

SB 1308

PA 705 (Vetoed) 1971

Transportation 345-346, 353-360

House 6048-6054

Senate 2933-2939, 3412-3413

Senate - Veto Session 269-273

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**TRANSPORTATION**

**PART 2  
338-674**

**1971**

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

Rep. Holdsworth: Workmen at these crossings, flagmen are involved is the intent of this bill, also that the cost of the flagmen would be born by the municipality involved?

Mr. Chapin: I think if it was a project that the municipality desire, I think that was the intent of the bill, at least thats the way I read it.

Rep. Holdsworth: I know involving flagmen, that many times its quite a chore to get flagmen when you want them, I mean there not generally at the wishes of the railroad, rather than the wishes of the municipality and many times a flagmen has to be sent down from some other area and you pay the expenses of travel expenses of the flagmen many miles an hour, and he's not readily available.

Mr. Chapin: Well, our people, of course are paid from their headquarters, they get -----.

Rep. Pugliese: Pugliese, 33rd. Sir, if one of these bills were passed would the responsibility ----- . Would it also be your understanding then, that , (not audible).

Mr. Chapin: I think the railroad would be involved in any case as a matter of protection for both the people working on the crossing and the trains themselves, this would have to be worked out between the railroad and the municipality in any case.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Chapin. Sen. Lieberman you have any comments on the bill?

Sen. Lieberman: I appreciate your calling on me. I'm Joe Lieberman, State Senator from New Haven, 11th District. I'm here to briefly testify on the bill at the top of the list, and then to speak at some more lenght about S.B. 1308, which I know there is substantial interest among those who are in the room. I guess its S.B. 115, which is AN ACT CONCERNING HEATING FACILITIES FOR RAILROAD EMPLOYEES. I sorry I might have missed some testimony on the other side but let me explain briefly why I introduced this bill. I gather that under the current law the railroad companies are obliged to maintain heating of 68 degrees fahrenheit between the months of October and March, and the bill that I've put in results from a call that I received from a railroad worker in Stamford, who I happened to know personally, who complained that last September it got pretty cold and that he asked for the heat to be turned on and was told that there was no obligation to do that. The intent of the bill is not to oblige the railroad companies to keep the heat on all the time but, just to under curcumstances when the heat does drop to maintain it at a liveable level, and months like September. I don't know if I can answer any questions on it. Thank You. S.B. 1308 is one that is of great importance to me and I hope that it will be of great importance to the committee, it is part of a package of three bills that are in , one of which is still to come up from the legislative commissioners office to your committee. The other a financing bill is in the finance committee. Mr. Chairman I want to suggest today that in the area of transportation in this state, it seems to me that there's a growing concensus that we have to put more and more influence and support, and support, behind mass transit and yet, unfortunely following through on that emphases

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

has not yet happened, so there's a real gap between the theory of the rhetoric and the reality of what happening now, and that's particularly so with regard to bus transportation (Dictaphone failure)

Mr. Kannel: (Dictaphone failure) If I may Mr. Chairman present to you a substitute bill 5561 which adds the additional language to the effect that we accept all these responsibilities as subject to the requirement that they cannot be implemented until further funds are made available by the legislature. As I think your all aware of, we're meeting now before the Appropriations Committee with respect to our new budget and in constant with states financial requirements we ask for no additional funds, simply intend to carry out the various programs now under way. For this reason it just isn't the funding to take upon ourselves an additional program, but the principle should be established by recognizing the state and the town should have responsibilities to maintain these bridges as part of the highway system.

Rep. Holdsworth: Earl Holdsworth, 125th. Mr. Commissioner, I'm a little concerned here about towns being required to maintain a bridge over a railroad. I don't know of anything off hand, I'm thinking of the Norwalk - Danbury line where I'm sure there are many town roads which have bridges over them. This is an \_\_\_\_\_ fine line the costs that \_\_\_\_\_ are for the type of operation, I think would be very high and I'm just wondering, there are certain towns, certain areas, where the municipalities are going to be under a severe burden if this is passed. I don't know how many lines are still in operational as far as the Town of New Haven that closes down the line someplace. I don't know how many lines total there are but I know this particular line in the North of Danbury \_\_\_\_\_ line goes up through a lot of small towns, most of the towns, would be unduly low towns, don't you agree.

Mr. Kannel: I agree this would be an additional load on towns, for this reason, of course, in years we have had an allocation of highway funds to help towns bear this responsibility, perhaps the allocation might be reduced in light of that, I agree the towns have a continuing problem with education, a number of matters that's part of our state local problem, how do we carry these costs, but the fact is that the bridges are not being maintained, and we do have a serious and \_\_\_\_\_ , and how do we meet it.

Rep. Frate: Rep. Frate, Sam I presume that the department gets a priority list----.

Mr. Kannel: Yes, you certainly do, as a matter of fact, the men right here have all the details and I don't think you want them right now, but they have all the information available if needed as to those that are, safety comes first, of course, then following safety is the traffic hazard or whether the traffic tieup because of inadequacy in any of these bridges.

Rep. McHugh: Rep. McHugh of the 117th, Is it true that surfaces of bridges and state highways is now the responsibility of the state highway department?

Mr. Kannel: Some bridges that were built more recently, other bridges by

along this route that would not interfere with traffic off the highway.

Rep. Connors: May I ask the same question that Representative Boggini asked, "who will finance this proposition?"

Mr. Kanell: Well, there's the Urban Mass Transportation Administration of the United States Department of Transportation which now has 3 billion dollars to finance programs of this type throughout the nation, we're trying to get all we can. What we are doing is an attempt to make this service as self-supporting as possible is Penn Central is proposing to restrict the sale of tickets at some stations, but no station will be closed as such all the stops will be continued the same service will continue but before any man is pulled out of any station for the purpose of selling tickets, there will be established a system whereby regular commuters can buy tickets by mail. This would be far more convenient and far less time consuming than what you have to do now is wait in line either at the local station or Grand Central to buy a ticket. Now you will have to face this fact, the greatest victory we have made is in Fairfield County. The entire contract with General Electric for 60 million dollars, I have to say this slowly its an awful lot of money, I'm not used to sums like that, 60 million dollars to build new \_\_\_\_\_ We are now working in contract to build high level platforms, contracts to fix up \_\_\_\_\_ the total program will be over 120-130 million dollars. We're very fortunate we get federal funds to do this, we couldn't do this ourselves, otherwise, and to have New York sharing the cost with us on the cars and other expense. In addition we're paying 5% rent on all these properties so our greatest committment financially is in Fairfield County, and why the Presidential study is approved all that can be done is being done to give us the best possible sevice.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Kanell. Anyone else want to comment on 983?

