

SB 1530 PA 789 (Vetoed) 1971

Senate 2597-2601, 3401 (6)

House 6034-6047, 6098-6108 (25)

Transportation 532-533, 539-545 (9)

**S-81
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 6
2436-2873**

May 28, 1971

5.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

I move for suspension of the rules.

THE CHAIR:

In each case, there being no objection it is so ordered as recommended by the Majority Leader.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, going back to page 10, we had marked ready Cal. 936. May that be held?

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has three items to read in.

The Raised bill accompanied by emergency certification H.B. 9255, An Act Amending the Charter of Bacon Academy.

THE CHAIR:

Government administration and Policy.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has a Favorable Report. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on General Law on Substitute Senate Bill 317 An Act to Grant Full Rights and Privileges to 18 Year olds.

THE CHAIR:

Table for the Calendar and printing.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has a House Favorable. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Liquor Control on Substitute H.B. 7015 An Act Concerning Wholesaler's Permits.

THE CHAIR:

Table for the Calendar and Printing.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk will now begin with the Calendar as marked.

On page 1 of the Calendar, first item. Cal. 387, File 1364. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Appropriations on Substitute S.B. 1530. An Act Providing for Photographs on Motor Vehicle Operator's Licenses and Extending the License Period.

May 28, 1971

6.

The Clerk has an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ives.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move for the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will the Clerk please read the amendment?

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment A. In line 1 delete the word on and substitute the word, subject to the provisions of Sec. 6 of this Act on. In line 169, bracket the period and insert the following: comma provided one the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles may renew any motor vehicle or motor cycle's operator's license issued on or before June 30, 1972 for either a two year or a four year period according to renewal schedules established by him, so as to effect staggered renewal of all such licenses.

Two. no more than 50% of such licenses being renewed in any month may be issued for a two year period.

Three. Any such license renewed by two year period may be issued with or without a photograph of the licensee.

Four. The fee for any such license issued for a two year period shall be \$8 provided that such license contains a photograph of the licensee. An additional fee of \$1 shall be charged therefore.

In line 241 bracket the word there and insert the following words: subject to the provisions of Section 6 of this act there.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ives.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move for the adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark on the amendment?

May 28, 1971

7.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President very basically this allows the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles to establish a staggered schedule for the renewal of the licenses, So that when we go if the main bill is passed with the photographs on the license, he also may issue a four year license that allows him to set up a staggered schedule.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage of the amendment. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of passage of the amendment, signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

THE CHAIR:

Will you proceed with the bill as amended?

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, the bill provides for the time in Connecticut's history a driver's license on a staggered basis of either two or four years. And eventually on a four year basis. With photographs on the license.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Alfano.

SENATOR ALFANO:

Mr. President, I rise to support this bill. This is a bill that I have had my heart on for many many months. In fact I am very happy to see that it has finally reached the floor of the Senate. And that Connecticut after a long period of time is going to see the photo ident. drivers license. Already there are 22 states that have legislation of this nature. Massachusetts adopted it last year. Several other states are considering it. This particular bill will be, make available a situation where a person can go into the Motor Vehicle Department for a matter of 4 minutes, have his driver's license after he takes his photograph, in a sealed container. He may then be able to leave and have a driver's license for a four year period with his colored

May 28, 1971

8.

photograph on it. And good identification you know. The various local police departments throughout Connecticut have supported this bill for a number of years. The State Police Department has long wanted this bill. Our banks who have had serious problems with forgeries in the state of Connecticut have clamored for the bill. Many of our supermarkets where people have gone in purchased groceries and passed forged checks. Certainly too have been clamoring for the bill. This will resolve a big problem in connection with counterfitting of licenses, which has been a thorn in the Motor Vehicle's Department side. And the police have had a considerable amount of trouble with it.

Of course another area where it is going to be very beneficial is the liquor establishments. Who had real problems with people who had inadequate identifications. Now with the photo ident driver's license. They will be able to adequately identify a person as to his age. And the people have always wanted something where they would have a proper identification so they could identify them. I know in Massachusetts in talking with the Motor Vehicle Commissioner up there he felt that not only with the enforcement agencies and the banks. And the various retailers happy with this legislation, but the people too feel now they have an adequate identification that they can use. And they are very happy and proud to have this.

I might also call the attention of the circle that this bill will pay for itself. You will notice that the increase in the fee over a four year period, is going to be \$1 more for the operator's license. Than it would be otherwise. So it won't cost the state any money. And I think its going to be a tremendous asset to the people in Connecticut and the enforcement agencies. Not only that, when the times comes that all 50 states adopt legislation of this nature, I think its going to be a tremendous weapon in combating crime. Especially that every person with a vehicle now will have an adequate identification. And it will certainly be a great value in assistance to enforcement agencies.

May 28, 1971

9.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage of the bill as amended. Will you remark further? Senator Hammer.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, I like this bill well enough. I am not rising to oppose it. But I would like to ask a question, of Senator Alfano. I've had quite a bitter complaint from one of my constituents. Which I think I ought to bring up. On the four year aspect. My constituent has written me and said what if a person dies? What if a person moves out of state after a year or two years. Do we get our money back? So I just wondered if the Committee addressed itself to this problem at all?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Alfano.

SENATOR ALFANO:

There is no provision in the bill for refunding any money in case a person leaves the state or dies. I assume that they pay for the motor vehicle license and they will lose whatever they have in it if they don't use it.

