

HB 8712

PA 593 (Vetoed)

1971

—

House	4647-4650
↳ Veto Session	428-444
Senate	3091

H-117

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

Thursday, June 3, 1971 81.

MBS

read the file number.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk is in deep conference but I'll instruct him accordingly. Will the Assistant Clerk continue with the call of the calendar.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1078, House Bill No. 8712, An Act Concerning the Establishment of a Drug Dependency Unit at Veterans' Home and Hospital, file 1187.

WILLIAM O'NEILL, 52nd District:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

WILLIAM O'NEILL, 52nd District:

Mr. Speaker, I wish that this bill need not be before us today but, Mr. Speaker, there is need for a drug dependency unit in our own state veterans' home and hospital. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government is being very derelict in its duty when it is releasing discharging men, men who put their lives on the line, back to their communities that are hung-up on narcotics. These particular individuals, these soldiers of ours, they have no place to go for their habit. I feel that the veterans' home and hospital is the place for them to go for treatment. I think they are special

Thursday, June 3, 1971

82.

MBS

...they are a special group, I think the main reason that they are addicted to begin with is having had to serve in the horrible areas that they've had to serve in and the horrible experiences that they've gone through and the frustrations certainly and the anxiety of Vietnam and Southeast Asia. I have been assured, Mr. Speaker, that the Commandant of the home and hospital will establish this unit within his own operational budget and it will conform to all state standards set up by the Health Department. And as I say, Mr. Speaker, I wish that this bill need not be before us, but it is needed and I hope it gets unanimous passage. Thank you.

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join in with the comments of Rep. O'Neill regarding the almost tragic circumstances we have, where our war veterans are returning home and being turned loose without effective treatment for addiction that they acquire over in Southeast Asia. I know that the gentleman has worked long and hard on this particular legislation. I think it is a tribute to him and I certainly hope that the assurances that he has received from the veterans' home and hospital can be implemented in the immediate future so that we can move ahead in this vital area.

NICHOLAS MOTTO, 3rd District:

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee I want to thank Rep. O'Neill for giving us the

Thursday, June 3, 1971

83.

MBS

guidance to get this bill into the form that it is today and to do and to benefit these veterans coming home from overseas.

RONALD SARASIN, 95th District:

Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join in in support of this legislation and to also compliment Rep. O'Neill. However, I think the tragedy of legislation of this type is that it indicates that the federal government and the Army, Marine Corps and Navy are not doing their job in this area. In a situation that I am personally familiar with, an individual was unceremonious dumped or discharged, bad conduct discharge from the Army, in, I believe, Oregon, pointed in the direction of Connecticut and sent home as an addict. He was discharged for that reason, his family was unaware of the fact that he was discharged, was unaware of the fact that he was on his way home. He could have been lost obviously from one coast to the other. He came home an addict suffering at that point from withdrawal symptoms. A terrible tragedy placed upon the family, primarily because of this young man's duty in Vietnam. This is legislation that we obviously need but it is legislation that perhaps we would not need if the Army and the military was finally doing its job in the first instance.

RUTH TRUEX, 23rd District:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to very briefly support this bill. Only the other day a mother called me much disturbed with her son who had been returned from Vietnam

Thursday, June 3, 1971 84.

MBS

a hopeless addict to heroin without any proper resources of help within this area around Hartford. It will be a great relief for me to be able to report to her that the State of Connecticut is conscious of these problems and that we are taking steps here to deal with the situation as quickly and as humanely as we can.

JOSEPH GORMLEY, 142nd District:

Mr. Speaker, I will favor any bill that helps the veterans of the present war or any past wars. This bill is needed and I hope it passes unanimously. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion is on acceptance and passage, all those....

VICTOR TUDAN, 42nd District:

Mr. Speaker, I agree completely, 100% with the remarks made by Rep. Sarasin. I think it is tragic that the federal government just doesn't live up to their responsibilities and I think it is a tribute to us that we are going to do something about this problem now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. All those in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1104, Substitute for House Bill No. 5574.

An Act Concerning the Benefits Paid to the Spouse of a Teacher Who Dies Before Retirement.