Mr. Gill: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, again for the record, my name is George E. Gill, I'm Assistant General Attorney for Penn Central Transportation, Debtor. As is the case of Mr. Kanell, I do not have the exact content of the bill, I have it by title only. I would cite that in the past the railroad has cooperated with the state in many projects concerning use of its rails and railbeds we have sold property to the state in the form of abandoned railroad rights of way for future use by the state either for continued operation of some form of transport or for other purposes such as recreation and many of the other projects that are contemplated mentioned by Mr. Kanell. Generally I find we cannot oppose this bill and I believe that it certainly is something that is well in the interest of the public. Therefore, believe however, as we have worked out details with the various authorities in the past that the bill should provide that the railroad is adequately compensated for any of the facilities which are desired or which may be desired in the future.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank You Mr. Gill. Anyone else to comment on the bill? The hearing is closed on 983. The next bill is 1308 AN ACT CONCERNING THE POWERS OF THE COMMISSION OF TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Lieberman has already spoken on this bill.

Mr. Bober: My name is Joseph C. Bober, Secretary and Treasurer of State Labor Council speaking in support of S.B. 1308. This bill would extend the authority to the Commissioner of Transportation by enabling him to operate any motor transportation service in the State of Connecticut. Presently he has the authority to contract but it is our feeling that the state would have to go a little further to take over operation. The situation in Connecticut is very critical at the present time and

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

particularly the area serviced by C. R. and L. which includes Bridgeport, Waterbury, and New Britain. Many areas have had service completely eliminated and at the rate this company is curtailing service it won't be too long before motor bus service will be eliminated in the company's entire area. In the City of Bridgeport and Waterbury the Mayors are attempting to organize mass transit districts. This is very laudable but it doesn't serve the entire problem, you can get a group of towns together and have a mass transit district this is possible under the present act, but the size of Connecticut would lend itself more to a Department of Transportation operating service because even with mass transit districts we have the problem of the inter city traveler and then you have to bring every town in the area, inter city traveler being practically eliminated by the bus carriers, we've had a line from Bridgeport through Stratford up to Shelton, and Derby that been eliminated and even in smaller towns where service is extremely bad. Now this bill is only an enabling bill, actually it would allow the Commissioner of Transportation to operate, he has the power now to contract the service, but we hope that he will operate the system. There's money available from the Federal Government for capital expenditures which could be utilized by the present carriers or by the Mayors if they so choose to do so. But as Senator Lieberman pointed out there is a companion bill which will be heard in Finance within a week or so, which would increase the gas tax by one cent. This we believe is the answer to our intr-city or inter-city transportation because what is happening now is the companies are raising rates and curtailing service, before too long you'll know the answer for that one. Where I live in the East side of Bridgeport after 9:00 o'clock at night there isn't any transportation at all and there's nothing on Sunday. So people then have to find alternative means of bus transportation its economical its, it really eliminates to a great extent our pollution problem because one bus can carry as many as 40 cars, you'll find people driving a car with only one person in it, once in a while if people are going in the same direction you'll have some groups getting together and traveling, but this motor bus service is central with this bill and the other bill I believe that we can bring back motorists service to the point where eventually it will be self-sustaining. It does need some assistance now, and it needs the assistance of the people that are using the highways. Your paying for the highways and we think that the highway thing should provide transportation for our people. Its more economical, I've heard the Commissioner talk about the rail bus service those are strictly limited, its more flexible, a bus can travel on a highway and go in any direction, you take the old rail line your limited to that particular line. whether they'll be self-sustaining is another question thats at this point no one knows. I'm not opposed to that idea and I agree that these systems should be tried but our basic service in the State of Connecticut is still on the roads with busses. Most families you know have one car and in most families, in many families I'll say you have two or more people working. The wife has to depend on the motor bus service or in lieu of that the husband has to take her to work and then pick her up, which is not the proper answer. Elimination of bus service would hurt our downtown areas inter-city areas because these people if they have cars will travel to less congested areas where there is parking. If the busses are available they'll go downtown, and for this reason we support the principle of this bill and also some subsidation which is not your problem at the present time, that will be up to the Committee on Finance. Thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you. Anyone else want to speak on this bill?

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is John B. Thompson, I'm the Legislative Chairman of the Connecticut Joint Legislative Conference of the Amalgamated Transit Unions throughout Connecticut. I wish to speak on behalf of bills 1308 and 1303. I will read from some prepared material because I could never remember this in a million years. The need for mass transit. The matter of air and water pollution as well as the traffic problems are a source of great concern and while it is frightening it is well to bring it to the attention of the public. Trying to picture this wonderful world of ours as going out of existence in another twenty of thirty years is just too horrible. While it might not mean much to us older people it certainly will mean much to our children and their children. This problem which might have such grave results cannot be treated lightly. It must be dealt with by men of knowledge and most of all, men with courage. We are all well aware of the lack of concern shown by many people who will not try to see the dangers that lie in the future. The gravity of these conditions are being made known from the President of the country right down the line. Drastic changes are called for. Established ways of life will, no doubt be interrupted or changed completely. Mass reluctance will be the chief problem to overcome. However it must be done if we are to survive, so we are led to believe. According to information published in state wide newspapers, it seems that about 90% of air pollution, is caused by car exhaust fumes. While I am at a loss to speak about water pollution I would like to talk about air pollution and traffic hazards. Being in the transportation business for over thirty-two years I feel qualified to speak on this subject. The need from mass transportation was shown during the years of World War II. With the shortages of car fuels, tires and cars, it was up to transportation to fill a very important chore in the winning of the war. The initial effort was to get the workers there so that they could produce the tools of victory. The efforts of the transportation industry were highly commended by President Truman and others when victory was achieved. With the war over, a great change came about in this country. The automobile age was upon us. This wonderful change brought about prosperity, jobs and new roads, for coast to coast travel. It brought about the use of trucks and it hurt the railroad commerce. After twenty-five years it also brought about air pollution which is slated to destroy us in another twenty-five years unless we act now. It is my sincere belief that the days of private ownership in the transportation business are over. What owners have had to do, to stay in business (make a profit) is the very thing that is ruining the transportation business, so vitally needed in this dangerous era. There is only one way to succeed in the business and that is to carry passengers. When your passengers drop away then you have to raise fares. Both of these factors result in the decline, and pretty soon there is no mass transit, or the cities and towns are forced to take over. When this occurs, it is usually after the business has been milked dry. This has been the history of the bus service throughout the nation since the end of World War II. I do not say this in criticism of private ownership. To stay alive, it was necessary, to have a profit. In the year of 1961, the legislature enacted into law, a bill providing for a Transit Authority if private ownership faltered. The Public Act Bill is No. 507. Private ownership, when it faltered, just stayed in business by cutting service and raising fares. At one time, here in Connecticut, the Connecticut Company, owner of the bus service had over two thousand employees. Today it has less than eight hundred (800). I believe that the time has come to have the municipalitites take over

