

HB8334

PA 700 (Vetoed)

1971

Judiciary

—

House

4603

↳ Veto Session

536-541

Senate

3355

H-117

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

Thursday, June 3, 1971 38.

MBS

those in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 786, Substitute for House Bill No. 8334, An Act Concerning the Number of Resident State Policemen.

WILLIAM O'NEILL, 52nd District:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

WILLIAM O'NEILL, 52nd District:

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, the number of allotted resident state troopers is set by statute, presently the number for the state of Connecticut is 60. Many of your smaller towns are in dire need of the services of a resident trooper. This particular bill would increase the number from 60 to 70, Mr. Speaker. The police department knows about the bill and they are in favor of this bill. Mr. Speaker, there is no cost because it would come out of the normal compliment of state police.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 12, Calendar No. 865, Substitute House Bill No. 5093,

H-122

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

Wednesday, August 4, 1971

55

THE CLERK:

djh

Total number Voting	144
Necessary for Repassage	118
Those voting Yea	90
Those voting Nay	54
Absent and Not Voting	33

THE SPEAKER :

Repassage is lost.

The Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

THE CLERK:

Please turn to page 7 of Monday's House Calendar. On Page 7 of Monday's House Calendar, Public Act No. 700, third from the bottom, substitute for H. B. No. 8334, An Act Concerning the Number of Resident State Policemen.

MR. O'NEIL (52nd):

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The question is on reconsideration. Is there objection? Hearing none, reconsideration is granted.

MR. O'NEIL (52nd):

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The question is on repassage of the bill. Will you remark?

MR. O'NEIL (52nd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will remark. First of all, I'd like to remark by reading the Governor's veto message. The Governor states, this legislation would cost an additional \$154,000. These additional funds were not provided in the budget passed by the legislature and into law. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Governor has read every bill very carefully. It's

Wednesday, August 4, 1971 56

been referred that he has done such by the minority leaders on the other side djh
for the last two days. Well, this is one particular bill that I doubt seriously
if he read the bill and I feel sure that he did not read the present statute
and I feel positively sure that he did not check with his new Commissioner of
State Police. This is enabling legislation, Mr. Speaker, allowing the number
of resident troopers in the State of Connecticut to be increased from sixty
to seventy at the discretion of the Commissioner of State Police. Mr. Speaker,
there are five towns in the State of Connecticut at the present time that have
applications in for additional resident state police, and none are available.
There are 775 troopers in the State of Connecticut as of this morning, including
12 that are in training. We are asking this increase because the towns do
need this help and I don't want to bore you with facts or money figures but I
feel as though I have to. The Governor's statement of \$154,000 cost is totally
incorrect. The cost of a resident state policeman is \$15,000. The town re-
imburses the state \$9,000, the net cost is \$5742., whereas presently the cost
of a trooper on the road is \$14,230 to the State of Connecticut. Consequently,
a net saving on each and every trooper that goes into residency work of
\$8488. If all ten were appointed, it would save the state \$84,800 so the
Governor in this particular instance is totally wrong in his figures. His
budget people are totally wrong. Evidently the Commissioner of Finance and
Control who must be giving him the figures to begin with is totally wrong.
Mr. Speaker, these five towns need these troopers. Governor Meskill during
his own campaign promised more police protection for the State of Connecticut.
It's a good bill. It's just as good as when it passed here unanimously and
passed the Senate unanimously. And, Mr. Speaker, I urge for its override
today and I urge in the future on any other vetoed messages, let's make sure
that the Governor really did know what he did when he vetoed them because on

Wednesday, August 4, 1971

57

this particular piece of legislation, I don't think he did.

djh

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on repassage? If not, the Chair will announce an immediate roll call. Will you remark further?

MR. OLIVER (104th):

Mr. Speaker, symptomatic of the Governor's veto messages is the fact that I can make the remarks I am now about to make in reference to this bill as I was going to make them in reference to another bill. They apply because the same fault exists in this veto message of this bill as exists in most of the others. These messages and this message indeed simply shows that whether or not Mr. Collins said he read the bill, he didn't. Although there may be an explanation. Perhaps he did and perhaps either did not, would not or could not understand them. You know we've talked at great length about assistance to the legislative process, staff and expertise. I think that these veto messages and this in particular show how much the Governor needs help. He needs help to learn how to read. He needs-

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, point of order.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

What is your point, sir?

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, how much more of this nonsense are we going to have to tolerate? We have a gentleman now on his feet throwing veto messages on his desk, ranting and raving as he usually does, totally irrelevant to the matter before us.

MR. OLIVER (104th):

Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman's point of order germane or is he

Wednesday, August 4, 1971

58

making an attack.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Gentlemen, gentlemen.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the gentleman--

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Excuse me, sir. Would the gentleman from the 165th please state his point of order?

