HB 5393 PA 576 1971

Elections 95-96, 123

House 3819-3825, 5145-5147

Senate 2690-2692, 2805-2812

25

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

ELECTIONS

1-174

1971
Index

concerned, he made a very unique contribution. Since he finished college he had worked at the polls as an election person and had become a student of election laws. He had the nice combination of the practical knowledge as well as the idealistic theory as to what was good for election procedure and he followed that very seriously. We enjoyed the contact with him and enjoyed any person who had any constructive suggestions to be made with regard to the improvement of election procedure in Connecticut.

I suffer the loss of a very dear personal friend and all of us suffer the loss of a person who has made a substantial contribution and I join Rep. Healey in the hope that our best way of praying tribute to Bill, is to the best of our ability to endeavor to carry on the high ideals which he expressed in this particular activity.

Thank you.

Amelia Toro, Elections Attorney, Office of the Secretary of State: So many of you that have served on this committee in the past, as well as the registrars and town clerks that are present here today, are aware of the very warm feeling that we in the office had for the late William Begg. In my 25 years of service, I don't think there was a more cooperate, helpful, more able and dedicated legislator and dedicated in the handling of legislation as a member of this Assembly. Bill became a very personal friend and one I am going to miss very much. On behalf of the Secretary of State and associates, we publicly extend our sympathies to Mrs. Begg and to Bill's childern in their great loss.

Mrs. Schaffer will appear later in the hearing and comment on the bills before you today.

Relating to the order of the offices on the ballot labels - HB5019 and 5393, and I think the intent of these bills is to so rearrange the listing, the sequence of the offices on the ballot label, as to what I certainly reflect the importance of the offices and particularly the importance of the function of lawmakers. If this were to be done, it will impede certain administrators responsibilities that we have with regard to sending out the list because the sequence of offices now, is based on the geographical size of the offices - those that have the widest in the geographical area being given precedence on the ballot label.

We would ask this committee to consider carefully

the disadvantages of disrupting this sequence before any such change was made. In all fairness I have to tell you, if you do change the listing in the manner suggested in these bills, we can administratively comply with the reqrranged order but it would involve more confusion in handling of certain functions we have. For example, the sending out of lists of candidates which until now has been based depending on the size of the area covered by the office.

There is a bill having to do with recanvass at referendum. We have done these by subject matter and as a matter of fact, we don't always approve entirely the language of the bill and would have recommendation for modification.

The bill I have referred to is HB5952 which relates to recanvass ona close question. The function of the secretary of the state is limited to elections at which public officials are elected and as the term election is defined, and does not extend to referendum so we are not going to comment on that particular bill, but since the subject of recanvass is before you, I can't emphasize strongly enough the need and desirability of making these certain changes in our statutes relating to recanvass. It is very clear in our mind the very close vote we had in the office of the attorney general in the recent election and how the statutes, as they now exist, are almost unworkable in that situation. It's extremely unfortunate when an administrator has to legislate because we are not chosen by the people to legislate. We are hired to carry out the laws you enacted.

The existing provision for recanvass, as you know, on a close vote, when a vote comes within the statutory margin, a recanvass must be requested by the defeated candidate within three days after the election. The sections that have to do with the returns require that the returns be mailed to our office within 2 days after the election. The defeated candidate is required to request the recanvass in writing, if he wants it. It is our recommendation that this procedure be reversed. On a close vote, a recanvass will be made unless the defeated candidate request it not be made. Also the time element and limitations on these several statutes that relate to these questions be synchronized as it is impossible if the present statutes are complied with to the letter, to have available the information on which a recanvass is to be based. I would like to present copies of our letters we sent out during the recent recanvass to indicate the problems that exist under the existing legislation and the need for having the time

Harvey Hubbell, Newtown: I'm speaking for the registrars of voters in Newtown today.

In reference to the two bills concerning the order on the ballot label. We would favor HB5019 and oppose HB5393. It is the feeling of the registrars that there is confusion, particularly in state elections, that the under ticket is so far forward. HB5019 remedies this by putting the federal legislators immediately following the governor, lt. governor, etc. This is the manner in which people generally look for names. We want to avoid confusion when the curtains are closed and this will more closely follow the way people think of their own offices.

