Finney of the 36th District

May 30, 1969

Page 155

Those voting Nay were:

None

Those absent and not voting:

Senators Fauliso of the 1st District

Barry of the 4th District

Jackson of the 5th District

Alfano of the 7th District

Eddy of the 9th District

Tansley of the 16th District

Moore of the 20th District

Dupont of the 29th District

Ives of the 32nd District

Pickett of the 33rd District

The opinion of the Chair the Ayes have it and House Amendment Schedule "A" is adopted and becomes part of the bill.

SENATOR MARCUS:

Mr. President, I believe a motion was made to adopt the bill as amended.

SENATOR HULL:

It is my recollection we had a voice vote on the amendment and we are voting on the bill as amended.

SENATOR MARCUS:

We have enacted the bill. I would now move Mr. President, that we suspend the rules and immediately transmit the bill to the Governor's office.

May 30, 1969

Page 156

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection the rules will be suspended and the bill will be immediately transmitted to the Governor's office.

SENATOR MARCUS:

Mr. President, can we now move to page 27 and take up Calendar No. 712.

SENATOR BARNES:

Mr. President, the Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 712, File No. 776, favorable report of joint standing committee on Transportation. Senate Bill 588. An Act concerning (Defining "Limited Access Highway." The Clerk has an amendment.

Delete everything after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

In Section 37 (c), line 10, of Substitute for Senate Bill No. 820 being file number 755 of the 1969 session theretofore passed by the House and Senate, after the word "safety":

", except, that no such purchase, taking or acquisition may be made by the commissioner of any such airport, restricted landing area or other air navigation facility which is owned or controlled by and used as a part of a research, development or manufacturing activity, unless with the consent of the one owning or controlling such airport, area or facility."

SENATOR BARNES:

Mr. President, I move the passage of the amendment.

H-103

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1969

VOL. 13

PART 9

4023-4395

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

21.

JS

grade education. What this would do is that anyone who passes the operator's examination could therefor be a registered hair-dresser in one year. I think it is a good bill and should pass.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?
If not all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Those opposed.
The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 3 of the Calendar. Calendar 1117, Substitute for Senate Bill 820. An Act concerning the Establishment of a Department of Transportation (As amended by Senate Amendments Schedule "B" and "C").

MR. O'Dea: (105th)

I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by Schedule "B" AND "C".

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 105th has moved acceptance and passage. I would indicate that the Amendments "B" and "C" are not in our file and therefor it would have to be acted upon separately by the body. Clerk please call the amendment.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk will read Senate Amendment Schedule "B". In section 50, line 7, strike out the words "to the United States".

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

22.

JS

MR. O'DEA (105th):

This was a typographical error and should not have been included.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on this amendment, if not all those infavor of its adoption indicate by saying aye. Those opposed? The amendment is adopted, it is ruled technical and will the Clerk please call the next amendment.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment "C". Strike out section 246.

MR. O'DEA (105th):

These sections are included within the act the, itself and it is not necessary to have this section.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on this amendment. All those in favor of the amendment indicate by saying aye. Those opposed?

MR. ..The amendment is adopted, it is technical and we may proceed with the bill.

MR. O'DEA (105th):

Mr. Speaker there is a House Amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the clerk please call the House Amendment?

THE CLERK

House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. O'Dea of the 105th and Mr. Provenzano of the 127th.

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

23.

JS

MR. O'DEA (105th):

Mr. Speaker, this is an long amendment, rather than have it read it merely states that ..

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection to it being outlined?

Hearing no objection would the gentleman from the 105th outline..

Would the House again return to order? I would suggest to the messengers that if this continues that several of them could station themselves upstairs at the last step before closing the gallery.

The gentleman from the 105th.

MR. O'DEA (105th):

This amendment merely states that if the commissioner goes to take any portion of a municipal airport that he should have the approval of the municipality and this approval should be by a referendum held therein at the next regular election held in that municipality. It is a good amendment and should pass.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment

MR. MCLOUGHLIN (132nd):

I believe in setting up this transportation as one of our purposes is to coordinate aeronautics activity in the state and the airports to be brought under an eventually state operation system. It seems to me that this amendment will handspring the activities of the transportation commission by authority by

4276

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

24.