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Haven is not being germane to the bill before us. He is attempting to launch into a general attack, apparently on the Governor's competency, on his reasons for veto message and several other things. I do not think that is proper sir. I think remarks should be restricted to the bill before us.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I think the point of order is well taken. I think that any comments concerning the Governor should be restricted to the bill before us, the bill under consideration.

MR. OLIVER (104th):

Absolutely, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will. Speaking with reference to the veto message on Public Act No. 700, substitute H.B. No. 8334, File No. 787, this veto message shows how much indeed the Governor needs help and assistance and I think it's clear that perhaps if we do nothing else in the next session of the General Assembly, we give him an adequate appropriations so that he may hire people who know how to read and how to advise him so that when he comes to write a veto message as in Public Act No. 700--

MR. COLLINS (165th):

djt

Wednesday, August 4, 1971

59

Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, again this speaker is not being germane to the bill in question. I think that we can well not afford to keep engaging in these apparent Mickey Mouse tactics by Rep. Oliver. I, for one, am getting tired of taking the time of the House with remarks that have no bearing whatsoever on the bill before us and I think Mr. Oliver does us all an injustice by attempting to range over a broad spectrum of things which are in complete contradiction to our rules.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 104th.

MR. OLIVER (104th):

Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to do an injustice to the gentleman in view of his voting record today and on Monday. But specifically with reference to Public Act No. 700, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this again shows clearly the message that runs throughout them all as indeed on this one, the Governor did not understand. I wish, I wish he used his eyes to read, his ears to listen and his heart perhaps to feel. He chose not to do so, so be it.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on repassage? If not, will the members take their seats, the aisles be cleared? Will the aisles please be cleared? Will Rep. Lenge and Rep. Lavine please take their seats? Gentlemen, would you take your seats, please? For the benefit of the members returning to the Chamber, we're on page 7 of Monday's Calendar, we're addressing ourselves to repassage of Public Act No. 700, An Act Concerning the Number of Resident State Policemen. Gentlemen, would you take your seats please? The machine will be open. Have all the members voted? Is your vote properly recorded? Will the

djh

Wednesday, August 4, 1971

60

members be seated? Is your vote properly recorded? The machine will be closed and the Clerk will take a tally. Will the Clerk take a tally?

djh

THE CLERK:

Total number voting	141
Necessary for repassage	118
Those voting Aye81
Those voting Nay60
Absent and Not Voting	36

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Repassage FAILS.

THE CLERK:

Page 11 of Monday's House Calendar, Special Act No. 145, second from the top, Substitute for H.B. No. 5433, An Act Creating a Commission to Study the Competitive Position of The Connecticut Economy.

MRS. BECK (50th):

Mr. Speaker, this legislation--

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Would the lady care to move for reconsideration?

MRS. BECK (50th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for reconsideration of Special Act. No. 145.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on reconsideration of Special Act. No. 145. Is there objection? Hearing none, reconsideration is granted.

MRS. BECK (50th):

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important acts of this session of the General Assembly because this act was designed to study the basic structure of Connecticut's economy at a period when it has the highest unemployment rate that it has had in over a decade and when, in fact, it is facing intense competition with the middle west, the far west and the international

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 26

of the bill, as amended, signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it, the bill is passed.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move for suspension of the rules for immediate transmittal to the House, On cal. 786, Cal. 1172 and Cal. 677.

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection, it is so-ordered.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, by agreement of the Minority and the Majority parties, may we take up on a Consent Motion, the following matters: I move for the adoption of the joint committee's favorable reports and the passage of the bills: On page two of the Calendar, 987, File No. 1125, Substitute House Bill 6484. An Act Concerning Personal Property Liens in Favor of Municipality 1101, File 1288, Substitute House Bill 7869, An Act Concerning State Pilots and Pilotage. Page 4, of the Calendar, Cal. 1190, File 1103, Sub House Bill 6709, An Act Concerning An Establishment of a Five Mile River Commission. Cal. 1196, File 1373, Sub House Bill 8671, An Act Concerning Acquisition of Case Mountain for use of A State Park. Cal. 1210, File 1425, Sub House Bill 5760, An Act Authorizing the Treasurer to Replace Mutilated, Defaced, Destroyed, Stolen or Lost State Obligations. Page 5, Cal. 1221, File 787, Sub House Bill 8334, An Act Concerning the Number of Resident State Policemen. Cal. 1224, File 930, House Bill 8453, An Act Concerning Military Funerals for National Guardsmen. Cal. 1230, File 1375, Sub House Bill 7929, An Act Concerning Second Taxing District of Norwalk. Cal. 1241, File 1471, Sub House Bill 5046. An Act Concerning Holding and Sale of Bonds to the State and the Pension Fund of the Teachers Retirement System. Page 6, Cal. 1242, File 1481