HB 6685 PA 673 (Vetoed) 1971

Education —

House 5595-5602
└Veto Session 444-452
Senate 3406

18

H-120

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 13
5555-6226

best suited.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

THE CLERK:

Page 9, at the bottom of the page, Calendar No. 1329, Substitute for House Bill No. 6685, An Act Concerning a Drug Education Program.

JAMES GAFFNEY, 80th District:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

JAMES GAFFNEY, 80th District:

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that the state board of education shall develop drug addiction programs in each of the mental health planning regions of the state. The mental health planning council shall assist in developing and implementing such programs. Further the bill states that regional programs shall be developed by this state board and the commission for higher education for future training. Such training will be at no expense to the teachers. Third, it states that the state department must report annually to the education committee regarding drug education and teacher training. Further, that no more than 10% of the funds may be used for planning, the remainder to be used for the teacher

training programs. There is a $250,000 appropriation which was contained in the Governor's budget as well as in the Democratic proposed budget. The Education Committee felt that a new approach to the problem was necessary and the regional approach allowed for newer ideas and more coordination with community groups already involved in drug education. This is a platform proposal, I know of the Democratic party and I think also of the Republican party. I strongly urge your favorable consideration and passage of this bill.

PAUL LA ROSA, 4th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because prior to adoption of this bill the only requirement that was passed upon the school systems of the state of Connecticut was that they meet once a year, in a general assembly, and the education that was given to the youngsters, just to say that drugs were bad and to have just some sort of an assembly just to cover the law. This is more specific, Mr. Speaker, where it outlines a program that could be adopted throughout the state of Connecticut so that at least we would be doing something constructively and to give some assurances to the people, and to the parents that send their children to school, to know at least it is a problem that they will know what it is all about and know the hazards that could happen in the event they do get involved. It is a good bill and I urge its passage.

JOHN MATTHEWS, 161st District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill, also, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask that the people who will be setting up this program give full consideration to the use of young people in trying to help the education of the teachers. There's a great abundance of information which indicates that those young people who have been through the state of addiction and have recovered can much comment and advice to older people who are about to help in these overall education programs. I support the bill.

DAVID LAVINE, 73rd District:

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to focus, briefly, on just two points of this bill. One point brings in the regional mental health planning units throughout the state. Mr. Speaker, this is a recognition that the drug problem, which we face in this state, and indeed which is faced in other states, is something which is not defined either to the schools or to the community. It is a pervasive problem. Children learn about drugs on the streets, children learn about drugs in the schools. Unfortunately, the schools have not recognized that drug education is a society problem, indeed, when we were considering this bill in the Education Committee, the response of the state department of education was please keep the community out of it, let us resolve and let us solve our own particular problems within the schools. This has been a very

shortsighted, and indeed, a pathetic response to a growing problem within our state. I would like to urge the state department of education not to be shortsighted any longer in this particular area. I should like to urge them to make the fullest use of the regional mental health planning councils. I should like them to open their eyes and, indeed, demand that the schools open their eyes to this particular problem and bring in every resource. This problem, the problem of drug addiction, the problem of children not being responsive to the type of program development that is in this area, this problem is one which will only be solved by speaking a language which is understood by children. The regional mental health planning council units have had some success, not total success, but somessuccess in this area. Only with cooperation and good will are we going to make any inroads on this problem. It is difficult, this bill was the first step, it recognizes that not all the wisdom lies within the state department of education. I hope that there will be a concerted effort to reach out and get that type of assistance in planning programs, in retraining and training teachers, which is necessary, I urge the adoption of this bill and I'd also suggest that everybody who goes back to their community advises their local school superintendent of the passage of this bill and advises them of what this bill means for their schools, within their communities and sees to it, each and every one of us, sees to

it that the intent of this bill is followed through. I urge the passage.