The four year aspect is really necessary because I am sure every driver does not want to be inconvenienced and go to a regional motor vehicle branch office and have the photograph taken every two years. I think the four year aspect was necessary. Results in increased costs, if a person doesn't use it for four the year period. But there was no other alternative.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not all those in favor of passage of the bill as amended signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 2, Cal. 364, File 907, Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Judiciary on H.B. 9023 An Act Providing the Right to Witnesses to Have Counsel in Grand Jury Appearances.

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 72

THE SENATE AT 10:35 P.M., RECESSED

AFTER RECESS

The Senate was called to order at 10:58 P.M., Senator DeNardis in the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

If I may make this announcement, Senator Caldwell is about to list a long number of bills, by number. And it is extremely important that we have quiet in the Chamber, so there is no confusion as to the bills that he will list. I ask your cooperation.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, I have a list of bills by numbers, to read. I move that we accept the joint committees favorable reports and acceptance of the bills, as follows: Cal. No. 1326, House Bill 7455, File 1256; File No. 1327, House Bill 7686, File 1349; Cal 1328, House Bill 7710, File 820; Cal 1329, House Bill 7744, File 1573, Cal. 1331, House Bill 7903, File 1284; C l. 1332, House Bill 7959, File 1292; Cal 1333, House Bill 7974, File 1382; Cal 1334, House Bill 8033, File 931; Cal 1335, House Bill 8182, File 979; C^al. 1336, House Bill 8228, File 1294; Cal. 1337, House Bill 8284, File 899; C l 1338, House Bill 8683, File 591; CAL. 1340, House Bill 8931 File 123; CAL. 1341, House Bill 8936, File 832; Cal. 1342, House Bill 8967, File 1072; Cal. 1343, House Bill 9025, File 953; Cal. 1345, House Bill 9229, File 1576; Cal. 1346, House Bill 9231, File 1451; CAL. 1347, House Bill 9327; File 704; Cal. 1348, House Bill 9251, File 1574, Cal. 1349, Senate Bill 825; C₂l. 259, Senate Bill 989, File 291; Cal. 695, Senate Bill 1700, File 990; C l. 732, Senate Bill 458, File 1052; CAL. 139, House Bill 7447, File 104; CAL. 166, House Bill 6409, File 136; Cal. 1363, House Bill 9194, File 1634; C^al. 1364, House Bill 5231

H-120

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 26A.

come in to conformity with the Town of Haddam, they would like to set a maximum mill rate at 15 mills, and they would like to set a minimum dollar per lot at six dollars per lot in assessment. I move that we accept the favorable report.

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Bill. If not, the question's on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill in concurrence. All those in favor will indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. The Bill is passed.

BRUCE L. MORRIS:

Mr. Speaker, I draw the Clerk's attention to Page 4, Calendar No. 1291.

THE CLERK:

Bottom of Page 4, Calendar No. 1291, Substitute for S.B. No. 1530, an Act providing for photographs on motor vehicle operator's licenses and extending the license period. As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill in concurrence with the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on acceptance and passage in concurrence. Will you remark.

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has Senate Amendment "A", and I wish he would read it, because it's important...extremely important

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 27A.

for the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk will please call Senate "A".

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A", adopted by the Senate on May 28th. In Line 1, delete the word "on" and substitute the words "subject to the provisions of Section 6 of this Act, on". In Line 169 bracket the period and insert the following: ", provided (1) the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles may renew any motor vehicle or motorcycle operator's license issued on or before June 30th, 1972, for either a two-year or four-year period according to renewal schedules established by him so as to affect staggered renewal of all such licenses; (2) no more than 50% of such licenses being renewed in any month may be issued for a two-year period; (3) any such license renewed for a two-year period may be issued with or without a photograph of the licensee; and (4) the fee for any such license issued for a two-year period shall be \$8.00, provided that such license contains a photograph of the licensee, An additional fee of \$1.00 shall be charged therefor." In Line 241 bracket the word "there" and insert the following words: "subject to the provisions of Section 6 of this Act, there".

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the Amendment.

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on adoption of Senate "A". Will you remark.

EFH

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 28A.

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, this is a phasing-in process, particularly when you consider there's one-and-three-quarter-million, approximately, license holders in the State of Connecticut, which will have to be processed to this new photo-containing license type within the next year, and year or two. I move adoption of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Senate "A".

HENRY A. POVINELLI:

Mr. Speaker, through you, to the gentleman reporting out the Amendment, relative to the photographs...the dollar charge. Would that be a one-time charge, or would that dollar remain on indefinitely.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 110th care to respond?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

That would be every time the license is renewed or on that first issue. Every time you receive a license, there would be a dollar charge.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Bill.

SIDNEY M. SHERER:

Mr. Speaker, a question through you, to the proponent of the Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please state your question.

EFH

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 29A.

SIDNEY M. SHERER:

When do you feel that the State will have all licenses photographed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

With the phasing in, and also the fact that each license on the basis of the setup we have now, it would have taken two years, plus the phasing in one year, so that means the entire State would be covered in a period of three years.

SIDNEY M. SHERER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Amendment. If not, the question is on its adoption.