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

the running of bus service. The government, the news media, the police, the health authorities, all have to educate the public of the necessity to curtail car travel and in the use of mass transportation. Laws have been enacted in the control of the use of Motor Vehicles in the past. Perhaps we shall have to make more laws. It cannot be classified as infringing upon a person's rights if automobile curtailment is in the interest of public safety. In my experience, as a driver, and as an executive of the bus driver's union. I agree with the statement made by Mr. Charles Chaves, Assistant planner of the C.R.P.A., that Monorails are not for this area. I do not have much hope for rail buses, it takes too much time to get on and off the railroad. Paving two tracks for bus use would speed things along but this seems very expensive according to the reports. AAA reports there are 160 thousand cars coming in and out of New Haven every day. Most of these cars have only the driver. The traffic tie-up would be a thing of the past if these cars were not on the road. We would not need special lanes for buses to travel on. If we are interested in fast moving traffic, the bus can get in almost as fast as a car does today, if we do not have the five thousand cars to contend with. During the war years, with the fare eight cents per passenger, the Connecticut Company carried over one hundred forty million passengers per year and made money. The people have to be put back on the buses. First bus riding must be attractive. Second thought must be given to passenger service, not profit. Third we must go after the passengers. We failed to do this years ago when they started to move away. It was easier to cut service and raise fares. Today we are interested in mass survival. This is the prime consideration. Many arguments can be made in behalf of other interests, but can you argue against 90% car exhausts that cause pollution. I believe that if people can be made to realize it is their lives we are talking about, and not bus profits and if the bus service can be made a lot cheaper than driving their own car, this change over can be accomplished. There is no doubt that mass transit, operated by the city and surrounding towns would have to be subsidized. I think that if a person was transported to and from work for about 15 or 20¢ instead of current fares you would see reluctance disappear in most cases. The argument for this would be that present parking spaces provided for workers by companies could be used for other purposes and this might reflect in the tax of the city. The round fare trip could be the issuance of a return card when payment is first made. Some inducement like this is necessary. I think there is some merit to the plan for perimeter parking lot. However this should be for people coming in from areas further away than the parking lots. If you can envision 160 thousand cars now on the road, you can readily see that time can be made by the bus. The bus is not slow, it is the cars that slows the buses down. As an appointed member of the Connecticut State Safety Commission, the Gentlemen that prepared this said, "I can also see a marked reduction in the number of fatalities that mar our pleasure of driving." In closing I would like to say again, this expression on my part is solely in the interest of doing what I think is necessary and in no way to criticize owners or others who may not agree. One last word in regards to the Public Utilities Commission, and again this is not meant as criticism, they have had to go along with bus curtailment every time the Connecticut Company and C. Arnell asked for it. While the best interests of the public is their responsibility, they have had to let people go without proper service because it was necessary for the Bus Company to make profits. Again our point of view is this, we have no place for the

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

profits. Today we must consider using the available money that can be provided in conjunction with cities, the state government, towns, and the funding on the basis of one sixth by a state or one sixth by a city and the other sixth by the state and two thirds by the federal mass transit act, which will provide a great deal of money if we can believe what we hear in the papers, and I assume we can. The cities listed here are already operating on bus service with a Transit Authority. Boston, Providence, Miami, Philadelphia, New York, Rochester, Cleveland, Washington and many others. Here in New Haven, and I am speaking for New Haven in my own effort because I live there, in the past decade, and again no criticism of the present owner, we are operating with a greatly reduced service, and I want to say this, that New Haven at this time there is a check going on in the buses at 9:00 o'clock at night. We can understand what's going to take place, they are going to remove the buses probably at the latest by 9:00 o'clock at night, the company also has a desire to eliminate Sunday service. The usefulness of public utilities and public service are no longer a possibility in existence. If we are to consider profits we are going to deprive the people, I think we should really put a strenuous effort forth to try to resolve this problem and work on the basis of the mass transit authority. If this possibility can become a reality I think that we can provide better service, remove the automobiles assist in ecology, and greatly intense the overall travel modes of Connecticut and I think we could be a showplace for the whole of the country if we were to do it because my instructions were from Washington are that Connecticut is a super perfect place for a complete mass transit, from the borders of Massachusetts to New York State. The redding and railroads in conjunction with bus connection services can go right across the street. And finally, if I can indulge the commission just a little bit longer. This is a resolution prepared by the Amalgamated Transit Unions throughout Connecticut. We share the view of Secretary of Transportation, John Volpe, that "public transit is so important that we must look at its financing much like any other public service", The constantly increasing fares charged for public transportation are in reality a form of regressive taxation - a tax imposed upon working people, the poor, the aged, the infirmed - for a public service from which all inhabitants and users of the central city benefit, including the automobile driver who uses the bus only when there is snow and ice on the ground, and our only chance for low fares and adequate service is to replace private transit with public transportation by and on behalf of the whole people, as Secretary Volpe has said. But public transportation alone is not enough. Unless we can keep fares down, transit will continue to decline under public ownership and operation, so long as the community relies solely upon the fare box to provide needed transit services. Fare box revenues, whatever the level, will never be sufficient to meet the true transit needs of the community. The recurring pattern has been that transportation services will be cut back year by year while ridership on the remaining services declines and fares increase. In this vicious cycle, which we contend is totally contrary to the public interest, transit employees lose job opportunities and suffer worsening positions in their employment because adequate and needed transportation services are not being furnished to the public; therefore, it is that the Amalgamated Transit Union, through its newly formed Connecticut joint legislative conference and Connecticut State Labor Council shall take all appropriate action to oppose any further fare increases on the Connecticut Company and C.R.&L. public transit systems, and to seek legislation providing financial assistance to Mass Transit on the local, state, and federal levels, from general tax funds, in amounts not only sufficient to