SIDNEY SHERER, 159th District:

Mr. Speaker, as an educator, not as an old country schoolteacher, but as an educator, I have to agree what was said on this floor by my esteemed colleagues but I think that we have to go much further. I personally believe that this drug education should start in the elementary grades, if it were starting in the second and third grade, I think we would do doing our school children a service. Today we read in the papers where eight year olds are addicted and I feel that this type of legislation would help so that we would not have to have legislation whereby we would have to set up drug centers because the old addage still holds true, that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. I also feel that we in education are not remiss from the fact that we have not been trying to do our jobs such as was intimated here on the floor. Drugs are a comparatively new thing on the scope onthe scene of things to come, I hope that if we do our job and do it correctly and with these bills that we are passing in the legislature today to prevent that which we have past prior to this, to cure, that we will have been doing a job for our young people in the state of Connecticut. I urge passage of this bill and I support it.

BERNARD AUGER, 55th District:

Mr. Speaker, Rep. Lavine said it well. I support this bill and I urge each and every member of this assembly to support this bill. Thank you.

RUTH TRUEX, 23rd District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, too, the sub-committee of the Education Committee worked a long, long time during the first months of this session, going around full circle on the implementation of this problem. And this is the second bill that he had brought out. The first one, as you will remember, authorizes the program under the department of education from kindergarten on up and in the problems of drug education. This one approaches it from a different angle and includes all of the community services within it under the direction of the department of education so that it will be incorporated within that framework. The appropriation for the money has been authorized in the Governor's budget and I'm very happy that we can get together on both sides of the aisle in support of this bill which is aimed at incorporating, including the community and all its facets, in the attack on this problem, which has come to be a number one problem for all of the communities and I urge support of the bill.

ARTHUR DELLA VECCHIA, 26th District:

Mr. Speaker, from a practical point of view the major emphasis on this bill is teacher training, 90% of the money we appropriate will go into training teachers. This money will

be spent on courses and courses for prospective teachers. It will also be spent to provide workshops, institutes and summer school programs for teachers and other educational people as well, at no cost to them. We want to provide our present teachers with the most modern and most effective tools to combat the spread of drug abuse among our young. This bill is worthy of our strong support.

ALBERT PROVENZANO, 127th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill but with some apprehension and with some caution. Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned that the people who are allowed to teach the very delicate courses of drug and drug abuse are not allowed to teach abuses and permissiveness in their use. And I want to make it clear for legislative intent that I intend to support it under those conditions. I want to make it clear that at no time in the future shall a teacher have the idea that it was with our consent that they give instructions even hinting on that proposition that the use of drugs might not be as bad as we may think. I'm concerned also that some sections were removed and those sections are the state board of education with the Commissioner of Higher Education consulting with the Commissioner of Mental Health. It now goes to that consultation and advice is with the mental health planning council make up, I understand, lay people and probably some doctors. Again, with their advice and consent and my caution is that I would not like to see this program abused but rather used for the

intention that we passed on it together today.

JOSEPH GORMLEY, 142nd District:

Mr. Speaker, I am all in favor of this program. I think it is needed in every one of the 169 towns in this state and I hope it passes unanimously.

SIDNEY SHERER, 159th District:

Mr. Speaker, speaking for the second time, I just wish to alay the fears of our esteemed representative, Mr. Provenzano, in the fact that most of us in education do not teach permissiveness. I also feel that it is very important to come down to a little more basis factor and that is that most children have parents and if the parents would do their job, and in conjunction with that in which the teachers would teach them, I think we'd have a well-rounded program.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Will the gentleman from the 118th direct the Clerk to the next calendar item.

CARL AJELLO, 118th District:

Rep. Hannon is down at the Clerk's desk for that purpose, sir.

ASST. CLERK:

At the bottom of page 13, Calendar No. 1491, in your files, file 1665. House Bill No. 7603, An Act to Amend an Act

H-122

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

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

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 Voting 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.

AN ACT CONCERNING A DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAM.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 80th, Rep. James F. Gaffney.

MR. GAFFNEY: (80th)

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on reconsideration. All those in favor will indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. Reconsideration is granted.

MR. GAFFNEY: (80th)

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on repassage. Will you remark.