H-122

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 15ss
395-600
no testimony for pages 601-690
691-941**

Monday, August 2, 1971

34.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting	152
Necessary for Repassage	119
Those Voting Yea	84
Those Voting Nay	68
Absent and Not Voting	25

roc

THE SPEAKER:

REPASSAGE IS LOST.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, nothing daunted, we now call your attention to Page 5 of today's Calendar, Public Act 593, House Bill 8712.
AN ACT CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A DRUG DEPENDENCY UNIT AT VETERANS' HOME AND HOSPITAL.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 52nd, Representative O'Neill.

MR. O'NEILL: (52nd)

Mr. Speaker, I move for reconsideration of this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark on reconsideration. If not, all those in favor will indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. Reconsideration is granted. Gentleman, my hearing may be bad but my eyes are pretty good.

Representative O'Neill.

MR. O'NEILL: (52nd)

Mr. Speaker, I now move for repassage of this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark on repassage.

Monday, August 2, 1971

35.

roc

MR. O'NEILL: (52nd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will. This particular bill created a drug dependency unit at the Rocky Hill Home and Hospital, our State Veterans' Home and Hospital. At the time of its passage through the General Assembly in the lower chamber, the bill was unanimously voted for by both sides of the aisle. As a matter of fact, we had some speakers from the other side pertaining to the very great importance of this bill. One was Mr. Stevens, Assistant Minority Leader and Mrs. Truex, whose son, Congressman Steele from the Second Congressional District, is very interested in the drug problem as well. This bill, Mr. Speaker, authorizes the Rocky Hill Home and Hospital to establish a drug unit. The Governor's veto message says that this legislation would deter action on the part of the Federal government in handling drug dependency in veterans. Well, our concern, Mr. Speaker, is not with the federal government, our concern is with the veterans who are returning from Europe and Vietnam that are addicted. Mr. Speaker, there are 24 beds available at the Rocky Hill Home at the present time that could be utilized for this very, very purpose and as far as the cost factor, under our present statutes, Section 27-113 of the 1959 Statutes revised, the State of Connecticut has already allowed to expend up to \$2,000 for any addicted veteran at a hospital to be designated by the Commission--the Home and Hospital Commission. So, we are not talking of additional cost. We are talking of a place for our veterans to be able to be taken care of when they do come home, the ones that are drug dependent. I

Monday, August 2, 1971

36.

said back when the bill was passed originally that the federal government has been very derelict in its duty in this area and because they are that is certainly no reason for us in this House to take the same attitude of "let the other fellow do it." The beds are there, the hospital is ready, the present statutes call for \$2,000 to be expended for each and every veteran that applies that is drug dependent. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Governor totally misinterpreted this bill and I certainly hope the same people that unanimously supported it, the bill hasn't changed, only the Governor's position has changed, will support it this time.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on repassage. Representative Yacavone of the 17th, East Hartford. I would suggest that you use Rep. Ajello's microphone.

MRS. YACAVONE: (17th)

Mr. Speaker, I support wholeheartedly repassage of this bill. The veto makes absolutely no sense. The Veterans' Home and Hospital is there, it is for veterans. We don't have to wait for the veterans to come home entirely, until they are all home. There are many home now, there are many addicted in Connecticut--our Connecticut boys. We need this facility, we need it now, not next February or some time later. I wholeheartedly urge the Republicans who supported this bill before to support it again. I can't think of one logical argument for disagreeing with this bill.

roc

Monday, August 2, 1971

37.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks, Representative Collins of the 165th.

MR. COLLINS: (165th)

Mr. Speaker, I'm the gentleman with, I hope the logical arguments against the repassage of this bill. Mr. Speaker, at present, we have treatment facilities for drug dependent veterans that we conduct in this state. At present, Mr. Speaker, every returning veteran with a drug problem has an opportunity and there is available sufficient funds and adequate administration to conduct rehabilitation for these veterans. The only import of this bill is to establish this type of program at a certain facility. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is existing legislation which does say that any veteran, who is drug addicted, can receive treatment at the expense of the state and the Commission, at the present time, has the latitude to prescribe the place and the conditions under which the treatment takes place. All veterans of this state are now eligible for the services that this bill would provide under existing legislation. If expansion of the facilities became necessary because drug dependent veterans return from Southeast Asia in large numbers, expansion can be provided for at existing facilities under existing budgetary amounts rather than the creation of new ones. The purpose of this bill is very narrow, it is to establish such a unit at the Veterans' Hospital. I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to provide this facility at this specified place in the bill. The Commission now has the

roc

Monday, August 2, 1971

38.