JS

obligating them to go to the referendum conducted by the people, conducted, that is, of one municipality and the people of one municipality will be able to override the wishes and desires of the state if they are going to override the welfare and well being of the rest of the people in this state and I oppose the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

I rise to oppose the amendment, Mr. Speaker, It seems to me that the remarks of the gentleman from the 132nd are appropriate in this instance. The department has been presented to us as a program which is intended for coordination and an overall development and to allow then one municipality to stand in the way of any such program seems inconsistant with the purpose of the act.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

That's exactly the reason why the amendment is in. I would like to support the amendment; I see no reason why a municipality should not have this opportunity for a referendum; we are not up here to take away rights from people, we are up here to help towns and municipalities and I support the amendment.

4277

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

25.

JS

MR. PORINELLI (120th):

Mr. Speaker, just for the members of this assembly, the town of Stratford recently conducted a public hearing pertinent to subject matter in this amendment and the town people turned out in mass to oppose any infringement upon their rights of making decisions on matters pertinent to their areas, and the airport was very vigorously discussed and I rise in support of this amendment. The townspeople of Stratford of which are in my local would be in support of this type of legislation to give them the right to object the, on their areas.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MR. MORANO (151st):

I rise to support the amendment. It is hard for me to conceive that a director of this department could look at a map and say we need to enlarge an airport and this part of Connecticut or that part of Connecticut and just roll in like a steam roller and take it over without allowing the people of the town to have some say in this matter. It destroys local economy therefore I support the amendment.

MR. AXELROD (65th):

I rise in support of the amendment also. There is probably no one mode of transportation can so effect the people in this particular area than that of airport transportation. Any of

May 28, 1969

26.

JS

you who have an airport within you back, and refuse to it, I think you can realize and appreciate the effect of the jets coming in and out at all hours of the day and night, upon your simple right of living. Two years ago we passed legislation, and I think excellent legislation, that any land can be acquired for an airport that you would go to a referendum within a municipality and this should have been passed and was passed that the municipalities would have some control over what could be one of the most destructive elements within that municipality. I think if we are going to be involved with the take over of any municipal airport that there should be some control within that municipality as to whether they want the State to come in. The general trend of state airports at this time is expansion and more expansion and with this comes the larger airplanes, the airplane that brings in more noise, more problems of many natures that I won't go into at this time. I think this type of amendment is clearly one that is in the best interest of the municipalities that have the municipal airports and we should support it.

THE SPEAKER:

Are there further remarks on the amendment?

MR. BOGGINI (20th):

I am opposed to this amendment. All of these people, my good friends that have spoken for it, but as far as I can see if you pass this kind of amendment you might as well stop

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

27.

JS

BUILDING airports and if you try to fly in this part of the country we already have too many problems getting up and down from the air and I urge killing of this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MRS. DUNN (17th):

Through you, is I may sir, to ask the gentleman who brought out the bill, Representative O'Dea, if this bill is intended in any way to infringe upon or in any way alter those rights which would affect an airport owned solely by an industry such as that owned by the United Aircraft in the town of East Hartford?

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 105th care to respond?

MR. O'DEA (105th):

If I heard correctly, Mr. Speaker, this applies only to municipal airports only, not private airports.

MRS. DUNN (17th):

And it is not legislative intent at this time to include that in any shape or form? Thank you.

MR. O'DEA (105th):

Yes, that's right.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MR. MAIOCCO (133rd):

~~I rise to oppose the amendment and I endorse remarks of my~~

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

29.

colleagues from the 133rd. I think what we are forgetting is that airports and air transportation today has gone beyond the serving of small town or community, it has become regional in their nature, they have become state-wide in their operation in use and I think to limit it, as this amendment would do, would do serious harm of the progress of air transportation in the State of Connecticut. I oppose the amendment.

MR. ROSE (69th):

I rise in support of the amendment; I think that the basic problem we have here is aviation and the noise and the pollution that comes from jets. I am sure that an industry that has such enterprise, such talent, such research facilities, will be able to develop aviation that would not be obnoxious in these areas. There has, there is no way to hasten this development anymore than by popular objection to these problems. If we do not object to pollution, if we do not object to noise that they will, of course, continue with them. It is an important function of our state that this objection comes from the places where it will be objectionable and I think this is basically what will bring about a more reasonable type of aviation industry and aircraft travel. The noise, the pollution can be evaded if the public insists upon it and this is the way to insist on it.