FRANCIS J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might take just a moment to look at the Amendment. I haven't seen a copy of it. Maybe a question, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman introducing the Bill. It's my understanding that the Bill in the file would require licenses to be renewed in person because of the photographing situation. Does the Amendment, sir, make any change in that requirement?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

No, it simply allows...sorry, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, the Amendment allows an extended year in order to

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 30A.

accomplish this phasing-in process.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Senate "A". Question is on its adoption. All those in favor will indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. Senate "A" is adopted. Will you remark on the Bill as amended.

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, now I move acceptance of the Bill as amended, by Schedule "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Bill as amended.

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Bill provides that on and after July 1st, 1972, the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles shall issue new and renewal motor vehicle operators' licenses containing an instant full-face, color photograph of the licensee, which shall be signed by the licensee and encased in a laminated plastic by the Commissioner. Nothing in this Section of the Bill is beamed to prohibit the Commissioner from acquiring, leasing or purchasing and installing at the Department of Motor Vehicles the necessary equipment for taking and processing the instant color photo into a plastic laminated encased license. Such license will be renewed quadrennially...that's once in every four years...at a fee of \$17, and this fee is determined at the rate of \$4.00 a year, which is our current fee, plus the additional dollar for the photo and the lamination. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some observations, even though the Bill doesn't include other

EFH

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 31A.

EFH

factors that it does take care of. The first observation that I want to make is the cost of this changeover. In our Transportation Committee, testimony was given by the Motor Vehicle Department that this cost would amount to about \$4,000,000. Yet, when we had a sample run from a company who has this special equipment who is making it available on a lease basis or outright purchase to the Motor Vehicle Department, pointed out that the process of taking the photo and laminating after the license is signed and affixing the photo to the license and then laminating it would cost approximately 40¢. This leaves the Motor Vehicle Department, for each application, a matter of 60¢ for processing, which is more than ample on the basis of past experience in other states. This has been proven out by statistics. Second factor I may make note of is counterfeiting. It's hardly believeable that with this unique machine that takes the photo and prepares the plastic lamination with its distinct characteristics that they can be duplicated, unless you duplicate the machine. Another observation is many of us have had occasion to present an identification, whether it's cashing a check or whatever the matter may be. This is a positive identification without much question, because anybody can ask for your license, and you can show your picture, unless, of course, if you've taken your picture, since then you've grown a heavy beard and probably long hair and haven't had a haircut. That's the end of my observation. To continue on with the Bill, Mr. Speaker, it also provides that all records pertaining to the operators' licenses of the current or previous five years shall be open to public inspection at any reasonable time during the

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 32A.

regular office hours of the Motor Vehicle Department. Records over five years old may be destroyed at the discretion of the Commissioner. It also provides that an applicant who has not held a Connecticut Motor Vehicle or a Motorcycle Operator's license for the past four years must demonstrate to the Commissioner that he is a proper person to operate a motor vehicle or a motorcycle. It further provides that any person under twenty-one years old, or of age, who, in operating a motor vehicle violates any of the provisions of the Motor Vehicle Laws pertaining to speeding, reckless driving, evading responsibility and operating while intoxicated shall have his license revoked until he or she attains the age of twenty-one and suspend the right to operate a motor vehicle for such period as the Commissioner may determine. This is an excellent Bill, Mr. Speaker. The people of the State of Connecticut have awaited its coming a long time. I move its passage with the Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further.

JOHN G. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of Mr. Gudelski.

MR. SPEAKER:

State your question.

JOHN G. MATTHEWS:

I'm not clear. I don't know whether the point has been brought up. What happens if someone loses this plastic photograph license? Could you tell us anything about that?

MR. SPEAKER:

EFH

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 33A.

Does the gentleman from the 110th care to respond? EFH

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, through you, I'm sure that you would follow the same procedure as it is on the first issue or on renewal where you will have to have your picture taken again, except, of course, your license will be renewed on a basis of existing statutes, but that additional one dollar for the processing of the photo and the lamination will be charged the applicant.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further.

JOHN G. MATTHEWS:

Thank you. One other question. Does the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles have the manpower to do this, or can he get it within some way, so that we don't have a difficult time administering it readily?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 110th care to respond?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, through you. With the time involved here of three years and the fact that this can be worked in immediately after the passage of the Bill, there is ample personnel available to process this particular new license.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further.

ASTRID T. HANZALEK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm aware of some of the advantages of having this new kind of identification, but I wonder

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 34A.

whether the Motor Vehicle Department offices would not have to be open weekends and evenings, and so forth, because there are an awful lot of people who do have to work for a living, and they couldn't possibly get to the Motor Vehicle Bureau offices without taking time off from work. I'm not sure whether that ought to be a question or just a rhetorical question, but thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further.

FRANCIS J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is ^{apparently} broad support for a Bill of this nature, but unfortunately I must rise and oppose this Bill. The estimated cost on this Bill is some 1.2 million dollars as estimated by the Department of Finance and Control. Their estimates of revenues produced by a Bill of this nature would be some \$450,000, leaving a net revenue requirement of some \$760,000 that would be locked into the budget for the next few years to implement a program of this nature. It's my understanding that the Motor Vehicle Department opposes this Bill on the basis that it would create an administrative nightmare from their standpoint, requiring not only substantially increased additional personnel but also requiring a change in hours in the operation of the branch offices to accommodate the public, particularly because of the fact that renewals of licenses would require the applicants to come to the offices in person where it's now done by mail. There is also a feeling that there would be a tremendous inconvenience, as mentioned by the lady from the 40th, to the motoring public in the fact that they would have to get to the offices

EFH

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 35A.

during the time the offices were open and in accordance with respective work schedules. I think, Mr. Speaker, the benefits to be gained by this are certainly less than the anticipated cost and administrative burden. Primarily the people that would be benefited by a Bill of this nature are commercial establishments who might require the licensing and be happy to have the photographs for identification purposes. It would not appear that it would substantially affect the motoring public, or the State of Connecticut, by requiring photographs on licenses.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Bill.