authority to provide these services where they deem fit. They are doing so. There is in the budget passed by this General Assembly some \$1.3 million for the expansion of such services. It is our hope and our intent that every returning veteran who has a drug problem will be adequately cared for by this state. It has no bearing on where this facility is located. I oppose this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Ajello from the 118th.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, the Governor's actions in this area belie the words and the attitude displayed in the remarks just made by the Minority Leader. And I think the attitude is an extremely important factor in what we are doing here this morning so far. We see, unfortunately, apparently an attitude on the part of the Governor and his administration which denies that there is a day care center problem to be solved, which ignores the legitimate needs of many sectors of our economy on the basis that we have got to spend money to take care of them. The State of Connecticut has been a leader in the United States in many of these fields simply because it was willing to do the things that had to be done for the people who could not do for themselves. Our people have borne the burdens of these things. It is not always easy to say that they must shoulder another. But we say that it is not worth bothering with day care so that we can try effectively to solve the welfare problem, it seems to me that it

roc

Monday, August 2, 1971

39.

is a big mistake. Now we say, well there are programs. I would like to ask what has been done under these authorized programs to take care of our own Connecticut veterans because the answer is nothing, Mr. Speaker. Nobody is taking care of them. This is our Veterans' Home for veterans in the State of Connecticut. The problems of veterans, whether it be in the drug area or other areas, are unique to them. They need the kind of treatment and understanding that they can get at the Veterans' Home. We're saying to them, if we deny this bill today, we don't want you to have that care and treatment. I say that this is not the posture of this State of Connecticut. I say that this is not what we can afford not to do, regardless of what we think we can afford to do. I think that the Governor's attitude is all wrong. I think that the people on the other side of this House whose attitudes I thought that I knew and could respect as reasonable and as open-minded should examine this very closely because it is in this area and a couple of matters we will be taking up very shortly that they will indicate what their preferences are and whether they are genuine and a concern to the State of Connecticut and its people or a blind political partisan approach to these problems. I would hope that they will go forward with us. We do not want to make this a partisan operation. We want to provide this service to these people who need it.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative LaRosa of the 4th.

Monday, August 2, 1971

40.

MR. LAROSA: (4th)

roc

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of repassage of this bill, on the basis that we talk about facilities already available. To give you an example. In Hartford, the facilities we have at the Blue Hills Clinic need about a dozen beds for the detoxification purposes. We also have some centers set up for methadone maintenance programs which at the present time cannot accept any other applicants. So we talk about facilities, Mr. Speaker. We talk that this is an expansion of facilities that the Minority side says that we already have. I submit to you that if we are to discharge our responsibilities to the veterans who are coming back, who people have said that drug dependency is a sickness, then I think that we should give the facilities in the Rocky Hill Veterans' Home so that they can take care of this sickness. But Mr. Speaker, what has been happening is this. In the Somers State Prison, we have 1100 inmates, I think it is 100 more than they should have of capacity. In Cheshire Reformatory they are overcrowded and the reason they are overcrowded, Mr. Speaker, is because what is happening is that all people who are drug dependent and who come back to Connecticut and who commit crimes as a result of drug dependency, when they go in front of a judge they get five to six years, execution suspended, and sometimes in the custody of the Mental Health Commissioner. What happens is that there are not enough facilities to take care of these people. Subsequently what happens is they reappear in front of that judge and then that sentence is now put into effect. If this is what we feel is what we owe some of the

Monday, August 2, 1971

11.

people who have come back from Vietnam and who are drug dependent then I say that we should cross party lines and vote for this bill and at least give them an opportunity to get some treatment. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is very, very important that this be an issue where we expand the facilities for drug dependent people because if we want to take care of our veterans, it is very important that we repass this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks. Representative O'Neill of the 52nd speaking for the second time.