MR. GAFFNEY: (80th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Governor in his veto message states that the funds appropriated by this act, some $250,000, appear in the Appropriation Act, passed by this Assembly and signed into law. This is very much a fact. He further states that he bases his veto on Section 2 of this Act which sets up fourteen regional districts for implementation. He further states that the Regional Mental Health Planning Councils inv olved in these regions should not be responsible for implementation of statute. Again, I have to agree with the Governor. However, this act clearly does not give the power of implementation to the regional planning councils. The language in the statutes states that they have the power, if you will, of consultation, advice and assistance to the State Board of Education. It does not grant the responsibility for implementation. This bill passed both

roc

Houses in June, unanimously. With this veto, what we do in essence is to grant some $250,000 to the State Board of Education without any plan, any program for implementation. The fact is that the State Board of Education has had the power to implement drug education programs throughout this State over the past years. The fact is they have done little in the way of implementation. With no direction or no plan for implementation of effective drug education programs throughout the state, this veto in essence would be irresponsible administration. I would like to quote from the Hartford Times in an editorial related to this bill. A $250,000 project to involve the regional mental health centers in training classroom teachers for effective drug education has been vetoed. The Governor apparently agrees the State Board of Education should do the job alone but most citizens must believe based on performance to date that the State Board needs help and advice. This I wholeheartedly concur with. The problem of drugs is not a problem that can be solved or will be solved exclusively in the schools. It is a community problem and to date in this area the State Department and the local boards have not been relating to the community. They have been trying to treat this problem as a school problem and not as a community problem. The act calls for cooperation, assistance, advice and consultation between community groups such as the mental health planning councils, the State Board of Education, teachers, boards of education in the regions and most important, with students. It states specifically that students must be involved in these

programs. If we fail to override this veto, I believe we will be guilty of irresponsible legislation. I strongly urge your favorable vote to override the veto.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Motion to repass Substitute House Bill 6685, the Chair orders a roll call vote under Article4, Section 15. Will you remark further on repassage. The gentleman from the 73rd.

MR. LAVINE: (73rd)

Mr. Speaker, this particular measure was considered at length by the Education Committee. We held numerous hearings and we availed ourselves of testimony from people involved in drug programs throughout the State of Connecticut. Two things emerged as we heard the testimony. One was and I emphasize, that there are no effective programs today which are being run from the State Department of Education. Now children need the information, guidance, help in this particular area. We all read, day in and day out, statistically of children who are becoming drug dependent. The Board of Education, the State Board, has failed to provide information, guidance, curricular advice for the local school board. We also found that there are many effective programs being conducted today by the mental health planning councils which are already established and in operation throughout the State of Connecticut. We have testimony from the planning councils as to the type of liason that they could provide for the local boards of education. This is a resource, it is a resource which is currently dealing with the

roc

problem. It is a resource which is currently dealing with children. It understands what the drug problems are in our state. Ladies and gentlemen, if we do not assist our schools we are going to find ourselves with an exploding problem in this area. The Board of Education, the State Board of Education, has admitted in hearings that it does not have the knowledge, it does not have the expert advice and wisdom to operate in this particular area. Really ladies and gentlemen, I would think that providing our young people of this state a healthy and happy start in their education and their social environment is about as important a thing that we can do today. We have a real problem here. We have a serious problem here. I don't know how many of you are involved directly with education or indirectly but this isn't an area of expertise for the State Department of Education. They need assistance. This act provides assistance to them. I urge you on the basis of long, thoughtful consideration which the Education Committee had in this area to support this legislation, it is very important that we do so. I hope that we will vote together to override this particular veto. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on repassage. Rep. Bingham.

MR. BINGHAM: (157th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to repassage. Present legislation in this field covering drug education is already in the budget. There is $250,000 allocated as an appropriation for this particular program and Mr. Speaker, we have many, many fine

drug education programs in the State of Connecticut. For instance roc the program which is brought to the children by the City of Stamford is considered one of the models in drug education programs for the State of Connecticut and I think that every member of the House has received a booklet from the City of Stamford on the drug education program. It has been stated by the previous speaker that the regional mental health councils are already taking care of this program. The budget message adequately covers the reasons for the veto that this is being covered already and that we have appropriated $250,000 generally for this program. Mr. Speaker, I think that the veto should be sustained.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. The gentleman from the 9th.