MR. GENOVESI (18th):

I rise to speak in favor of this amendment; I think it is

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

29.

JS

a good amendment, and I think we should allow the people in an area to either refuse or accept the airport being taken over by the State. I think the people have this right and we should give it to them by the use of this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further before we vote on the amendment?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, I believe that honesty is always the best policy, I have about four amendments to this bill on my desk and subsequent to my last speaking on it, I talked to the Chairman and I feel that my remarks were really pertinent more to an amendment which I had read, which is not the one before us. At this point I would then withdraw my previous remarks and indicate that I am willing, at this time, to accept the Chairman's word for this and support it on, support him on it.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MR. COLLINS (165th):

I was just hoping that the Majority Leader feels the same way on the next amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment, if not all those in favor of the amendment indicate by saying aye. Those opposed? The amendment is adopted. It is ruled technical

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

30.

JS

and we may proceed with the bill. Are there further amendments to be offered.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk please call House Amendment "B".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B" offered by Mr. Provenzano of the 127th. Section 37, sub-section "c" line 3, before airport,

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to get straightened out here as to which amendment we are going to work on.

Mr. Collins is up introducing an amendment which I am, which I have in front of me and the clerk is reading one from Mr. Provenzano. I would like us all to be going the same way so that I don't get any more confused than I have been ah up to this point.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the clerk indicate how many further amendments he has and who the introducers are?

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has two amendments; I have an amendment from Mr. Provenzano and I also have an amendment from Mr. Collins.

Wednesday, May 28, 1969 31

JS

MR. COLLINS (165th):

I would yield, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Provenzano.

THE SPEAKER:

Mr. Provenzano has just yielded to you.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

I accept his yield. Would the clerk read my amendment please?

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B" , offered by Mr. Collins of the 165th. Add section 265 as follows: This act will take effect on July 1, 1971.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 165th.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

The intent of this amendment is to delay the operation of this program and, until two years hence, July 1, 1971 and the purpose behind this amendment is very simply in this next coming biennium we do not have sufficient funds available to start a brand new department from scratch. I would indicate that the Republican party both through its individual members and its party platform has long supported its concept of a department of transportation. As a matter of fact, my good friend in front of me, the gentleman from the 151st, introduced a bill somewhat similar to the one in our file in this session. I would further indicate that he graciously withdrew this bill at the time of the public hearing because of the fact

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

32.

that the state was in no financial position to afford this particular bill at this time. The effect of the amendment by allowing it to take effect on July 1, 1971, would also allow the next session of the general assembly to take along hard look at just what this bill does. It is my understanding that the particular bill in front of us does not include the Motor Vehicle Department, which is one of the largest items of transportation in this State. It is a serious question as to whether or not the Motor Vehicle Department should be included. This amendment would allow the next session of the General Assembly to very closely look at it and decide whether or not to include the Motor Vehicle Department and any other departments not included in this bill. I reiterate the Republican party has and does support the concept; it does not support passing legislation carrying a substantial price tag in a time of fiscal crisis. Perhaps two years from now when the present administration has been able to correct its mismanagement of state affairs we might be able to support it.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

I would like to thank the gentleman from the 165th, for clearing up my confusion on this item. I oppose this amendment and I am sure I do and if it needed any underscoring, his last sentence was just what sufficed. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker,

JS

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

what the Republican party is saying to us today is that we support it but don't really support it. Again they are damming it with faint praise. If we are going to have the program we should have it; if they are going to support the program they should support it. Said last week it is time to put up or shut up on some of these matters. Is the program good, or never mind these phony claims about saving monies; is the program good, do you support it or don't you support it? If it is good and you are going to vote for it, vote for it, never mind these gimmicks, these artifices to make it look as though they are in favor of economy which there is not really any economy because it does away with part of the program. You are for it or you are against it.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment.

MR. MCKINNEY (141st):

I think it is rather obvious that, despite all the comments on phoniness or not phoniness that the Republican Party is for this department of transportation; to say specifically that we are for this one proposed, it is highly questionable. I point out to a lot of people that this particular bill is well over 100 pages long and I have read every page. I think there are serious ignitions in this bill; I think the most serious ignition is the motor vehicle department; I think it is also highly questionable that we have created a department of transportation and not included the state police. Now, let's take

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

34.