We would like to speak in favor of HB6973 which provides for the change of form for the absentee ballot to contain the names of the candidates. On the third alternative in the present law, on the absentee ballots, blank lines are drawn where the voter may write in whoever they choose. Having served at the polls in practically every capacity I can assure you this adds to confusion. People will start off and will write in the constable first because their brother is running and then random choices on down through the list. It adds to the confusion of counting and delays the count and ivolves the accuracy of the result.

We wish to speak in opposition to HB7468 and SB1138. These bills concern the party checkers at the polls pertaining to bringing in electronic equipment or communicating back with party headquarters. The telephone at the present time is for checking for the registrars and I'm sure it's used for ordering sandwiches, etc. but to tie up that line for a political party, we do not favor.

Mrs. William Kenat, North Haven, speaking for the League of Women Voters of Connecticut. We thought HB5952 was going to be heard next Tuesday and had expected to make a statement in support of it. Actually it supports another position we have here.

We should like to speak to the following bills concerning the absentee ballot and moderators: SB151, 360, 1020, 1062 and HB6973.

We strongly support provisions in SB151, 1062 and HB6973 which would simplify the absentee ballot form. At the present time voting by absentee ballot is a procedure considerably different from voting by machine and apparently, much more complicated. In the situation in North Haven, the original difference was something like 35 and when the recount was finally

H-115

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 8
3377-3877

be closed and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Total number voting		152
Necessary for passage		77
Those voting Yea	80	
Those voting Nay	72	
Absent and not voting	25	

MR. SPEAKER:

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1002, at the bottom of page 6, Substitute for House Bill No. 8773, An Act Concerning the Death Penalty and Alternative Penalties.

CARL R. AJELLO, 118th District:

Mr. Speaker, may this item be passed retaining its place on the calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none, the matter is retained.

JOHN A. CARROZZELLA, 81st District:

Mr. Speaker, I like to announce that the Judiciary Committee will go into Executive Session now and I would appreciate all the people coming up.

THE CLERK:

Page 7, Calendar No. 1071, House Bill No. 5393, An Act Concerning the Order of Offices on Ballot Labels for State Elections.

PETER W. GILLIES, 75th District:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage, will you remark?

PETER W. GILLIES, 75th District:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Clerk has an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman like the Clerk to read the amendment, or would the gentleman like an opportunity to outline it?

PETER W. GILLIES, 75th District:

Well, it's an amendment offered by Mr. Lenge and I believe it simply places the order of the state representatives between the office of Comptroller. So that it would be Governor, Lt. Governor, then State Representatives, Senators, and then Comptroller. It divides....

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the Clerk please read the amendment?

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. Lenge of the 13th.

Strike out everything after the enacting clause and substitute the following: "Section 9-251 of the 1969 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: In the preparation of ballot

labels for use at a state election precedence shall be given to the offices to be voted for at such election in the following descending order: Presidential electors, Governor and Lt. Governor, (secretary of the state, treasurer, comptroller, attorney general,) United States senator, representative in congress, (sheriff), state senator, (judge of probate) state representative, SECRETARY OF THE STATE, TREASURER, COMPTROLLER, ATTORNEY GENERAL, SHERIFF, JUDGE OF PROBATE and justices of the peace. In the preparation of ballot labels for use at a municipal election, unless otherwise provided by law, the order of the offices shall be as prescribed by the secretary of the state, which order, so far as practicable, shall be uniform throughout the state."

MR. SPEAKER:

You've heard the amendment.

PETER W. GILLIES, 75th District:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose the amendment so I will yield to Mr. Lenge.

NICHOLAS LENGE, 13th District:

Mr. Speaker, the bill in the file is a step in the right direction. Inoother words, I consider the situation good, better and best. The bill in file without the amendment would move the office of State Senator....

PETER GILLIES, 75th District:

Excuse me, if I may. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that

anyone has moved the acceptance of the amendment.

NICHOLAS LENGE, 13th District:

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A", will you remark further?