HENRY A. POVINELLI:

Mr. Speaker, a question through you, if I may to the distinguished...

MR. SPEAKER:

State your question.

HENRY A. POVINELLI:

...to the distinguished gentleman from New Haven reporting out the Bill. At one point in your explanation, you mentioned that, and correct me if I'm wrong, that an individual 16 to 21, if he is convicted of speeding on the first conviction, he shall lose his license till he's 21?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is the intent of this Bill.

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 36A.

EFH

HENRY A. POVINELLI:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I can pursue this just a little bit further.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

HENRY A. POVINELLI:

Speaking along the same lines, someone 21 years of age or over, being convicted of speeding for the first time, would not lose his license. Am I correct in asking this?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I can only respond insofar with what the Bill says. The Bill says that anybody under 21 will have his license revoked until he is 21 or, if at the discretion of the Commissioner, the suspension is imposed that is much longer than 21 years old.

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 120th has the floor.

HENRY A. POVINELLI:

Mr. Speaker, just to pursue it just one step further.

In my opinion, if an individual 21 years of age is allowed to speed and not be, or not have his license suspended upon the first conviction, in my estimation, it would be taking an unfair advantage of those under 21. I'm not justifying the fact that they're speeding, but it seems a little ludicrous to allow those over 21 to speed on the first conviction and those under 21 not. Thank you,

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 37A.

Mr. Speaker.

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further.

BERNARD L. AVCOLLIE:

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I can't quite believe what I just heard. I wonder if I might ask, through you, one more time, to Mr. Gudelski. Am I correct in what I ^{have} heard within the past few minutes from Mr. Gudelski, that this Bill requires suspension of a 16-year-old convicted of speeding until he's 21, or until the Commissioner, in his own discretion or sole discretion, reinstates? Is that right?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, through you, please. The intent of the Bill is if his is under 21 and he violates the four Motor Vehicle Laws, his license will be revoked until he is 21, or if, in the discretion of the Motor Vehicle, the offense carries the suspension beyond his birthday of 21.

MR. SPEAKER:

Remark further.

BERNARD L. AVCOLLIE:

Through you, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker. Which offenses besides speeding are you referring to. Did you say four offenses or just speeding?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 38A.

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The four violations that are involved are speeding, reckless driving, evading responsibility and operating while intoxicated.

BERNARD L. AVCOLLIE:

And, Mr. Speaker, one final question. Any one of those offenses? Is that correct, Mr. Gudelski?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond? Through the Chair, please, gentlemen. Does the gentleman care to respond?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Through the Chair, if you please, Mr. Speaker. That is correct.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Bill.

BERNARD L. AVCOLLIE:

Mr. Speaker, that's fantastic. I can't quite imagine what would even require us to sit and consider such a Bill. Five years without a license for a young man or young lady under 21 is worse than 30 years without parole that we considered here a couple of weeks ago. The punishment doesn't fit the crime. And as good as the rest of the Bill might be, but, frankly, I haven't heard anything good about it, I'd have to oppose it on that basis alone.

BRUCE L. MORRIS:

Mr. Speaker, I move you, sir, that this matter be passed temporarily until we can straighten out this matter. Mr. Speaker,

EFH

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 39A.

we'd like to continue our business on the Calendar...

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

The matter will be passed temporarily.

BRUCE L. MORRIS:

Mr. Speaker, I draw the Clerk's attention to Page 18...

Page 18, a Disagreeing Action, Calendar No. 1248.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the 84th, Representative Ryan, after the Clerk calls the Calendar item.

THE CLERK:

Page 18, Calendar No. 1248, Substitute for H.B. No. 7041, an Act concerning the use and operation of snowmobiles. As amended by House Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A".

WILLIAM F. RYAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would first of all move the adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk will call Senate "A".

WILLIAM F. RYAN:

May I ask that the reading be waived.

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman will outline Amendment "A".

WILLIAM F. RYAN:

Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment Schedule "A" is purely a technical Amendment that corrects a small error which has deleted the \$50 fine if the operator refused to stop at the request of an law enforcement officer. This is a house-cleaning Amendment that

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 90A.

EFH

ROY HENRY ERVIN:

Mr. Speaker, I now move adoption of the Bill with House Schedule "A" and Senate Schedule "A" as amended.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Bill as twice amended. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. Bill is passed.

PETER W. GILLIES:

Mr. Speaker, going back to Page 4, Calendar No. 1291, which had been passed temporarily.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the gentleman allow the Clerk to call the item.

THE CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar No. 1291, Substitute for S.B. No. 1530, an Act providing for photographs on motor vehicle operator's licenses and extending the license period. As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Earlier today the House adopted Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill in concurrence with the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on acceptance and passage as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark further.

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has House Amendment Schedule "A".