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

hold fares at present levels, but, in fact, to reduce or eliminate them; and be it further that this Amalgamated Transit Union and the Connecticut Joint Legislative Conference and Connecticut State Labor Council, urges and supports the prompt acquisition of all private transit companies in the state by public bodies, provided adequate employee protections are included; and be it also that officers and appropriate committees are hereby instructed to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to coordinate such action with other like-minded public interest groups, and to distribute copies of this resolution to appropriate public bodies and officials, and the communications media. Thank you very much gentlemen, I'm sorry to have taken so long.

Rep. Boggini: Representative Boggini from Manchester. I'm very much interested in your statement recommending subsidization of bus lines, rail lines, and I'd like to put an interpretation that is favorable on it if you will agree with me. In effect, wouldn't it cost less if we were to subsidize bus and rail lines then to pay the cost of building highways. Number one, and is such a cost analysis available, perhaps Commissioner Kanell might have an analysis. In other words, the cost of building highways as compared to subsidizing cost \_\_\_\_\_, one question. The other problem is that we're not going to have many places to build highways. From the taxpayers standpoint, when we approach tax payers to talk cost it is very helpful if you can say if you have surveys if you have data showing that it costs less to subsidize a bus or rail line then it does to continue to build highways this would be very helpful.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I'm sure that we can provide you with these things because we are off hand figures which are not authenticated report that railroad and highways there crossing on the average of better than a million dollars a mile and this kind of money reaches into the billions of dollars on highways. Certainly for many, many millions of dollars less we could streamline and put a transportation system in this state for much less than that.

Sen. Mondani: You mentioned in the resolution that they wanted the money to come from general revenue. There are some of us that feel that perhaps the highway fund doesn't fit today's mass transit movement. Would you be terribly upset if we formed a transportation systems fund?

Mr. Thompson: We think that it would be one of the best things that could happen here and we do agree fully with this thinking that at this time there would seem to be enough highways to serve for at least 10 to 15 years, because we're going to kill ourselves with cars if we have enough highways its quicker.

Rep. Holdsworth: Representative Holdsworth. We've been subsidizing the railroad for years and people don't ride on them.

Mr. Thompson: This is true, I think we ought to start thinking about the transportation in the bus era, areas, and lets see if the people will go for that much and I'm sure they will.

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

Rep. Holdsworth: Holdsworth 125th. Don't we have, the New Haven have, a shuttle bus, a service provided a new cart to the public, I don't know who pays for it, how its subsidized. Yet, when I observed the busses don't seem to be very, to many people riding on them.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I think your speaking of the one Long Wharf Project its on a trial basis partially funded by the Department of Transportation of Connecticut and I think they run from about 10:00 o'clock to 6:00 o'clock and, of course, there very perculiar and strange thing about this. I represent union people, this is not a union bus down there, it was very strangely, ,escaped most peoples involved at the time, no criticism meant there, but I don't think the proper approach and the proper manner of applying it bringing it to the publics attention was taken care of.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Thompson. Mr. Hannon do you want to speak on the bill?

Rep. Hannon: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is George W. Hannon, Jr. Assistant Majority Leader, of the House of Representative, speaking on behalf of the Democratic Majority leadership in the House in support of Senate Bill 983 and House Bill 6802. The consequence of overcrowded highways and inadequate rail facilities is clear to anyone who has tried to make his way into a city at rush hour. Massive congestion as cars inch along routes never designed for so many automobiles. Increased pollution, as auto fumes account for much of the sulfur dioxide in our air and a hampering of mass transit, as city buses compete with automobiles for the inadequate street space. An urgent priority must be given to programs designed to move large numbers of people to and through the cities. The legislature must aid in the development of imaginative uses of existing rails and railbeds. High speed commuter trains, rail buses and dual form vehicles capable of operating on both rails and roads are means to alleviate our commuter problems. We cannot wait years for solution to our commuter problems, however, immediate action is necessary to improve inter-city traffic conditions. Funds should be allocated to increase state parking facilities at interchanges and bus stations, thus encouraging the use of car pools and bus service for inter-city travel. The Department of Transportation should be given authority to lease state land to towns for use as commuter parking facilities at rail-road and bus stations and at highway interchanges. Commuter facilities in Connecticut are a cause of near insurrectionary dissatisfaction. Connecticut commuters are demanding action now, and the Democratic leadership supports their plea. Thank you very much.

Rep. Hanzalek: Representative Hanzalek, from the 40th district. I'm sorry that I came late, but I did want to point out that I was asked to submit a bill that turned out to be No. 7594 AN ACT CONCERNING ESTABLISHMENT OF NORTHERN CONNECTICUT MASS TRANSIT AUTHORITY. Basically its just in the form of a statement of purpose and I say I was asked to introduce this kind of thing, because I'm really not an expert on it at all, but the idea was that it might be one step that we might take to reduce the speed at which we are suffering hardening of our traffic arteries and this problem of athrosclerosis probably should be stopped as soon as we can. Certainly C.R.P.A. is the right agency to study the overall mass transit needs in the various regions, but when you take the captitol region for instance, in that 29 town area there are a variety of smaller regions that have to do with traffic patterns, and I'm thinking now of specifically the Springfield to Hartford routine which is a, I don't know whether you would call it a corridor or what, but whether you use the word corridor

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

in broad terms or in a narrow definition, there is a distinct corridor between those two state capitols, that I think deserves transportation, that is mass transportation that is, a little bit more effecient than what we know have. I'm not quite sure how to achieve it but the thought was that perhaps if you had a transit authority in each of these little areas that they would be specifically concerned with the problems in that area could as an authority apply to the Federal Government for funds and intergrate themselves in a larger picture. Now again, its only one of a thousand suggestions and I am sure that you will weigh them all carefully. Thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Representative. 1308 anyones comment of this bill?