NICHOLAS LENGE, 13th District:

Mr. Speaker, without...referring again to the bill and the amendment, the basic bill has as its reason for even being before us today, the fundamental proposition that those offices that stand in terms of representing constituents ought to have visability and...if they are to have meaning and purpose for the electorate. This is a question of degree. The bill in the file moves the offices of state senators and state representatives from the lower spots on the ballot up higher on the ballot label. That's what this is all about. For example, the bill, the law as it stands says state election precedence shall be given to the offices to be voted for in the following descending order. Well, heretofore, they have descended representatives in this General Assembly to the lowest echelon. What this amendment would do would make the descending order as follows: it would make the order beginning with the office of presidential electors, governor and lt. governor, the United States senator and representatives in Congress, state senator and state representative.

This is a session that is concerned above all other things with the continuing viability, as we've heard it so often said, of the electoral process, the political process. We're concerned in this session with the matter of reapportionment, why? Except to give validity to the whole system. There is no valid reason why the offices that represent constituents because the people are here through these offices, ought not to have the highest visability. This isn't a matter of personal pride for us, it is a matter of understanding elections. It is a matter of putting it before the people for determination and decision one of the most crucial votes that they could express. For that matter I think we ought to have the penance of going through it in a different order. The highest ones ought to be at the end. And let us go through with lots of labels until we can clear the first ones, including questions, until we get to the presidential. And frankly, I think that if there is any thrust against this it's nothing more nor less than the fact that we're used to something, it's convenient, it's habit and it might possibly be inconvenient for the first time around. Inconvenient in terms of fixing the voting machines to meet the needs or requirements of this bill. If you want to give validity to the process, if you are going to vote for the basic bill, then you are voting for a little more of what is already good in the right direction in the basic bill.

PETER W. GILLIES, 75th District:

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment. I think we've discussed it here, on this side, briefly. It does seem to move in a better direction. We are eight inches closer than we were before and I will support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further in support of eight inches closer.

JOHN MAIOCCO, 133rd District:

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Elections Committee we did consider this bill along with the one that is in the files, in other words, the amendment was, in fact, a bill before our committee. There was some talk in the committee about if we can't be first maybe we should be last or whether we're in the middle or closer to the top, I guess it doesn't make too much difference. There is a great deal of support for Mr. Lenge's amendment and I don't feel the committee would feel too badly if the amendment were adopted so I will not object to it.

ROBERT OLIVER, 104th District:

Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman who introduced the bill in the bill...or the file...I certainly welcome Mr. Lenge's amendment. I would say, however, when we first started out I thought it was 1967 again. You know, strike out everything after the enacting laws and substitute in lieu thereof but

it is a pleasure to agree with Mr. Lenge and I think the amendment is right and it gives the General Assembly the visability on the voting machine that we should have. We shouldn't hide in obscurity down at the far end, right hand side of the voting machine. I think we should stand or fall on our own merits and our own record.

ALBERT CRETELLA, 99th District:

Mr. Speaker, I think we should make it known that that eight inches is not the same eight inches we were talking about yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"? If not, all those in favor of House "A" will indicate by saying aye, opposed? The amendment is adopted and the Chair rules that it is technical. Question is on acceptance and passage as amended, will you remark further on the bill as amended?

PETER GILLIES, 75th District:

Mr. Speaker, she may have been confused but we certainly weren't. I move acceptance of the bill, as amended.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, the question is acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill, as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A", all those in favor will indicate by saying aye, opposed? The bill is passed.

H-118

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 11
4831-5162

of the bill. I move adoption of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule A. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. Senate Amendment A is adopted.

Gentleman from the 88th.

MR. COLUCCI:

I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule A.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark. Further remarks. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Disagreeing Action, Calendar 1071, House Bill 5393 - An Act Concerning the Order of Offices on Ballot Labels for State Elections. (as amended by House Amendment Schedule A) (Senate Rejected House Amendment Schedule A on June 3)

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Maiocco.

MR. MAIOCCO:

I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report in concurrence with the Senate's action.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would you remark.

MR. MAIOCCO:

As the Clerk indicate, the Senate rejected House Amendment

Schedule A which then returns the bill to us in its original form as reported out by committee. At that time the committee reported out the order of names on the ballot for state elections be changed by placing the State Senator and State Representative names before the Sheriff, Judge of Probate and Justice of the Peace and follow the United States Representative in Congress. It was felt that this was the move in the right direction although the amendment that we did pass was a no worthy one, apparently it didn't meet with the approval of the Senate and in order to get some change I recommend that this body goes along with their action and we pass the bill as it is in the file 1169.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Lenge.