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 91A.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", offered by Mr. Gudelski, of the 110th, Mr. Holdsworth, of the 125th, Mr. Nichols, of the 138th. In Lines 111 and 112, delete the following language: "until he attains the age of twenty-one years". In Line 112, bracket the word "and" and insert the word "or".

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 110th, on House Amendment Schedule "A".

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, through you, may I yield to Representative Holdsworth?

EARL T. HOLDSWORTH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This, unbeknown to most all of us, including the Legislative Commissioner, the Bill as was presented in the file is the existing law as it is today. The problem arose where the term of the license was extended from two to four years. Now the Amendment strikes out this sentence, and leaves it up to the discretion of the Commissioner relative to revocation or suspension of the license. There's nothing mandatory. It strictly leaves it up to the Commissioner, and actually this is an improvement for the young people who are ages 16 to 21, who are driving, that their licenses not necessarily have to be suspended or revoked. So actually this is an improvement. This is a change in the law from what it was existing. I, therefore, move adoption of the Amendment...House Amendment "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

EFH

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 92A

Will you remark on House "A".

HENRY A. POVINELLI:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for a point of information and clarification for my own edification, Mr. Speaker. Question through you to the distinguished gentleman from Trumbull reporting on the Amendment, if I may. Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As far as the legislative intent, there is nothing in this Bill that discriminates against the teen-ager from 16 to 21 versus the 21 or over driver?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

EARL T. HOLDSWORTH:

Sorry, Mr. Speaker. That is correct. There is no... There was, in the existing law, a discriminating factor, which we are, with this Amendment, changing to eliminate this discrimination.

HENRY A. POVINELLI:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on House "A".

STANLEY BIGOS:

Mr. Speaker, in the previous debate there's some figures given on the cost of this Bill, and since the Bill had been passed temporarily, I was able to obtain some figures, too, and I find that if we work this on a four-year cycle that the cost factor is nowhere near as much as it has been reported to be. Now, in the first year the cost is \$1,200,000. Then, in the second year, it

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 93A.

becomes \$1,049,000, and in the third year \$995,000, and in the fourth year...

MR. SPEAKER:

For what purpose does the gentleman from the 126th rise?

GERARD S. SPIEGEL:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please state your point of order.

GERARD S. SPIEGEL:

I believe the honorable gentleman is talking on the Bill, not the Amendment. I don't disagree with what he says, but I think he should hold it.

MR. SPEAKER:

I think he's made his point.

STANLEY BIGOS:

Mr. Speaker, how do I correct a wrong figure, if I'm not able to speak on this again?

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the gentleman try to conclude his remarks on House Amendment Schedule "A".

STANLEY BIGOS:

I'll conclude my remarks that I'm in favor of this Schedule.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is that Schedule "A", or the dollar schedule you just mentioned?

RICHARD B. EDWARDS:

EFH

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 94A.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, a question for Representative Holdsworth. In Line 105 it says about any person, "or who has", this being the driver, "who has a record on file with the Commissioner which is sufficient in the opinion of the Commissioner to require revocation of such license". Do you feel this is a fairly broad...how does this come...does this match up with the Bills, for instance, that we had one today which required a hearing or gave the privilege of a hearing. Doesn't this give the Commissioner a pretty wide latitude?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

EARL T. HOLDSWORTH:

Mr. Speaker, this is an existing law.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Amendment.

RICHARD B. EDWARDS:

It gives a pretty wide latitude.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on House "A".

ROY HENRY ERVIN:

Mr. Speaker, going back to a question asked, and I'd like to ask a question through you, Mr. Speaker to Mr. Holdsworth. Mr. Povinelli had asked you this. It's discriminating against people under 21. I believe you said "no", Mr. Holdsworth. But looking at the Amendment, I look at Line 88, which still remains in the Bill, I believe, and there it says, "any person under 21 years of age operating a motor vehicle", and then it goes on to say...the

language stays the same. Isn't the Commissioner still given the right to discriminate, if you want to use that term, against these people, with that language remaining in this?

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond? If not, the question's on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". All those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. House "A" is adopted. Does the Clerk have further Amendments? If not, the question's on acceptance and passage as amended by Senate "A" and House "A". Will you remark further.

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I made my remarks previously when this Bill was first taken up, and they still stand. I move acceptance of the Bill as amended by Schedule "A" from the Senate and Schedule "A" from the House.

ALBERT W. CRETELLA, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, in support of the Bill, I would respond to the inquiry that Representative Ervin just asked a moment ago, and that is this. The law today makes reference to a holder of a license under the age of 21. That's today's law, and it calls that person a "provisional license holder". This Bill merely deleted all reference to provisional license holders and instead substituted the words "a license holder under the age of 21", so the law has not been changed in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Bill as amended.

HILDA S. CLARKE:

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 96A.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions to the proponent of the Bill. Where do you go to get the photographs taken? You have to go to the Motor Vehicle place in your own town? Is that it?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct...at a Motor Vehicle license office.

HILDA S. CLARKE:

And one more question through you, Mr. Speaker. The cost of the machine. It was very costly. Wouldn't they have to have one in every town for it?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, this is left at the discretion of the Motor Vehicle Commissioner, and this equipment is available on a lease basis, purchase outright or rental basis, and I might point out that this is an example of what that machine does, and this is what your license will look like, and the cost, and again I repeat, for the photo and the lamination is 40¢...60¢ is allowed for processing of the application.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks. If not, all those in favor indicate by ...excuse me, Representative Dooley, of the 47th.