Mr. Kanell: Mr. Chairman, I understand, San Kanell Deputy Transportation Commissioner, I agree with all that been said concerning the bill but yet, I must tell you that I do not think the bill is necessary because existing legislation, vest in the Commissioner of Transportation all necessary authority to carry out the purpose of this bill we now have the right to work with the towns, with groups, contract with any party under the existing legislation to contract for either rail or motor carrier or new forms or experimental forms of public transportation. We're attempting to interest all towns and informing them to form transit districts for the purpose of utilizing federal funds that are available under Mass Transportation Act to provide capital resources to acquire new vehicles. The bill speaks of the application of provision 13 (c) of the old Mass Transportation Act which pertains to protection of labor, when federal monies are utilized. And, of course, they must comply to these provisions when they utilize federal funds for this purpose. Therefore, I suggest that while I agree completely and wholeheartedly with the purpose of the speakers concerned with this bill, its not necessary this time we have such legislation on our books.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you. Anyone else to comment.

Mr. Bonenfant: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Peter Bonenfant. I'm Chairman of the C. R. & L. Employees Conference Board of the Amalgamated Transit Union, representing Union employees in the Railway and Lighting Company. On behalf of my people and myself I want to go on record in support of Senate Bill 1308 for the reasons previously stated by Mr. Joseph Bober and Mr. John Thompson, I don't want to go into them there too lengthy, but I did want to bring out the plight, Mr. Thompson pointed out the plight of the Connecitcut Company, and I would like to point out the pligh of the C.R. & L. Compayn beginning with last June, up to this point they have cut out approximately seven hundred bus hours, and there's a hearing before the PUC, April 19, to hear the companies plight again to cut another four hundred and fifty hours. I would like to make this point that if something isn't done soon it will probably be to late. Thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Bobenfant. Anyone else now on the bill? The hearing is closed on 1308. The next bill is 7452 AN ACT CONCERNING THE RECONSTRUC-TION OF A RAILROAD OVERPASS IN NEW BRITAIN. Anyone in favor of the bill?

Mr. Gill: For the record, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is George E. Gill, Assistant General Attorney for Penn Central Transportation Company, Debtor. I appear in support of H.B. No. 7452. H.B. No. 7452 proposes that the Commissioner of Transportation reconstruct the highway and railroad overpass on South Street in the City of New Britain and that

**H-120**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 13  
5555-6226**

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 40A.

was caught in the Senate, and I would urge its adoption.

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Amendment. If not, the question's on adoption of Senate "A". All those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. Senate Amendment "A" is adopted.

WILLIAM F. RYAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would then move for passage of the Bill in concurrence with the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on acceptance and passage as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B" and Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark further. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. The Bill is passed.

BRUCE L. MORRIS:

Mr. Speaker, I draw the Clerk's attention to Page 9, Calendar No. 1586.

THE CLERK:

Before the Clerk calls Page 9, would you correct your Calendar on Page 18. On Calendar No. 1248, the matter which we just passed, the title should read, "As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A", House Amendment Schedule "B" and Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Now on Page 9, at the bottom of the page, Calendar No. 1586, Substitute for S.B. No. 1308, an Act concerning the powers of the Commissioner of Transportation, File No. 1509.

FRANK M. REINHOLD, SR.:

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill.

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 41A.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

FRANK M. REINHOLD, SR.:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has House Amendment "A". The Amendment is rather lengthy. I would be happy to summarize with your permission.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further.

FRANK M. REINHOLD, SR.:

Speaking to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment, while lengthy, simply repeats Section 16-338 of the 1969 Supplement to the General Statutes. There are a few words changed, and these words are of some importance. This particular statute is one which came into being in 1965 as a result of the condition of the New Haven Railroad, which at that time was practically dead and almost ready for burial. This House recognized the problem and did something about it. What I mean by doing something is that they provided funds which have resulted in saving this railroad, and before too long probably showing some rather vast improvement. Now, the Amendment calls for an increase from 20% to 30% of certain funds to be made available to the Department of Transportation in order that these additional funds may be used to help save our urban bus companies throughout the State of Connecticut. I think all of us are well aware of the desparate position of our bus companies. The one which serves Hartford, New Haven and Stamford, as we know, is the Connecticut Company. You will read an editorial in the Hartford evening paper tonight regarding their

EFH

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 42A.

situation. I have before me a small editorial which appeared in the Waterbury paper last evening regarding the situation there, which company serves Waterbury and Bridgeport. The Mayors of the ...all of the larger cities of the State of Connecticut have...

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Reinhold has the floor.

FRANK M. REINHOLD, SR.:

The Mayors of all of the large cities of Connecticut have been pleading with the Public Utilities Commission to take some action in this field, but their hands are largely tied. I would like to quote from the editorial in the Waterbury paper of last evening...just one or two sentences, to this effect. "The Chairman of the Commission expressed it very succinctly when he stated that everyone is opposed to restricted bus operations, but how can you order a public utility to lose money." Well, what is happening is that the buses, because of their terrible financial situation, are cutting back on night runs, Sunday service, holiday service, and the sort. Now, we've got to keep in mind that there are a large percentage of the people of our State...very young people...very old people...a lot in between...who, for some physical infirmity of one sort or another cannot drive an automobile. There are many poor people who do not have automobiles. And bus service, particularly for those commuters who have to get to and from work, is a practical necessity.

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman is not being heard. Could some of the conferences taking place on the floor take place off the floor.

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 43A.