MR. O'NEILL: (52nd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, speaking for the second time because I do believe the issue is vital. I think that it is an issue that could be spoken about all day here and my only fear is that the end result will be the same because we will not sway a vote. This will lie on your conscious, ladies and gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. It will lie on your conscious also that the money is there, the money is available. We are not talking of new monies. We are talking of the present statute that allows the expenditure of \$2,000 for a drug dependent veteran. And if this drug dependent veteran is put into a private hospital, which is conceivable, the cost would be more than if they were at Rocky Hill. We have talked about what is being done in the area and as Majority Leader Ajello has stated, nothing is being done in the area. We have checked with the West Haven Veterans Hospital, the federal hospital, they are

roc

Monday, August 2, 1971

42.

totally overcrowded at the present time. They couldn't even accept one new person if they were to apply there today. Mr. Speaker, in closing I would address, through you, the Minority Leader, Mr. Collins, does he know of a specific instant at a specific institution in the State of Connecticut, today, that this problem is not adequately being handled even being -handled at all.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks.

MR. COLLINS: (165th)

Mr. Speaker, naturally I understood the question but if it was whether or not I knew of any situation where it was not being adequately handled, I do not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. O'NEILL: (52nd)

Sir, that was not the question. Where it is being adequately handled is the question. Or where it is being handled period.

THE SPEAKER:

Would you respond further.

MR. COLLINS: (165th)

Mr. Speaker, I don't know and I don't know if it is being inadequately handled. I can only rely on what the various departments in state government tell me and that they indicate that they have the power now to provide these services at existing facilities; that a new facility such as this bill is directed toward is unnecessary, that there is the money the gentleman

Monday, August 2, 1971

43.

roc

talked about in the budget, that these services will be provided but it is absolutely unnecessary to create this specific new facility when the other facilities are available and when there is existing legislation that will allow the Commissioner to provide these services and treatment at existing facilities.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 52nd.

MR. O'NEILL: (52nd)

I appreciate Representative Collins' response but I say to you and to this House that yes, the legislation is on the books but, no, we are not handling this problem, we are not solving it, we are not doing a thing about it at all. We are, as the Governor is saying, waiting for the federal government to do this. And as he said in his message, we certainly do not want to deter the federal government from their responsibility. Well, this is our responsibility. It is everybody in this room, the responsibility of everyone in this room and the responsibility of everyone in this state. And I urge you, from the bottom of my heart and for every kid in the State of Connecticut that has this problem, to vote to override the Governor's veto of this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks; Representative Morris from the 118th in New Haven.

MR. MORRIS: (111th)

Mr. Speaker, briefly. It is unbelievable that the

Monday, August 2, 1971

44.

Governor chose to veto this particular bill and that we are here today for repassage. After every major conflict that this Nation has ever been engaged in there have always been songs written about when the boys come home. I dread the day after this Vietnam conflict that the boys will come home when they talk about 15 to 20 percent of the boys in Southeast Asia that are inflicted with this particular disease and that's what it is if you think about it. It is considered a mental disease. Eighty percent of all crime caused in this nation today is caused by drug addicts. 80% of all the crime. Just think of it when twenty percent of all those boys are fighting in Southeast Asia come home and 20% of them are engaged in the crimes in our streets and in our society. The State of Connecticut has always been that kind of a state that has been inventive and yes this was an ingenuous idea. We have been accused and rightfully so of "yankee ingenuity" and yet the Governor of the State did not see fit to take a chance in allowing the Veterans' Home in Rocky Hill to help solve this particular problem in our society here in the State of Connecticut. I say to you, on the other side, search your consciences, because you will have to come back someday and you will have to deal with this particular problem. But the magnitude of this particular problem will be much greater than it is today.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks. Representative Morano of the 151st.

MR. MORANO: (151st.)