THOMAS H. DOOLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I think it's a very, very poor piece of legislation. Even though the

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 97A.

Amendment has brought existing law relative to the suspension of a young person's drivers license back to where it is now, I still oppose the Bill for the purpose of having the photographs on the license. I happen to represent a District which is approximately an hour-and-a-half's round trip from anywhere in Connecticut where you could get such a photograph, and I also object to the expenditure of State's monies to help merchants. Now, I think Representative Collins, here, today, indicated that the Motor Vehicle Department is not in favor of this Bill. I have yet to hear from one of my constituents who are in favor of the Bill, and if a merchant feels that he should have some identification containing a photograph, then I expect...I would suggest that he spend his own funds and issue credit cards with those photographs on it. It's a poor piece of legislation, and I would urge its defeat.

STANLEY BIGOS:

I'm going to say now what I couldn't say before, because ...thank you...I wound up with the fourth year where the cost is \$1,100,000. Now, the increase in revenue amounts to \$750,000 for the first year, and then the increase in revenue amounts to \$1,000,000 annually, which means that the cost of implementing this program is not as great as it appeared to be when you were given the report before. There's one other factor to consider... that we are dealing in many situations with people who have had counterfeit licenses. I understand there are three states...New Jersey, Oregon and Maryland...

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Bigos has the floor.

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 98A.

STANLEY BIGOS:

EFH

Thank you...where they do a booming business issuing counterfeit licenses, and a license such as we have in Connecticut, which is nothing more than a very simple piece of paper, can be counterfeited easily...and a substitution of licenses. Licenses are handed over from one person to another, and another person sometimes is not the one who has any kind of a license. There are a few of the things that are a benefit accruing from this law.

WILLIAM C. LEARY:

Mr. Speaker. Very briefly. I rise in support of this Bill. I think it's an excellent idea that our drivers license, which are...which are currently used, I think, as the prime means of identification contain a photograph so that people attempting to pass bad checks, minors attempting to buy liquor, and so forth, could be discovered. I think it's a good Bill, and I urge its adoption.

ELMER A. MORTENSEN:

Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I met with many representatives of the banks in all of this neighborhood around Hartford, at the Mayor's office in Hartford some months ago. We met with the Welfare Department. They attended these meetings, and everyone of them was in favor and was asking for this. There are thousands and thousands of dollars lost by the banks every year because of cashing checks. There are thousands of dollars lost in the Welfare Department because of the same thing. There are many calls made by Police Departments to check on drivers whom they're suspicious whether they have the right

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 99A.

license or not. All of this would be eliminated. The Highway Department was represented there. The officials of the Highway Department said they could live with this. They weren't in favor of it because it was going to be a little more work, but upon the second and third meetings that we had in the City Hall, here in Hartford, they went along with the Bill. I urge the passage of this Bill. This Bill would cover a lot of territory. It would save a lot of money, even though it does cost a little bit of money, and I'm ready to vote, Mr. Chairman, in favor of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on acceptance and passage as twice amended.

MARILYN PEARSON:

Just briefly, I'd like to support the Bill, and I'm looking at the picture that Representative Gudelski had. I didn't notice that it had raised lettering on it. It's all sealed... tamper-proof, which I am in favor of. I had a similar piece of legislation. But I might suggest that we might consider the possibility of embossed lettering at some time or another, because I have thought that perhaps in the future there could be some type of a process whereby a police officer or an attendant could carry, perhaps, a small portable machine on his hip, and if you had a parking fine, you could automatically have it as a credit card. I think this is a good Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HENRY A. POVINELLI:

Mr. Speaker, just one final question, very briefly, to the gentleman reporting out the Bill. Is there a rebate provision in this Bill in the event someone dies after paying the \$17 fee?

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 100A

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

EDWARD S. GUDELSKI:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any rebates.

HENRY A. POVINELLI:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on acceptance and passage. All those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. Bill is passed.

PETER W. GILLIES:

Mr. Speaker, Page 7, of the Calendar, Mr. Speaker. Calendar No. 1544, Substitute for S.B. No. 558, an Act concerning the arbitration of Public Works' claims, File No. 1247. I move that that matter be recommitted to the Committee on Judiciary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Bill is recommitted.

PETER W. GILLIES:

On Page 3, Mr. Speaker. It's time to run it up the flagpole. Calendar No. 0883.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before we begin with this Bill, may I indicate to the Members it's our intention to recess somewhere between 7 and 7:30 for no longer than an hour-and-a-half. When we come back, I'd urge you to respect the original request not to invite friends, or family or guests on to the floor. We cannot conduct the business. We will not conduct the business unless the aisles are cleared

EFH

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

TRANSPORTATION

**PART 2
338-674**

1971

Chairman Mondani presiding

Members present:

Sen: Burke

Reps: O'Dea, Reinhold, Holdsworth, Pugliese, Miller, Boggini
Gudelski, Nichols, McHugh, Connors, Gregorzek, DeBaise

Sen: Mondani: Good morning. We will allow the legislators to speak the first half hour as is our usual custom.