MR. LENGE:

I too understand the virtue of wisdom and in view of the fact that the upper chamber did not see fit to join us in what we sought, I think that we have got some improvement and some I suppose is better than none.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Oliver.

MR. OLIVER:

As the one who took the middle road when the bill came out, I'll take that and we had to drop off the extremes.

MR. SPEAKER:

(inaudible) before us we need to reconsider our previous

action. Is there any objection to that. Hearing none, our previous action is reconsidered. The question then would be on acceptance and passage. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Page 42, Calendar 705, substitute for Senate Bill 1531 - An Act Concerning the Qualifications of the Building Inspector of the Town of Lyme.

MR. GILLIES:

The Clerk has a Senate Amendment. This amendment simply provides an effective date of October 1, 1970 which implements the act effectively and I move adoption of this Senate Amendment.

MR. COLLINS:

A point of clarification. My calendar indicates that the House rejected the Senate Amendment Schedule A on May 10th. Are we talking about the same amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

That would be (inaudible) of the earlier inquiry and it would appear that we now have a new Senate Amendment Schedule A.

MR. GILLIES:

Senate Amendment Schedule B.

MR. COLLINS:

Thank you, that clarifies it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Schedule B. You move adoption of Senate Schedule B.

S-81
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 6
2436-2873

like to ask Senator Houley.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Through you Mr. President, the twenty-five thousand dollars calculation was arrived at considering the districts that might be effected in the state of Connecticut. And on that basis the total amount of students that also might be effected and arrived at a figure of approximately twenty-five thousand dollars. It could very well be twenty-three thousand, nine. It could very well be twenty-six, one.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further?

The question is on passage of the bill as amended. All those in favor of passage of the bill signify by saying aye. Aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 15, Cal. 1002, File 1169 Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Elections. House Bill 5393 An Act Concerning The Order of Offices on Ballot Labels For State Elections.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Dupont.

SENATOR DUPONT:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR DUPONT:

Mr. President there is a House Amendment Sch. A. and at this time I would like to move to reject House Amendment Sch. A.

THE CHAIR:

Will you explain and remark on your motion?

SENATOR DUPONT:

Well since that amendment unfortunately is not printed in our files, Mr. President. I perhaps would ask the Clerk to read that amendment to the members of the circle. With your permission.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Strike out everything after the enacting clause and subsitute the following: Sec. 9-251 of the 1969 Supplement to the General Statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof. In the preparation of ballot labels in use for the state election precedence shall be given to the offices to be voted for in such election in the following descending order. Presidential electors, Governor and Lt. Governor, Secretary of the State, Treasurer, Comptroller, Attorney General, U.S. Senator Representative to Congress, Sheriff, State Senator, Judge of Probate, State Representative, Secretary of the State, Treasurer , Comptroller, Attorney General, Sheriff, Judge of Probate and Justice of the Peace.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk that was a very unintelligible reading. Is that the way it actually reads? I listened to each one and there must be some errors? If you would start again, I think you may have skipped a line or perhaps the typist skipped a line.

THE CLERK:

No they've got CAPS on the Secretary of State, Treasurer, Comptroller, Attorney General, Sheriff, Judge of Probate and Justice of the Peace. Apparently that is suppose to follow state senator and state representative.

THE CHAIR:

All those who understand the amendment signify by saying aye. AYE. Senator Crafts. Just a moment Senator Dupont is still on his feet.

SENATOR DUPONT:

I would yield to Senator Crafts.

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Mr. President, I move this matter be tabled.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Dupont do you object?

SENATOR DUPONT:

If there was some way to have this amendment printed, I think that might be the wiser thing.

THE CHAIR:

May I make a suggestion that the amendment not be necessarily printed but be zeroxed and placed on the desk of every Senator. And we take it up tomorrow. Would you object sir?

SENATOR DUPONT:

I think its a good idea.

THE CHAIR:

No we are not blaming you, Mr. Clerk. It sounds more unintelligible than most matters that come up to the House.

There being no objection, thank you Senator Crafts for your helpful motion? The matter will stand until tomorrow and pass retaining.

Mr. Clerk will you see that the House amendment gets on the desk of every Senator?

