

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-507		1060	2	2	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Elections 145-146</i> 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4348-4349 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2478

H-117

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 10
4344-4830**

Wednesday, June 2, 1971

THE CLERK:

Business on the Calendar for Wednesday, June 2, 1971, page 1 of the Calendar, the Consent Calendar.

MR. GILLIES (75th):

Mr. Speaker, I move pursuant to Rule 48 that the matters printed on today's Calendar, under the heading Consent Calendar, be adopted.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Please proceed to enumerate the items phrased in your motion.

MR. GILLIES (75th):

Calendar No. 0589, substitute for H.B. No. 7483, An Act Concerning the Husband and Wife Retirement Income Option under the Probate Court Retirement System, File No. 1387, 554; Calendar No. 0590, H.B. No. 7484, An Act Concerning Disability Retirement for a Judge of Probate, File No. 1389, 544; Calendar No. 0592, substitute H.B. No. 7490, An Act Concerning the Definition of "Average Final Compensation for a Judge of Probate", File No. 1383; on page 2, Calendar No. 1247, substitute for H.B. No. 6272, An Act Providing for Consultation Between the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee of the Superior Court, File No. 1371; Calendar No. 1255, substitute for H.B. No. 8330, An Act Concerning the Expansion of the Wequetequock Fire District in the Town of Stonington, File No. 1378; Calendar No. 1257, H.B. No. 9253, An Act Validating As Timely the Notice Given by Helen Romanewicz and to that Extent Granting Her Permission to Prosecute to Final Effect a Suit Against the Town of Colchester and the Borough of Colchester, File No. 1403; Calendar No. 1259, S.B. No. 0531, An Act Concerning Revisions to the Motor Vehicle Junk Yard Laws, File No. 886; Calendar No. 1260, substitute for S.B. No. 1060, An Act Concerning Submission of Constitutional Amendments or Questions

Wednesday, June 2, 1971

6

at Elections, File No. 1245; I move acceptance of those bills as read.

djh

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is there objection on the part of any member to any individual Calendar item contained in the motion?

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Mr. Speaker, I would object to the inclusion of Calendar No. 1247 on the top of page 2, substitute for H.B. No. 6272 and would ask that it be removed from the Consent Calendar.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Your objection is noted. The matter is removed from the Consent Calendar. Is there any further objection on the part of any member at this time? Hearing none, all those in favor of the passage of the bills enumerated in the motion of the gentleman, will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bills contained in the motion are PASSED.

MR. GILLIES (75th):

Mr. Speaker, I now move you, sir, referring to page 4, that the Resolutions appearing on the Calendar be adopted.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

MR. GILLIES (75th):

Calendar No. 1369, House Resolution No. 95, Resolution Commending Stanley Beskind of Westport who will head the 1971 United Fund and Red Cross Drive; Calendar No. 1370, House Resolution No. 96, Resolution Congratulating Irv Stolberg of this House and Lassie Barela on their Engagement; Calendar No. 1385, Senate Joint Resolution No. 105, Resolution for the Recall of House Bill 5245 from the Legislative Commissioner's Office; I move that these Resolutions be adopted.

**S-81
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 6
2436-2873**

May 26, 1911

43

Elections on Sub SB 1060, An Act concerning Submission of Constitutional Amendments or Questions at Elections.

SENATOR DUPONT:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill eliminates some of the confusion with respect to placing questions on the ballot at elections. It provides for an alternative method of doing this. In addition, it provides for the numbering of a series of questions in accordance with the order in which they will appear on the ballot. I think this will have a practical effect in that people who are either for or opposed to a particular question can advertise or solicit support or opposition by simply saying, vote for or against question number such and such. It's a good bill and I urge its passage.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, all in favor of passage of the bill signify by saying Aye. Opposed, nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 16, Calendar 919, File 898, Favorable report of the Committee on Banks and Regulated Activities on Sub HB 5190, An Act concerning Share Insurance for Credit Unions.

THE CHAIR:

May I interrupt, Mr. Clerk? It is my understanding that that bill will be passed retaining its place on the calendar.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Yes, Mr. President, that was going to be my request.

THE CLERK

Calendar 923, File 1069, Favorable report of the Committee on Public

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

ELECTIONS

1-174

**1971
Index**

SB1069 - the four year term for town clerks we are in favor of and also for the registrars.

SB1072 - an act concerning an Election Laws Study Commission, we are in favor of being continued. This bill states municipal election administrators and we would like that specifically spelled out, both town clerks and registrars included. It doesn't specify both of them.

HB5024 - Education in the use of voting machines, we are in favor of. Most towns at present have a course in high school but we would like to make it mandatory.

HB5030 and 5757 both deal with Spanish interpreters for Boards of Admissions. We like the working of 5757 better than 5030. HB5030 says at the request of an applicant eligible to register, you will have an interpreter there, but 5757 says you will have a 24 hour notice to provide the interpreter and many small towns have no need. In Berlin we have never had this need and 5030 would almost make it mandatory to have one there.

HB7314 - the third registrar in the City of Norwalk, I attended a district meeting in Fairfield last week and was asked by the two registrars in Norwalk to speak against this bill.

The Independent Party polled a very large vote in the municipal election in Norwalk and because of that the Secretary of State's office recognized the three parties in the municipal elections only, according to the report I received from the registrars there. In state and national elections they recognize just the two party system - Republican and Democrat.

There have been other towns in the state that have had mayors that were not connected with the major parties, Bridgeport in particular, and they have never had to have a third registrar represent them. We feel all 169 towns should stick to just Republican and Democrat registrars and they can handle any election.

Rep. Maiocco: Just for the record as I recall it, Bridgeport had three registrar of voters at the time Mr. McLevy was our mayor. We will go on to SB1060 - submission of local questions at elections.

Miss Toro: Again the change which our office feels is desirable in Section 9-370 relating to the submission of local questions at elections involves another Statute 7-9C. Section 9-370 is very clear and states no question is to be submitted to the electors for their vote at any election as the term election is defined in Section 9-1 namely an election of officers.

Unless the action to approve that question

for submission to the electors was taken at least sixty days before the date of the election. This is to provide adequate time to the electors to the town who are primarily concerned as that time with election of officers as to provide them with time to familiarize themselves with the question to be voted upon.

7-9C which I think was designed primarily those votes of towns where the sole purpose of the vote was to vote on a question - a referendum as distinguished from any election - it was enacted to cover that type of vote but the language is ambiguous and the statute that should be clarified is 7-9C. In our opinion any clarification which makes it clear that the provisions of 7-9C regarding the time within which a question must be approved in order to be voted upon, those would apply exclusively to referendums as from elections - the submission of questions at elections is adequately covered in Section 9-370.

Another statute that would be desirable to clarify is Section 9-369 which has the sole language in it that makes it sound as if the designation of a question when it appears on the ballot label, is to be repeated twice. It's ridiculous to repeat a question twice and it would be confusing and we say the question itself is stated only once, then the yes or no appear below it. This is a minor change but it would be desirable and again clarification change.

Betty Hanson: We weren't certain what was intended by this bill SB1060 but we support the intent to clarify the provisions and procedures relating to the submission of local questions.

We were particularly interested in the question regarding the designation of local questions for the ballot label and wondered if it could be the same requirement, as I understand it is not required that the local question be stated in the same manner as the state question - that is for - yes and for - no. In either case this requirement is not for local questions but only for state and our feeling is it should be made a requirement for local so that when a voter actually votes yes he is voting yes for yes and no for no.

We would like to support the bill for continuing the election laws commission. Many of these bills have such ramifications and complexities, particularly on the federal level this commission would be very much in order. Thank you.