JS

A Look at what we are doing and why we are asking that this be amended and carry over to a two year start. The problem is simply this, Mr. Speaker, this department is going to be a super department in the state of Connecticut. It is going to cost a great deal of money; it is estimated by the other side of the aisle to cost \$200,000. (Two Hundred Thousand Dollars). I would question this estimate. I would question it on very sound grounds that if you read and follow through by page by page of this bill, you will find that we are headed in exactly the same direction that we were headed with the department of community affairs, and yet this bill is missing something. This bill while it creates a super agency in the state of Connecticut is not economizing one dime in the administrations of the organization that this department will coordinate and I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we withdrew our department of transportation bill from this House because we felt the taxpayers could not afford another department. And until we did, could determine that this department could save money we operate the government more efficiently, would mean not only coordination but the saving of tax dollars, then we felt we could back a department of transportation bill. At the present moment we would be taking on an extra burden in the next biennium, we can not back this bill. This bill we feel does an admirable job in many ways of coordination, with Two omissions already mentioned. It does absolutely nothing to make

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

34.

JS

for more modern administration unless expenditure and the operation of the branches of the state government are involved. I would suggest to you that I will not back a Department of Transportation until I know it is number one, going to get the job done and number 2, save the State taxpayers of the State of Connecticut money.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. POVINELLI (120th):

This amendment, for a different reason, as stated the illustrious minority leader, I rise in support of this because of the effective date July 1, 1971 and by having this interim period allow the towns effected by this airport expansion, if I could dwell in that one subject. It means to have the proponents of the airport expansion go into the affected towns and explain their proposition and allow the people or the electorate and the citizens of those areas to come forth and voice their opposition or their approval of this type of airport expansion and for those reasons I support this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MR. MORANO (151st):

In 1967, the Governor of the State of Massachusetts, recommended a department of transportation. At this time, with a surplus, with a House and Senate to aid him in implementing

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

36.

JS

this program, nothing was done about it. Now here we are in 1969 putting forth this bill, asking to pass this bill, with a deficit. Isn't this a tiffany stomache with a Woolworth's pocketbook? I ask you, all of you, to believe I did have a bill in the Transportation Committee in favor of this type of legislation but in view of the deficit facing the people of Connecticut I would support this bill to save money, to keep taxes down; I therefore support the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

I move that when the vote is taken it be taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:"

Question is on a roll call, all this, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Those opposed?

More than 20% having called for a roll call will be summoned.

(Transcription machine inaudible) Pearson of the 128th, Kennelly of the 1st and Stevens of the 122nd then spoke and discussed this bill)

THE CLERK:

The following is the result of the vote:

Tally was taken.	Total number voting	163
	Necessary for adoption	82
	Those voting Yea	70
	Those voting Nay	92
	Those absent and not voting	15

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

37.

JS

THE SPEAKER:

On the roll call vote the amendment is lost.

REP. PROVENZANO (127th):

Offered House Amendment Schedule "C" and moved its adoption.

RECORD NOW CONTINUES

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 127th care to respond?

MR. PROVENZANO (127th):

Mr. Speaker, my amendment has nothing to do with that; the present bill would take care of that and I suggest that she ask the person who prepared the bill. I would say yes.

THE SPEAKER:

Are there further remarks on the amendment?

If not the gentleman from the 133rd.

MR. MAIOCCO (133rd):

I rise to oppose this amendment. I think the effect of the amendment would be to completely do away with the intent of this particular section of the bill. Air transportation is becoming a very important thing in our state. The effect of this would be to curtail and limit the State's use of airports or if they feel it is necessary to develop one for the public's interest or the good of the State as a whole, this would completely limit them from doing so. I think this is a bad amendment and I think all of the effects of it would be bad for the entire of Section 37 of this bill. I oppose it.

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

38.

JS

THE SPEAKER:

Q Are there further remarks on the amendment. If not all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Those opposed. The amendment is lost. Are there further amendments to offer? If not the question is on the bill as now amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "B" and "C" and House Amendment Schedule "A", will you remark further?