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every member of this Chamber

Monday, August 2, 1971

45.

is in agreement that we do want to help veterans who return home and who are seeking help to overcome a habit. Now if the facilities are available and the money is there, let anyone come to you legislators in your own respective towns and tell you that they are being refused help. We all admit, as Representative O'Neill said, that they haven't been carrying out previous legislation. Then it is our job to see that the previous legislation is enforced. It is our job then, if this young man or young lady is seeking help, to get the help for them. There aren't that many that we are going to be run over like a steamroller. Thank God there are only very small percentages that are coming home who have adopted this habit and I see no need for this bill to be passed. It is there.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Lenge from the 13th.

MR. LENGE: (13th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened intently and I have yet to hear anyone say what the unit is, whether it will be bonded, how many beds it will contain, the amount of staff that will take to operate it and whether or not in itself it will solve a particular number of bed shortages. The fact remains that there is legislation on the books that says that anyone under these conditions is entitled to these services. There is no distinction of conscious between one side or the other and I am very interested, particularly in the spenders and the spenders on the cuff wherein we are debating this thing under

roc

Monday, August 2, 1971

46.

a situation where we don't have a stabilized tax and revenue program. There is no greater heart anywhere here, it is an overall picture and I think the Governor is right on this one until someone can say that there is this particular shortage anywhere in the State.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks before we vote.

MR. O'NEILL: (52nd)

Can I reply to the question.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman pose the question. Does the gentleman wish unanimous consent to speak for the third time.

MR. O'NEILL: (52nd)

Yes.

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection. Hearing none, Representative O'Neill.

MR. O'NEILL: (52nd)

Mr. Speaker, there are twenty-four beds at Rocky Hill that would be available if this act is repassed. It is estimated that there is 14% by one of our Congressmen in the State of Connecticut, Congressman Steele, of our veterans that are addicted. We know that there are 8,000 heroin addicts in the State of Connecticut at the present time. This certainly will not solve the problem but it certainly is a step in the right direction because I do repeat, nothing is being done about it at the present time.

Monday, August 2, 1971

47.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Lenge, speaking for the second time.

MR. LENGE: (13th)

Mr. Speaker, the last sentence that nothing is being done about it at this time, could not be further from the truth. The fact that 24 beds might become available at a stated time in the future would obviously be a step in the right direction. But a step in the right direction can be taken in many other aspects of what we will be deciding here today and no one is saying what the ultimate costs of those 24 beds would be - (a) in terms of staff, terms of cost of construction, whether it is a new unit and the dollar amount entailed and whether or not the 24 makes the difference between adequate service available now or not. And that question has not been answered and insofar as and so long as it goes unanswered, you cannot claim heart and conscious for good programs unless you stabilize the revenue situation and the spending situation of this state as an overall package. And let's not begin now at 12:30 on a series of overrides" situations to segment cost, necessity, service and other things. We have a budget, the statute says that every single person is entitled to services to the extent of \$2,000 and no one has said that there are "x" numbers who are in need of the service and there are "x" number of facilities and there is a shortage of 400 beds or facilities or what have you. That statistic cannot be rendered here this afternoon and the Administration is saying that its services are being rendered and when the Majority Leader says

roc

Monday, August 2, 1971

48.

roc

that they are not being rendered now, how far did it go back; just the last six months or does it go back into last year or the last two years. The fact is that there are no statistics saying that there are men or women, young or old, who are veterans, who are not being given the services.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Gillies of the 75th.

MR. GILLIES: (75th)

Mr. Speaker, when the vote was taken on this bill earlier in the session, it was a unanimous vote. There was not one single voice raised in opposition to this bill from that side of the aisle. It was a good bill then and it is a good bill now. And the mere fact that one man sitting in another office happens to disagree with its wisdom, doesn't mean, I would hope, that all you people sitting over there must now line up like dominoes and be knocked over. I would suggest that each one of you has a mind and you used it before and you voted for a bill that was a good bill and there isn't anything that has been changed except one man's opinion. And I would suggest that you follow your conscious as you did before and vote in favor of this excellent legislation.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative LaRosa from the 4th.