THE CLERK:

Page 17 the second item from the top. Cal. 1012, File 1210. Favorable substitute report of the joint standing committee on Insurance and Real Estate Substitute H.B. 9015 An Act Concerning Clarification of the Insurance Statutes So That Mobile Homeowners Qualify for Homeowner's Insurance Policies.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Dinielli.

SENATOR DINIELLI:

Mr. President I move for acceptance of the report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further?

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, courtesy to Senator Rome, I withdraw my motion for roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

Motion for a roll call vote has been withdrawn. Will you remark further?

SENATOR PETRONI:

Mr. President, I rise in support of this bill. I feel that in order to get the fine men in this field, we have to consider giving them this kind of a benefit, even though at times, it may appear to be a little bit more equity than law. Especially in the cases I've read. But to get the kind of men that we have now and to improve the quality of the men in this great field of fire and police protection, I am going to support this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage of the bill signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1002. File No. 1419. Favorable report of the joint committee on Elections. House Bill 5393. An Act Concerning the Order of Offices on Ballot Labels for State Elections.

SENATOR DUPONT:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. I move also to reject House Amendment Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

THE CHAIR:

I will believe that it will be in order to move that first. Let us consider that remark first.

SENATOR DUPONT:

I wanted to get the bill before us, Mr. President, I stand corrected.

THE CHAIR:

So, your motion now, after the bill is before us, is to reject House Amendment Schedule A? Would you like to proceed on that?

SENATOR DUPONT:

House Amendment Schedule A, in effect lowers the offices of Secretary of State, Comptroller, Attorney General and Treasurer down on the ballot, to a position after that of State Senator and State Representative. I think they should belong in a higher place where they currently are on the ballot.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on a motion to reject House Amendment Schedule A, will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify

SENATOR PETRONI:

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the last speaker and rejecting House Amendment Schedule A. I think that we have to consider the importance of the elected offices of State Senator, State Representative. In the sense that they are really offices that the people are directly concerned with, on a day to day basis. Our obligations are certainly to the people we represent. I think that we should consider that the place on the ballot is one where, the people can find us a little more easily and know that these offices directly affect us. I hope that we can sustain the amendment as was passed in the House and therefore, I urge you to consider rejecting the remarks of the

gentleman from the 29th.

THE CHAIR:

I don't really want to reject his remarks, Senator, he is entitled to his remarks. And they will be ordered not rejected.

SENATOR DUPONT:

Mr. President, I was a little annoyed that I might get rejected.

The bill as originally reported out of committee, does move the office of State Senate and State Representative up in the order of the offices on the ballot. I think it's a little presumptuous on our part to, really jump up. The Amendment A, does. I think that, as indicated in the last election, the office of Secretary of State, Attorney General likewise the office of Comptroller where Mr. Agostinelli, received a large tribute at the ballot in the election. I think these are important offices and I think they should remain in their place on the ballot. And for that reason, I urge you to reject House Amendment Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on rejection of House Amendment A.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, I think now, with annual sessions, we might be just a little bit more important than we used to be. But, I don't think we're quite as important as Senator Petroni is trying to make us. I vote to reject also.

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Mr. President, through you, a question to the Chairman of the Elections Committee. I would like to know just what position the Senators and Representatives would be in, if this amendment is rejected? It seems to me that, we follow the position of Sheriff and then the House of Representative follows

two spaces down on that, if I read this correctly.

SENATOR DUPONT:

The original bill as reported out of committee, moves the State Senator and State Representative up ahead of the Sheriff. It moves State Senator ahead of the Sheriff and moves State Representative ahead of Judge of Probate and ahead of the Sheriff.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further?

SENATOR PETRONI:

Mr. President, members of the circle, certainly I didn't mean any offense to the Chairman of the Elections Committee, who I served so jointly with. I enjoyed my service with him on the committee. And it isn't any personal sense that I wanted to disagree with my collegue from the 23, the distinguished Majority Leader. And his remarks of the importance of the different offfices that we are considering under this bill.