FRANK M. REINHOLD, SR.:

EFH

Now, this Amendment, which, as I said, increases from 20 to 30% certain funds, is a bit involved, but with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain in some detail just how it functions. Beginning in 1965, with the passage of the statute at that time, the figure of 20%, or one-fifth, of all of the utility or public service tax monies paid into the General Fund of the State of Connecticut were made available to the Department of Transportation. Back in those days we did not have a Department of Transportation. It was made available to the Connecticut Transportation Authority for the purpose of saving and improving the New Haven Railroad for the transportation of persons and goods. Now, that Fund has worked and has worked exceedingly well. It has never been overexpended, but it is needed for the railroad situation...the full amount. In order to make additional monies available for the saving of the bus systems of our State, this Amendment has been put together, which, according to my arithmetic, will make available to the Department of Transportation something between a million and a million-and-a-half dollars of additional money for the purpose outlined.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House will stand at ease.

FRANK M. REINHOLD, SR.:

I'm about finished.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House will stand at ease. Will the aisles be cleared. The gentleman from the 171st, speaking on the Amendment.

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

44A.

EFH

FRANK M. REINHOLD, SR.:

I've about finished with the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. I believe it has been covered fairly in detail. I can enlarge upon it if anyone requires additional information. I believe it's exceedingly important that something be done in this area. I move acceptance of the Amendment as outlined, and I request a roll call vote, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on a roll call. All those in favor indicate by saying "aye". In the opinion of the Chair, an insufficient amount have asked for a roll call. Will you remark further on Amendment Schedule "A".

DAVID LAVINE:

Just very briefly. I'd just...I'd like to support the Amendment. There's one point that the distinguished Representative did not mention which is a concern to many of us who have been working in the environment area. Very simply it's this. If we lose our bus transportation, we're going to be forced into more and more use of automobiles, and this is something that none of us relish...none of us look for. We are just absolutely going to have to work towards mass transportation as a solution to some of our major problems. We cannot see the future which is going to be bogged by the haze of fumes from cars, and we are going to have to get behind Bills like this and other legislation which talks to this particular problem. We're going to have to start doing a lot of thinking and homework, and I hope we pass this particular Amendment.

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 45A.

NICHOLAS A. LENGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support this Amendment. It's timely. It's well-conceived, and it's absolutely essential. I think it's been adequately explained. It's life blood for motor bus systems in this State, and it's life blood and a continuation and furtherance of mass transit, or rapid public transit. It's well-grounded in...and very well safeguarded in terms of the financial aspects, and I think it falls within the requirements that have been established thus far in these late hours for giving a green light to legislation. I think we ought to give it a resounding vote of support.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment "A".

NICHOLAS M. MOTTO:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, support this Amendment simply because I think our problem in the cities and in transportation in general, this would indeed help the mass transportation. I support this Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Amendment.

LEONARD G. FRAZIER:

Mr. Speaker, I, too, arise to support this Amendment. In the core cities of all our major urban areas, due to the disorders, many, many people now have to go either by cab or private car to get to the markets. Here, in Hartford, for instance, we've lost four supermarkets and 14 drug stores. Mr. Speaker, the elderly cannot get the medication that is needed without getting a cab

EFF

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 46A.

or private transportation. Maintaining the buses in the urban areas especially is highly needed. I support this Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Amendment.

RUTH H. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Amendment. I think it is essential that we keep the few remaining bus lines in operation between our suburban and urban centers. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on adoption of Amendment Schedule "A". All those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. "A" is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended.

FRANK M. REINHOLD, SR.:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I now move acceptance of the Bill as amended and passage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. The Bill is passed.

BRUCE L. MORRIS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the Clerk's attention to Page 11, Calendar No. 1601. Sorry, sir, I withdraw that, and I yield to Mr. Reinhold.

FRANK M. REINHOLD, SR.:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I was just a little slow on the uptake there. I now move for suspension of the rules for immediate transmittal of this Bill as amended to the Senate.

RONALD A. SARASIN:

S-82  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1971

VOL. 14  
PART 7  
2874-3413

June 4, 1971

Page 60

other sources of legitimate income for the State and I think vanity is a rich untapped source and this is the beginning.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Mr. President, I didn't realize that I was the signature of this bill. Until Louie told me. However, I move passage of the bill because I feel that anybody that can get signature plates, number plates certainly is big enough to want them and certainly has the ability to pay.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage, will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1078. File 1509. Favorable report of the joint committee on Transportation. Substitute Senate Bill 1308. An Act Concerning the Powers of the Commissioner of Transportation.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This act allows the Commissioner to contract in terms of taking over either a bus or rail transportation necessary with a labor organization and the contract must contain provisions which would protect those rights built up by employees over the years. Arbitration provisions priority for reemployment of employees terminated or layoff, continuation of pension rights and so on.

It's sort of a protective measure. As we see some of the companies, which now provide a great deal of transportation, public transportation for people because of the lack of subsidy and so on, might go under and this would permit protection for the employees who have spent a great number of years working

June 4, 1971

Page 61

and would allow the Commissioner of Transportation to enter into a contract with them. I urge adoption of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further?

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Mr. President and members of the circle, I rise to oppose this bill. I would like to point out a couple small technicalities. The bill provides for the Commissioner of Transportation to take over certain modes of transportation. It has been indicated by my esteemed colleague from the 33rd, that he might do this if, a company was going under or indicating the company might be going to bankruptcy. I don't believe that any businessman should be saddled with a crew that's guilty of putting a company into bankruptcy. And that's exactly what this bill does. It provides that the Commissioner of Transportation shall continue the employment of those who in fact have caused the fall of this company. I would ask the members of the circle to seriously consider this matter. Place yourselves in the position of taking over a bankrupt company and then being saddled with the crew that didn't know how to run it.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, I would refer to line 27 and 28,29 where, assurances of continued employment to the fullest extent possible, consistent with sound management principles. And I believe that they're not going to be totally saddled with people that were they to keep people on, that it would be required based on these principles of management and efficiency, that now exists in our major corporations, that it just is not an automatic granting of people rights. I think it must be justified according to that.