MR. O'DEA (105th):

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for Department of Transportation for the State Government with full responsibility for and control over development and maintenance of transportation facilities and services in Connecticut. This department would be headed by a commissioner and a deputy commissioner. The activities of the department are to be carried out in six operating bureaus, namely, planning of Bureau of Research, Bureau of Highways, Bureau of Rail and Motor Carrier Services, Bureau of Aeronautics, Bureau of Waterways and Bureau of Administration. Each of which is administered by a Deputy Commissioner who is directly responsible for the Commission of Transportation. There are 263 sections of this bill. The first 54 sections provide for the establishment of the Department and its organization, invest in the Commissioner principal powers necessary to carry out the functions of the department. Many of these are new, many of them are from our Statutes. The remaining sections are technical revisions and amendments to the

sections of the General Statutes, not transferred to the Act.
Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and as amended it should pass.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 118th.

MR. AJELLO (118th):

I rise in support and passage of the bill which will create something new for the State of Connecticut or Department of Transportation. Several States, including New York, New Jersey, many of the Eastern States, Alaska, have recognized the need for coordinate, coordination of planning and developing in transportation facilities. I submit the fact that we can no longer afford the luxury of independent planning of highways, airports, and mass-transit facilities. The result of such independent planning tends to be lack of coordination, confusion and duplication and additional expense to taxpayers. We have problems in the State of Connecticut, inadequate rail service, congested highways, limited parking, limited airport facilities, limited mass-transit facilities. Adoption of this bill may not be the final answer but will be a most significant step that we can take to insure that we have obtained the best advantages of each form of transportation for the State. For example highways must service railroad stations. Airport facilities must take into account the need to improve mass-transit facilities. I understand the recent report, calling for the expansion of

4292

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

40.

JS

our airport gave limited consideration for the construction of mass-transit facilities to serve these airports. This is the wrong approach. It points up a need for coordination of expanding all of our transportation facilities. This bill would vest in a single commissioner, the Commissioner of Transportation, the responsibility of planning and developing all forms of transportation; this is a logical approach and I submit it is an essential approach. I understand that all of the State Agencies concerned with transportation, namely highway, aeronautics, transportation authority, steamship commission, are all in accord with the objectives of this bill. One of the most important things we can do with this session of the legislature for the future benefit and economic development of Connecticut is to enact this bill providing untold benefits for the overall benefit of the State. We are fortunate we have been able to reserve our rail service despite the difficulties of maintaining the bankrupt of the New Haven Railroad. We are further fortunate that we are a party of high speed train service. The new Commissioner of Transportation would be charged with the responsibility of exploring the feasibility of extending this modern service. He will also be charged with the responsibility of preserving and developing other forms of mass-transportation service. I look forward to construction of convenient parking facilities at railroad stations; I look forward to driving a short distance to such a station, getting on a new highspeed train,

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

41.

JS

which will take me to my destination. I look forward to the use of high speed trains providing fast convenience service to airports. I look forward to planning transportation as a coordinated system rather than a piece meal planning that we now have under a separate department. Time is running out as we see cars congesting our highways as fast as new highways are in effect. Time is running out as our center of our cities become huge parking lots. The coordinating and construction of transportation facilities are provided by this bill, will put Connecticut in the forefront if we are providing the most modern, the most convenient and most economic form of transportation of, for the people of the State. Connecticut has always enjoyed a position of leadership, Mr. Speaker, in many of its programs and this another in the continuing search for the better environment and better life for the people in this state. I think there should be no question as to where each of us stand on such a vital issue and for that reason I move when the vote be taken it be taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call, all those in favor say aye. More than 20% having called for it a roll call will be ordered.

MR. MCKINNEY (141st):

I think it is safe to say all of us look forward to what the gentleman from the 118th looks forward to. But I think it is also safe to suggest to this body that this particular department

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

42.

JS

of transportation bill is not going to remove the special interest, is not going to remove the special desires, is not going to put the whole transportation system of the State of Connecticut under the hands of one single group that can determine the best possible means for the State of Connecticut to achieve them and it is not doing this; this particular bill is not only just paying lip service to modern transportation in the State of Connecticut, but it is creating not one department of transportation but it is instead another department for the State Government and I would suggest to you ladies and gentleman in this Hall, until we realize, that we must have a department of transportation where there is the total ability of that department to override the special interest of the local road advocates. The super highway advocates. The airport advocate. The railroad advocate where there is that one single department that can say and tell the people of the State of Connecticut and help the people of the state of Connecticut particularly in our cities, get from point A to point B until there is this authority vested in the department of transportation, until the rest of the commissioners of the separate departments become responsible to doing the over all wishes, we are simply adding one more department and accomplishing nothing but the expenditure of more of the State's money.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

43.