I think there is a basic philosophical judgement that we have to make under this bill. And it isn't any personal sense that I rise to oppose rejection of House Amendment A. The list of offficers as set forth in file under 1419 and as I read it, the ballot would be in any order president, Governor and Lt. Governor, U.S. Senator, Representative in Congress, State Senator, State Representative, Secretary of the State, Treasurer, Comptroller Attorney General, Sheriff, Judge of Probate, Justices of the Peace. And I do think that, the elective officers of State Senator And State Representative which are close to the people deserve to be on the ballot, as set forth in the amendment that the House passed, which is schedule A, for the reasons I gave before. I don't certainly feel that we're talking about individuals.

We're not. We're talking about offices and I certainly hope that the circle will consider it on that basis and vote to reject House Amendment, not vote to reject House Amendment Schedule A, nor the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from the 29th.

THE CHAIR:

Senator, you want them to reject the rejection? Will you remark further? The question is rejection of House Amendment Schedule A.

SENATOR RIMER:

Mr. President, very briefly. I rise in opposition to the motion to reject the House Amendment and to express my concurrence with the remarks of Senator Petroni. Basically, what we're talking about on this amendment, is a matter of philosofy and the order of priority of voting for members who are candidates for the Executive Branch of Government on one hand and other individuals or candidates for office in the Legislative Branch of Government.

It's my opinion that, the candidates for the legislature on a question of priority should be higher up on the ballot. And I support House Amendment and I'm in opposition to the proposal to reject the House Amendment.

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Mr. President, I rise to support the motion to reject the House Amendment. It is my opinion that the Executive Branch should be grouped together on the ballot so they can be properly identified as the Executive Branch rather than split up. And I would like to see this House Amendment defeated.

SENATOR DUPONT:

Mr. President, I would move for a roll call vote on this. And, it is my understanding so that we can have it clear, if you want to reject the amendment, you would vote, yes, is that correct?

THE CHAIR:

That is correct.

SENATOR FAULISO:

The hour is late. I really don't appreciate the full import of this debate. I tried to pay full attention, but, I'm almost certain that after this session is over and our business on the taxes and the rest of the session pertaining to legislation including special interest, I think the people are going to look for us on the ballot.

SENATOR EDDY:

Mr. President, I merely wish to say that, I think they're going to find us.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on the rejection of House Amendment Schedule A, will you remark further? Motion has been made that there be a roll call vote, on the rejection. All those in favor of a roll call vote signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it. More than 20% having voted, there'll be a roll call on the motion to reject.

If you wish to overturn or reject, wipe out of this bill, the House Amendment A, you will vote, yes. If you wish to vote on the bill with House Amendment as part of it, you will vote, no. Proceed Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

The following is the roll call vote:

Those voting Yea were:

SENATORS	FAULISO	SENATORS	ODEGARD
	BURKE		JACKSON
	PAC		ALFANO

SENATORS	CIARLONE	SENATORS	LIEBERMAN
	CUTILLO		SULLIVAN
	CRAFTS		MURPHY
	CASHMAN		CALDWELL
	STRADA		RUDOLF
	DUPONT		MONDANI
	HOULEY		FINNEY

Those voting Nay were:

SENATORS	SMITH	SENATORS	ROME
	EDDY		HAMMER
	ZAJAC		GUNTHER
	MACAULEY		PETRONI
	DOWD		RIMER
	POWER		DINIELLI
	IVES		DENARDIS

THE CHAIR:

The results of the roll call vote:

Whole number voting		34
Necessary for passage		18
Those voting Yea	20	
Those voting Nay	14	
Those absent and not voting	2	

House Amendment Schedule A, is rejected.

SENATOR DUPONT:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. The bill without the amendment appears as

File No. 1169, and as I mentioned earlier, it does elevate the offices of State Senator and State Representative ahead of those of Sheriff, Judge of Probate and Justices of the Peace.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage of the bill, signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1002. File No. 1419. Favorable

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. Clerk, I believe that is the one we just did.

At this time, I would like to ask that the next matter be passed, retaining? Calendar No. 1004.

THE CHAIR:

There being no objection, it will be passed retaining.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1005. File No. 583. Favorable report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. House Bill 6814. An Act Concerning Support of Children at High Meadows.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I urge the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill enlarges the definition of Human Institutions to include not only mental hospitals but also community mental health centers, treatment facilities for children and adolescents and any other facility or program administered by the State Department of Mental Health. I urge adoption.