June 4, 1971

Page 62

Senator Crafts:

I accept the points raised, the rebuttal of my comments and would like to ask that the circle continue to read passed the members 3. On line 30. which says, provisions for the preservation of rights, privileges and benefits including but not limited to continuation of pension rights, benefits under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise.

I submit, Mr. President, members of the circle, this is a saddling of unwarranted waste and should not be part of our law.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Mondani, speaking for the third time, if there is no objection.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Again, Senator Crafts has pointed out something that's true, but, with these pension rights and benefits, many of the people involved in this type of employment have contributed, have worked and earned these rights. And if the pensions were weighed they were thrown out. It's conceivable that you could get someone who spent all of his working years, working for a company earning benefits, which are suddenly thrown out, dismissed and discharged. Again, I don't think that this would be abused. I don't think that we're granting someone something that he hasn't earned. He's going to retain his pension rights. This is not abnormal. And what it does do, is, not take the little man, who spent his life working and just throw him out in the street without any benefits whatsoever, that he has contributed and worked toward. I don't think that that's an unreasonable thing in this type of bill.

SENATOR MACAULEY:

Mr. President, members of the circle, I heard the question from Senator

June 4, 1971

Page 63

Crafts' answer by Senator Mondani as to number 2, and I wasn't satisfied with the answer. Because the answer as read by Senator Mondani stopped in the middle of a sentence. The rest of that sentence goes on and says, its talking about priority of reemployment of employees terminated or laidoff. So that, my reading of the full sentence, but, it says that if there's any possible way of reemploying people or hiring other people are the people that you were saddled with originally as posed by the original question are the ones that are going to have to be stuck with and rehire.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mondani, this would be your fourth time.

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Point of order, Mr. President. Under Rule 14, I object.

THE CHAIR:

There's been objection made, Senator Mondani. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage of the bill, signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, I'd like to challenge that vote. I ask for a standing vote, please.

THE CHAIR:

Will those in favor of passage please stand up.

SENATOR BURKE:

I move a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

There's been a move for a roll call vote. All those in favor for a roll call vote signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay".

June 4, 1971

Page 64

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, the challenge came after the Clerk began reading another measure. It's my understanding that until the challenge can only be made before something has been transacted.

THE CHAIR:

It is my judgment, that the challenge was timely. And I so rule. A roll call vote is ordered.

Senator Dowd, you're shaking your head. If you're shaking your head, please make your objection?

SENATOR DOWD:

Mr. President, point of order, sir. I would move, sir, that the request for a roll call is out of order, at this time. The rules specifically provide, that when the vote is doubted, it shall be taken by standing. And consequently sir, I would suggest that the proper, that the motion for a roll call would be out of order at this point, since the notice of taking the vote was clearly decided and is specifically covered in the rules.

THE CHAIR:

It is the Chair's opinion, that that provision must be read with the provision for a roll call vote. We're not talking semantics, here or just theoral mechanics, we're talking about the best method to ascertain the wishes of the members. And I'm well aware of the rule that says it shall be taken by standing vote. But, that must be read in conjunction with the rule that says when 20% or more, have ruled for a roll call vote, there will be a roll call. And it is my opinion, and I rule your point of order, not well taken. That after a standing vote, after a voice vote, before a standing vote has been taken, a roll call vote can be taken as an alternative thereto.

June 4, 1971

Page 65

Now, I had ruled earlier in the session, on a motion of Senator Buckley's that once a standing vote was taken, you could not then have a roll call. Because in my opinion, that would be a sort of appellate vote which is not proper. But it is the Chair's judgment, and I will so rule, that after a voice vote, if a motion for a roll call is supported by 20% of the members, that rule will overcome the rule concerning a standing vote. Let us proceed with the roll.

THE CLERK:

The following is the roll call vote:

Those voting yea were:

SENATORS FAULISO

BURKE

ALFANO

CIARLONE

SULLIVAN

MURPHY

CALDWELL

DOWD

STRADA

POWER

DINIPELLIE

HOULEY

SENATORS SMITH

PAC

EDDY

CUTILLO

BUCKLEY

CASHMAN

PETRONI

RIMER

RUDOLF

MONDANI

FINNEY

Those voting Nay were:

SENATORS ODEGARD

HAMMER

CRAFTS

SENATORS ROME

ZAJAC

GUNTHER

June 4, 1971

Page 66

SENATORS MACAULEY

SENATORS DUPONT

IVES

DENARDIS

THE CHAIR:

The results of the roll call vote:

Whole number voting	33
Necessary for passage	17
Those voting yea	23
Those voting nay	10
Those absent and not voiting	3

Absentees: Jackson, Lieberman and Blake.

In the opinion of the Chair, the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1127, File 1615. Favorable report of the joint committee on Appropriations. Substitute Senate Bill 298. An Act Concerning the Establishment of a Scenic and Protected Rivers System for Connecticut.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. The clerk has an amendment. I move the adoption of the amendment. Will the Clerk, please read the amendment?

THE CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT A, offered by Senator Pac;

Add section 11 as follows: Sec. 11. Section 11 of substitute Seante bill 1458, of the current session is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: Any party may apply for a rehearing within thirty days after publication of an order issued on an application for a certificate or an ~~amendment of a certificate and whether or not such rehearing is sought, may~~

June 9, 1971

Page 83

And so, the attempt here, was to bring a New York State Law into Connecticut and try to impose it on the people. Knowing full well, in advance, that it would not work, legally, but it would have been a beautiful political ploy, to impose upon the people.

It says here, that the combination of inflation and high unemployment undermines, the capacity of governments of all levels to meet the need for public services and to deal effectively with growing social problems. As well as, the capacity of individuals citizens to provide for their own needs.

Mr. President, I'll just point out, one of the most blatant lines imbedded in this amendment itself. It says here, Mr. President, that Connecticut has more persons on welfare for 1000 population than any other state in the nation. And, I would challenge anyone, to tell the people of the State of Connecticut, such a blatant falsehood.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a motion on another bill? And we'll make no attempt to take a vote on this bill.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, I will yield to the Minority Leader.

SENATOR IVES:

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

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, there being no objection.