JS

MR. AXELROD (65th):

Through you, if I may, I have a question to the gentleman who reported out the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 105th care to respond?

MR. AXELROD (65th):

In section 39 of this bill, as well as section 417 and 18, and possibly other sections, references made to a plan of development and is made to the compiling of studies of airport expansion. My question is whether it is the legislative intent of this bill to approve in its entirety of the Harris Report and of the recommendation and implementation of that report or whether it is simply the legislative intent of this bill that that is one of the reports that may be considered without the legislature at this time putting a stamp of approval on it.

MR. O'DEA (105th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reports that will be considered.

THE SPEAKER:

Are there further questions or comments?

MR. AXELROD (65th):

One more question, Mr. Speaker, section 39, of this act, also sets up the method by which land or interest therein may be acquired with the fact that such acquisition would have to go to the municipality for its approval. Under section 39

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

44.

section 39A, in line 13 and 14, it referes to the land or interest therein. My question is whether the reference to lands or interest therein would also include air right or air space over the land itself?

JS

THE SPEAKER:

With all due respect to the gentleman of the 126th, 81st, does the gentleman from the 105th care to respond?

Are there further comments, will you remark further?

MR. LAGROTTA (170th):

I rise to oppose this bill, not because I am against on improving our transportation system in this State; not because I don't think it could be improved but two years ago, almost at this time, I stood here and asked for some appropriations to be spent in the areas of human needs and everybody said you are trying to break the budget or you are trying to spend too much money but as I look at the condition of our Statenow as I look at the amount of money we need in housing, educationand vocational education, in slum clearance, in work that we need to improve the welfare situation so that people can get off welfare and get positions; when I see the minimum amount of money that is gdng into these areas and to see ourselves go out and reach out in indulging in new operation, I really wonder whether we are being the leaders of this state. This reminds me that the leadership of this House and this building reminds me of the brains of a family and when you are in trouble in the family you do the first thing first, you put the children through school, you

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

45.

fix the holes in the roof, you do what is needed and then eventually if you can scare up the money you buy yourself a new car. I think we have got the cart before the horse. I concur with the thrust of the bill but as I said two years ago, our priorities are wrong, it is evidenced they were wrong because two years later here we are in the worse deficit of the history of the State.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 94th raised a point of order.

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th):

The gentleman is making a speech on the budget not on this Act and I don't think he is germane.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the gentleman from the 170th direct his remarks to the Department of Transportation?

MR. LAGROTTA (170th):

I will in that the Department of Transportation is going to be a new part of the budget and I hope it will not be an expanding department.

(Transcription machine out of order - inaudible) Record continues..

THE SPEAKER:

Will the members be seated and the aisles cleared?

Will you remark further on this bill before we transport it?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

The gentl

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

46.

JS

I rise to speak in support of this bill and to indicate, for the second time, for all of the fuxs that was made at the time the amendments were offered, I have attempted by making notes and listening carefully, leaving aside the personal considerations of people from towns which have a direct interest in the outcome of the bill such as East Hartford or Stratford, to distill the Republican objections to proceeding with this Bill and desiring to put it off for at least two years and in preference to my remarks at this point, I would like to read just one sentence again, from that famous document the Republican Party Platform, wherein it says we will seek an aggressively work for the creation in 1969, and in my calendar it is 1969 now, the creation in 1969, of a Department of Transportation, to pull together and unify and coordinate facilities in a comprehensive policy for air, rail, highway and water transportation; now they come here today and say why the Motor Vehicle Department should be in there, well the motor vehicle department doesn't transport anybody. The State Police should be in there, they are a law enforcement agency, they don't transport anybody, it is very true they police the highways but so do the street sweepers and I don't think they ought to be in there either. It is just a bold attempt to break what their own campaign pledged because they think they can get some political mileage out of it; plain and simple as that, to save \$200,000 as against the mammoth budget which they even proposed, they would do this. But more than important than that, Mr. Speaker, they would interfere with the orderly progress of the State of

Wednesday, May 28, 1969 47.

JS

Connecticut. This bill is important to the State of Connecticut. Our transportation systems have suffered too long from the lack of this coordinated approach and planning which is so necessary so I say the Republican Party today does disservice to its own image, disservice to the people of the State of Connecticut, which we can ill afford.