MR. LAROSA: (4th)

Speaking for the second time. I don't profess to know all the statistics that are available but I can say that, to some

Monday, August 2, 1971

19.

of the people on the other side of the aisle, who are probably not aware of some of the facilities that are available, in comparison to the drug dependent people, these facilities have to be used for it. In Hartford we have at Blue Hills Clinic, we have I believe 12 beds which will be expanded to 32. We have Dartek (?) House in Meriden which was authorized by this General Assembly. If you have been there, I think there are 40 or 45 people that avail themselves of those facilities. We have a facility which is in Cheshire which I don't know how many people they take care of. These are the facilities we have today, they are very limited. I think that what 24 beds will do in Rocky Hill - if you take 24 beds and you turn them over 13 times in the course of a year, you have 25 times 13 and if my mathematics is right it is 312 people that could be serviced in that particular facility. I say that what has happened is that for the people who are drug dependent, which they estimate to be, 8,000, I would say that there may be closer to 10-15,000. And if anyone in this Assembly says that there are people who are clamoring for facilities, I say to you, come with me. Come with me tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock and I'll show you 100 people who are drug dependent who would avail themselves of some facility if we could at least expand that particular market. I think that you have to walk around the cities and talk to some of these people before we can sit here and vote against this bill. This is a bill that will do something for the human person. This is a bill that is going to do something that will bring feeling

roc

Monday, August 2, 1971

and bring families together as a result of rehabilitation. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, we should have no alternative but to vote for this bill and give it a unanimous passage and override this veto. Thank you.

roc

THE SPEAKER:

I will announce the roll call. For those who have just returned to the Hall, we are at the fifth page of the Calendar, Public Act 593, An Act Concerning the Establishment of a Drug Dependency Unit at Veterans' Home and Hospital. If you wish to repass the bill, vote yes. If you wish to uphold the veto, vote no. Will the members please be seated and the aisles be cleared. The machine will be opened. Has every member voted. Have you checked the vote to be certain you are recorded in the fashion you wish. The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

THE CLERK:

Total number voting	152
Necessary for Repassage	119
Those Voting Yea	96
Those Voing Nay	56
Absent and Not Voting	25

THE SPEAKER:

REPASSAGE IS LOST.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, directing your attention to Page 7, Public Act 673.

THE CLERK:

Page 7, Public Act 673, Substitute for House Bill 6685.

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 7 1971

20.

Cal. 1191 File 1374 Substitute for H.B. 7041 An Act Concerning the Use and Operation of Snowmobiles.

Cal. 1193, File 1387, Substitute for H.B. 7483 An Act Concerning the Husband And Wife Retirement Income Option Under the Probate Court Retirement System.

Cal. 1194, File 1378 Substitute for H.B. 8330 An Act Concerning the Expansion of the Wequetequock Fire District in the Town of Stonington.

Cal. 1195, File 1293 Substitute for H.B. 8541 An Act Providing a Bonus for Veterans Who Were Eligible But Did Not Receive a Bonus for Service in World War II or the Korean War.

Page 10, Cal. 1206 File 1389 H.B. 7484 An Act Concerning Disability Retirement for a Judge of Probate.

Cal. 1207, File 1383 Substitute H.B. 7490 An Act Concerning the Definition of Average Final Compensation for a Judge of Probate

Page 11, Cal. 1209, File 1236, Substitute for H.B. 5574 An Act Concerning the Benefits Paid to the Spouse of a Teacher Who Dies Before Retirement.

Page 12, Cal. 1219, File 1187 H.B. 8712 An Act Concerning the Establishment of a Drug Dependency Unit at Veterans' Home and Hospital.

Cal. 1222, File 1422 Substitute for H.B. 8343 An Act Concerning Mandatory Refusal of Liquor Permits.

Cal. 1223, File 983, Substitute for H.B. 8359 An Act Concerning the Creation of a Commission on Compensation for Elected State Officials.

Page 13, Cal. 1225, File 1435 Substitute for H.B. 8798 An Act Concerning Public Hearings on Proposed Layout of State Highways.

Cal. 1229, S.B. 1830 An Act Concerning Participation of Hospitals in the Health And Educational Facilities Authority Act.

Page 14, H.B. 5491, File 916 An Act Granting Payment of the World War II Veterans' Bonus to Edward david Wellins.

Cal. 1233, File 777 H.B. 5672 An Act Granting Payment of the Korean War Veterans' Bonus to John P. Belansky, Jr.