SENATOR IVES:

I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 1308. Powers of the Transportation Department.

June 9, 1971

Page 84

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection to the passage of this bill? Hearing none the bill is passed.

Under the provisions of the Constitution of the State of Connecticut, I hereby declare, the 1971 Session of the Senate of the State of Connecticut adjourned, Sine Dine.

THE SENATE AT 120'Clock Midnight adjourned Sine Dine!

**S-83**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14**

**PART 8**

**1-468**

**SP.SESS**

**INDEX**

August 2, 1971

51

THE CHAIR: Results of balloting on File No. 781  
The following is the Yea and Nay Vote:

Whole Number Voting	33
Necessary for Passage	24
Those voting Yea	15
Those voting nay	18
Those absent and not voting	3

THE CHAIR:

The bill is not repassed. The veto is sustained.

THE CLERK:

Page 3, second item from the bottom. File No. 1509. P.A. No. 705.  
Sub. for Senate Bill 1308. An Act Concerning the Powers of the Commissioner  
of Transportation.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lieberman:

SENATORLIEBERMAN:

Mr. President. I move for repassage of this bill. I would have to call this bill my sentimental favorite of the session, a kind of Lee Trevino type bill, not wanting to dwell too much on the past, I recall the night about 11:50, Senator Smith stood up to begin a mini philabuster on a residency bill and about thirty seconds to twelve Senator Ives stood up and said he wanted to interrupt. I thought this bill was long dead and I was much thrilled to hear him move for the passage of Senate Bill 1308, and it did in fact pass and became Public Act 705, only to be vetoed later on. The moment of excitement certainly makes this my sentimental favorite. Having said that, may I say briefly that the bill does three things. It allows

August 2, 1971

52

the State Commissioner of Transportation to carry on experimental programs in Mass Transit, It extends the powers of the Transportation Commissioner in this state so that he has the same powers as the same kinds of powers as the Federal Secretary of Transportation to enter into agreements with Labor Organizations working for mass transit companies and finally it allows the Transportation Commissioner of this state to take up to 10% more from the Public Service Tax Fund for the purposes of Mass Transportation and particularly bus transportation. Very briefly, I think we find ourselves in a situation in this state and elsewhere, where this a growing consensus that bus transportation is the most effective way we can move people in a growing state like this and the fact of the matter is that the Bus Companies themselves, seem to be falling into deeper and deeper problems. This bill is an attempt to bridge the gap what seems to be the consensus and the fact. In New Haven and I am sure in the other areas served by bus transportation, people both within the city and the suburban areas depend very, very critically on bus transportation. Without adequate bus transportation in my district I know, and throughout the Greater New Haven area will have trouble getting to work, to places of recreation, to religious institutions to medical care in fact, so I feel that the bill will help the, for instance you know the Connecticut Company has threatened to curtail weekend and evening service. Connecticut Company has labor negotiations coming up at the end of this year and I predict without the possibility to subsidize that this bill affords, a bus ride in Connecticut will cost as much as forty to forty-five cents at the end of this year. So with the hope that the bill will do as well as Trevino has been doing lately, I move repassage of Senate Bill 1308.

August 2, 1971

53

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on repassage?

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, because it is not ten seconds prior to adjournment, I must rise to oppose the repassage of this bill. There are many laudible objectives of this bill, but there are some that are not so laudible and because of this we must sustain the veto. In any experimental veto, undertaken by the Department of Transportation, if they should take over existing bus lines or trains etc., they have to take them over subject to the agreements already in effect. In effect, the state would be saddled with the problems the nation is facing with a transportation strike right now and I believe these restrictions should not be put on the Commissioner of Transportation and that he should have a free hand. I think we should sustain the Governor's veto.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, immediate Roll Call is ordered on repassage.

ROLL CALL ON .P.A. 705. Sub. Senate Bill No. 1308

SENATOR FAULISO	YEA	CIARLONE	YEA
SMITH	YEA	LIEBERMAN	YEA
BURKE	YEA	HAMMER	NAY
ODEGARD	NAY	ZAJAC	NAY
JACKSON	YEA	PRETE	YEA
PAC	YEA	CUTILLO	YEA
ALFANO	YEA	SULLIVAN	YEA
ROME	NAY	BUCKLEY	YEA
EDDY	NAY	CRAFTS	NAY

## ROLL CALL CONTINUED

SENATORS	MURPHY	YEA	
	CASHMAN		NAY
	GUNTHER		NAY
	MACAULEY		ABS
	CALDWELL	YEA	
	PETRONI		NAY
	DOWD		ABS
	RIMER		NAY
	STRADA	YEA	
	RUDOLF		NAY
	DUPONT		ABS
	POWER		NAY
	DINIELLI	YEA	
	IVES		NAY
	MONDANI	YEA	
	DENARDIS		NAY
	HOULEY	YEA	
	FINNEY		NAY

## The Chair:

The following is the Yea and Nay Vote

Whole Number Voting	33
Necessary for Passage	24
Those voting Yea	18
Those voting Nay	15
Those absent and not voting	3

August 2, 1971

55

THE CHAIR:

The bill is not repassed. The veto is sustained.

THE CLERK:

File No. 1215 P.ublic Act 710. Sub. Senate Bill 452. An Act Concerning Connecticut Industrial Assistance.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

I move repassage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President. This bill as the Governor himself says in his veto message, was one of the milestones in helping Connecticut attract industry. Basically, the purpose of a very long document is to authorize the Connecticut Development Commission to purchase industrial sites , to finance construction of new industrial plants, to finance extensions and additions and remodeling to existing indsutrial structures. The bill to the best of my knowledge received unanimous support of this Circle. It had the assistance of the Office of the State Treasurer who was in favor of the principle. It had the draftsmen ship of the State Bond Council, through intercession of the Exncutive Branch of Government, President Nixon's former firm in New York City. I suppose a considerable amount of money was spent on it to have that draftsmanship completed. The bill in my opinon , is not only necessary, but absolutely mandatory in the year 1971, when the State of Connecticut generally has more than ten percent in unemployment, where Bristol and other communities like it have figures ranging from 15, 18 to 20% unemployment. Here is a vehicle