MR. MORAN (151st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the distinguished majority leader that since street cleaners are in the bill, the highway department.

MR. MCKINNEY (141st):

It is always enjoyable for me to hear the gentleman from the other side read the Republican platform, I keep hoping that some of it may rub off one of these days. I might remind the gentleman that when we wrote this platform we weren't quite aware of the fact that the State was entering one of the greatest fiscal crisis in history, and I might also remind the gentleman from the 118th that the department of transportation that the Republic Party has supported and worked for in, and suggested in many cases, has always been a Department of Transportation which we felt would not only add efficiency but would add a cost saving to the State of Connecticut's Government. That is the reason we stand in opposition to this particular bill in front of us.

THE SPEAKER:

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

48.

JS

Are there further remarks before we vote? Will the members be seated and the aisles be cleared?

For the benefit of the members who have again returned to the Hall we are still considering on Page 3, Calendar 117, which is the Department of Transportation Bill. We will proceed with the vote.

MR. KENNELLY (1st):

I was rather amazed to hear the distinguished Minority Leader just indicate that at the time the 1968 Republican Platform ..that the members of his party were not aware of a fiscal crisis in the State of Connecticut because when I read Page 1 of the 1968 Republican Platform, I read and I quote, "a critical State deficit"

...

Mr. Speaker, point of order..

THE SPEAKER:

Now that the gentleman has been recognized..are there further comments before we vote.

MR. KENNELLY (1st):

I think they are germane but although they may be somewhat uncomfortable.

MR. EARLE (99th):

A lot has been thrown back and forth in one way or another but I think the most profective thing thing that has been said

4301

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

49.

JS

this entire afternoon were the final words of the gentleman from the 118th. He said that we can ill afford and that is exactly it, sir. We can ill afford. I have been around these Halls for a long while and I have seen departments come and be established and my goodness established with \$100,000 here or \$200,000 there and I don't know what in the world they use for fertilizer but I haven't seen anything grow like these things in my life and time after time when I walk into the Governor's Office for finance advisory committee meetings, time after time, we are faced with continued requests from these departments because they do not or do not or were not granted sufficient funds with which to operate and this is the case right here and now. \$200,000 is a mere drop in the bucket when you start talking about this department and I can say, sir, right now, you know it, they know it, we can ill afford this department and we should not have it at this time.

MR. GENOVESI (18th):

Mr. Speaker, as long as we are reading party platforms I would suggest that the other side of the aisle read their own platform and from what I read in the paper, with all indications of an income tax, I think they.....

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Point of order Mr. Speaker.

MR. STECKER (39th):

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

50.

Mr. Speaker, I would note, speaking in opposition to this bill, while basically I am for a Department of Transportation, I think delaying the matter for two years, when perhaps this State may be under better leadership...

JS

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Point of order Mr. Speaker..

I realize it is very discomfoting to have one's platform read back to one in this way and the crow doesn't taste so good at some points but the gentleman is not germane to the bill and I will not permit this type of discord.

THE SPEAKER:

I would suggest to all of the members that we are getting along way from the Department of Transportation, AND WE would do all of ourselves benefit by restricting our comments to that and I am sure that there will be more than an appropriate time to consider the Budget and tax program when they are before us. Will you remark further?

MR. ...

THE SPEAKER:

A Will the members be seated and the aisled cleared? The machine will be opened. Has every member voted? Is your vote properly recorded? If so the machine will be locked. For the benefit of the gentleman from the 86th the machine will be unlocked. Has every member properly voted? The machine will be locked again and the clerk take the tally.

THE CLERK:

JS

Total Number voting	165
Necessary for passage	83
Those voting Yea	99
Those voting Nay	66
Absent and not voting	12

THE SPEAKER:

The Bill is passed.

..

Mr. Speaker, I move for suspension of the rules for immediate transmittal to the Senate.

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection for suspension of transmittal to the Senate?

.....

Mr. Speaker, we object.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 105th to, wish to pursue his motion further?

MR. KENNELLY (1st):

The..

THE SPEAKER:

I note the objection from the gentleman of the 105th in withdrawing his motion.

Will the Clerk call the Calendar?

THE CLERK:

Page 17 of the Calendar. Reconsideration - Matters Returned to the Calendar.