MR. KLEBANOFF: (9th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of repassage of this bill. I think it should be realized that the Education Committee probably worked harder and longer on this bill than any other bill it had before it. I think one of the reasons it did so was obvious. We all recognize what a critical and crucial problem the drug element presented to the Committee, the drug problem presented. I think one thing we should realize very clearly that the State Department of Education has not done its job. Two years ago, we passed a bill requiring the State Department of Education to see that a course in drug education was taught at least once a year in the public schools. It was not done. We did a survey and found it was not done in approximately 40% of the schools. The

State Department of Education did not take action to see that it was done or would be done. It seems incredible that we could have passed the other bills we have this session - the bill extending drug education down to the elementary grades - the bill providing for privilege communication of teachers and yet b y our action today, our action here perhaps jeopardize the most vital area, the area of student education. I think one of the things that became very apparent to the Education Committee is that the most effective programs in drug education are those developed by a combination of people. As was indicated by previous speaker, there are few people where there is really no department that has a given expertise. There are few people who are all knowledgeable in this area. But by combining many groups, agencies and people, we perhaps could come up with a meaningful program. We talk about fiscal responsibility. We are appropriating $250,000 with no plan, with no guideline to a department that has already shown it has an ability to do nothing in this area. Well, if this is the way we feel, if there is someone else outside pulling the strings or pushing the levers, then I guess the futility of talking here today any further is obvious. But I think one thing we should realize that we all have to face each and every parent in this state. We each have to face the student, the teenager who may become drug addicted and we will face a lot of them if we don't override this bill today.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. For the second time the

gentleman from the 73rd.

MR. LAVINE: (73rd)

To a comment that Mr. Bingham made - he said that the City of Stamford had an excellent drug program. Admittedly, this istrue but that's not what this bill talks to. It talks to the fact that we are not getting leadership from the State Department of Education. And if Mr. Bingham wants to cite something the State Department of Education is doing in this area, I wish he would. It's precisely because some towns are able on their own without assistance from the State Department of Education to go ahead and do something but other towns are unable and to get the advice and assistance they need that we have this piece of legislation before us. This is what we are speaking to. We are not getting the proper advice, guidance and assistance and this bill provides it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. The gentleman from the 157th.

MR. BINGHAM: (157th)

The previous speaker has stated that the State Department of Education has not performed its duties and we would agree. And I did not intend to point a finger at a previous administration but this is Governor Dempsey's State Board of Education that hasn't done anything. Under the present administration, the money is appropriated to the proper place, $250,000, and under the present Governor something will be done.

deputy SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. If not, will the members be seated. With the staff please clear the aisles and the floor. The machine will be opened. Have all the members voted and is your vote properly recorded. The machine will be closed. The Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting		150
Necessary for Repassage		119
Those Voting Yea	84	
Those Voting Nay	66	
Absent and Not Voting	27	

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

MOTION FAILS.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer another opportunity. On Page 8, Public Act 713.

THE CLERK:

Page 8, Public Act 713, Substitute for House Bill 6380. AN ACT CONCERNING DAY TREATMENT CENTERS, GROUP HOMES AND RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES OR COMBINATION THEREOF FOR EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED AND MENTALLY ILL AND AUTISTIC CHILDREN.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 113th.

MR. WEBBER: (113th)

Mr. Speaker, I move for reconsideration.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on reconsideration. All those in favor will

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

File numbers and I'll move for suspension for immediate consideration. They should be in the Clerk s possession and we ll file this list too, if he wishes.

THE CHAIR:

That s what we're talking about, Senator. We want to compare the bills themselves, against the list we have.

Would you come up, Senator Ives and we'll expediate this very quickly?

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move for suspension of the rules for immediate consideration of the following bills:

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection it is so ordered.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, House Bill 5109, File 1268; House Bill 5298, File 1699; House Bill 5433, File 1310; House Bill 5730, File 940; House Bill 5781, File 1196; House Bill 5782, File 1211; House Bill 6277, File 289; House Bill 6411 File 1117; House Bill 6448, File 1377; House Bill 6685, File 1461; House Bill 6716, File 1684; House Bill 6927, File 934; House Bill 7170, File 769; House Bill 7811, File 1104; House Bill 8410, File 1106; House Bill 8225, File 1197; House Bill 8796, File 927; House Bill 8835, File 1305; House Bill 9189 File 1453; House Bill 6928, File 1080; House Bill 8485, File 1642.

Mr. President, I move for the adoption of the bills listed.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection to the adoption or passage of the bills? Hearing none; said bills declared passed.