Sen. Alfano: Members of the Transportation Committee, I'm here in support of S.B. 1530, or any other bill which has the objective of hearing out photographs on driver's licenses. This particular bill I'm supporting calls for the instant photograph. This is a means by which any operator would go to the Motor Vehicle Department of a branch of the Motor Vehicle Department, within a matter of three or four minutes have his photograph taken and, thereafter his photograph would be given to him in a plastic sealed container, of a permanent nature. Now we talk about law enforcement over a period of many years, the tools that we can give to the police enforcement agencies throughout Connecticut. I know of no better tool that you can give them than the photograph on a motor vehicle operators license. I've talked with members of the various local enforcement agencies throughout the towns in Connecticut, before I introduced this bill, I talked with members of the State Police Department, they all indicated that they would very highly support legislation of this nature. It would be of a tremendous advantage to them. The advantages, of course, would be in the counterfeiting field of licenses, license switching which is so prevalent today throughout Connecticut. The many forgeries that take place in our banking institutions in Connecticut, everybody suffers as a result of this, depositors, and savings banks, and mutual savings banks, The prevalent use of counterfeiting driver's licenses, or license minors in the purchase of alcohol beverages, the grocery stores have tremendous problems today in cashing checks, people using phony identification or drivers license's that aren't theirs. So this is I think, would be a tremendous asset to our law enforcement agencies in Connecticut. It would help them apprehend criminals on the highways, who now do not have an adequate identification. Most of important, I checked with some of the states who have enacted laws of this nature, I've talked with the Deputy Motor Vehicle Commissioner of the State of Massachusetts, they are all very, very happy with their legislation. In fact, the people want it, they want some permanent form of identification which they can use to establish their identity. Already some 22 states have enacted legislation of this nature. I think the time is here in which Connecticut should immediately take this initiative and put a program of this nature in the State. Costs is provided for in the bill I have introduced, if you look at the bill, it will go up one dollar, which makes it nine dollars. This is not costly because we have States of Massachusetts, where I think, a driver's license is now ten dollars, and I think in New Hampshire it's twelve dollars. So the additional cost would take care of the installation of this system and of the administrative cost of them. The only possible opposition I can know of to this, the Motor Vehicle Department in the past has reluctantly refused to take on the tremendous administrative task of putting this program into affect. I don't know what the new administration's policy is, but I think it's so important to the people in Connecticut, that we adopt a driver photo ident license, that the Motor Vehicle Department should take on the additional task, and be very happy to give us these additional tools that will aid our law enforcement agencies in Connecticut. Thank you.

FRIDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 2, 1971

Sen. Mondani: Thank you Senator. Senator Crafts.

Sen. Crafts: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I'd like to very briefly lend my voice in support of Senator's Alfano's bill 1530. I do think it's a good protective measure for the people of the State of Connecticut, and it should be enacted. I would like to speak in favor also of H.B. 5245 AN ACT REPEALING THE REQUIREMENT THAT MOTORCYCLISTS AND THEIR PASSENGERS WEAR HEADGEAR. To my knowledge no ones life has ever been saved because they wore a headgear while riding a motorcyle, and I do believe it impairs the vision, it's most uncomfortable to wear, and I urge your favorable consideration of this bill. And, in conjunction with this H.B. #6332 which is a new bill pertaining to headgear for motorcyclists, and while your considering 5245, I would ask you to oppose 6332. A favorable on 5245, naturally follows that an unfavorable should be voted on 6332. Thank you.

Rep. Rose: Representative Rose, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Transportation Committee. I want to speak in favor of H.B. 5245, 7596 and S.B. 696. S.B. 696 is a qualification for motor vehicle and motorcycle operators licenses requiring annual inspections and of the operator and of the vehicle. And, this is in conformity with the Federal Uniform Safety Code and I think that it is high time we in Connecticut can adopt this type of legislation, which does protect the public. The bill which has to do with license plates for motorcyles, 7596 is a very simple bill, which simply states that registration plates on motorcyles may also have the option buying at special rates plates which have initials, which under the present law we allow automobile license plates to buy at an additional costs, license plates that have initials. I can see no reason to discriminate against the motorcycle in this particular area. My main thrust this morning speaking to you Gentlemen, and Ladies is to support the repeal of the present compulsory helmet law which has been on the books now for some four years. I'm sure many of you who have been in the legislation know how this has been waged up and down in the past few years. You know that I am a motorcyclist, I've riden motorcycles all my life, I find it an extremely wonderful sport, a very attractive method of quick transportation about in local areas and I even come to the Capitol when the weather is good, on it. I do not consider it a vehicle which is a primary dangerous vehicle, anymore than an automobile, it is a matter of skill, matter of passing proper examinations, and soforth. The fundamental issue is as I see it, in repealing a compulsory helmet law is this. If you as the public is coming down the highway, bringing a automobile with your family aboard, and you see a motorcyclist coming in the opposite direction, my question to you as a motorist is this. Do you feel safer as the motorist in that automobile, if the person coming toward you on the motorcycle has a helmet on, or does not have a helmet on? Does it have any bearing on your safety as the public? In my judgement it has no bearing whatsoever. And this is what the area of legislation sofar as Transportation is concerned involved in, is safety of the public. You attempt to impose upon an individual his right to protect himself in the manner in which he feels is protection, seems to me to be outside the purview of the legislation. This caused all sorts of difficulties, all over the country. I would remind you that no country in the world has compulsory helmet legislation, except the present temporary one which is now on our books. The riding of motorcycles is something which is becoming extremely popular in our country in the last few years. And because of the unfortuante happenings of some of the so called "Hell Angles Clubs" and soforth there has been

FRIDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 2, 1971

should not be driving or should have limited licenses. And in the past you had many attempts at controlling this to some extent. Most of the attempts I feel in the past have been either unworkable or too costly or created hardships and things of that nature. So in thinking of it I think that I have found a way to correct it in some extent. And I think this bill might perhaps do it, and it's a very simple thing, all we're doing in the bill is to say that the Motor Vehicle Department shall add a question to the license renewal. And the question would say "have you had a heart attack, stroke, or any incapacitating illness since your last renewal" and any individual who checked off "yes" would then be summoned for a physical inspection, or their own Doctor could submit a statement saying that they are capable of driving. Now obviously this is not going to be one hundred per cent effective, but it does play on the fact that most people are honest and most people will answer the question truthfully. I don't believe this would cost anything, it would not create any great problems, it would not ^{as}Some of the other proposed legislation in the past have done, be aimed directly at older people. This would be at any age, and it would be, eliminate the idea of periodical sections. And I think it's worth, I think it would work to a great extent and I would like to see the thing considered. Thank you.

Rep. Boggini: May I have a few moments please? Representative Boggini from Manchester. I'm speaking for Representative Mahoney and myself, he couldn't get here. I want to speak in opposition to bill number 8390. This is the bill which requires eye tests and written tests for all persons 65 years of age and older. Now I spoke to Mr. Yedziniak who introduced the bill, and he told me that he would be willing to ~~delete~~ the part relating to a written test. He told me he would do this. I also feel that it's discriminatory only to force senior citizens, people over 65 to take the eye test. I've spoken to many of them and they tell me they would not object to taking the eye test along with everybody else, but it shouldn't be limited only to them. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Now we will ask if any one else wishes to speak in terms of photograph licenses, and let me read the bill numbers, so that we can hear them all at once, there's quite a group of them. S.Bs. 91, 124, 385, 1252, 1374, 1530, H.Bs. 6158, 6607, 7305, 8290, 5128, 5144, 5346, 5499, or any other such bills, that isn't with us today, but deals with photos on licenses.

Mr. Courtney: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Neil Courtney Executive Director of the Connecticut Food Stores Association. Our membership consists of the stores that do some 80% of the food sales in the state, and the stores probably cash more checks than any other segment of the business community. So this is a tremendous problem for the stores. We have tried unsuccessfully now for some 8 years to get this assistance in the way of a photograph on a driver's license. I've seen all kinds of bills, all kinds of proposals, we've submitted some ourselves. But, I believe S.B. 1530 Senator Alfano's bill is the best one that I've seen submitted yet. And we would like to go on record as supporting this bill. First I think one of the most important features of the bill is that it calls for the instant photo. Now this would cause the public the least inconvenience. Under the other system described as wet system, sometimes when the film is developed you find that a person has blinked or something, and you don't have a good picture, and you have to call him back to have his picture taken again. This is one of the advantages. Senator Alfano touched on some of the administrative problems that might be involved. I

FRIDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 2, 1971

think that it could be very well taken care of by merely looking at the lists of states that now have this type of legislation, particularly California. It is the largest most popular state in the country, over 12 million drivers, they've had this for several years. I'm sure it wouldn't be that great a problem for the State of Connecticut. Our neighboring States, Massachusetts has it, Rhode Island, has it, New York State has had favorable report of committee and it looks like they'll pass it also. Now from a State angle, there are several state departments that are involved ~~in~~ think in this thing. On the first and the fifteenth of the month thousands of welfare checks, state department welfare checks are presented in our stores for cashing, many of them are stolen, and it's quite a problem for the states as well as the stores. Another place where I think its ~~in~~the public's interest to have this type of legislation, a lot of stores handle beer, and as carefully as they try to operate in this area, it's very difficult at times to tell whether a young boy sometimes as girls is a minor, and they present as has been noted previously they have stolen or borrowed licenses and other identification. I think if you ever attended a hearing before the liquor commission of this state and saw the predicament that some of the store operators, not only the grocery stores, but package store operators, have had in determining whether a young man was of age or not, you'd realize what a problem it was. I recall very well one time when I was over there and there was a boy who was convicted of purchasing liquor, and was now testifying during the hearing, and I was sure he was at least 27 years of age, he turned out to be 19 years old. Now that isn't an isolated case, there are many cases like that, so many agencies and many segments of the business community and the public need this legislation. We're way behind on it, most every time that I attend an industry conference I see three or four more states added to the role. I've seen both the wet process license and the instant and talked to people at great length that are concerned with this, and I think that S.B. 1530 would do the job for us very well. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Excuse me. I'm going to ask Mr. Tudden if, Rep. Tudden if he would care to make a quick remark.

Rep. Tudden: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Representative Tudden, from the 42nd. As you know I have a bill in for photographs on driver's licences and of course, the House Chairman knows full well, that I've had this bill in before. I'm certainly pleased to see so many other pieces of legislation put in on behalf of photos on licences. There's one point I'd like to make, because from the gist of what I picked up there's not too much more I can add. I think that we did have an obstacle in regards to photographs on licenses, and that obstacle has been removed with a new commissioner of the Motor Vehicles Department, and I certainly hope that you folks will give this thing a favorable report.

Mr. Luttell: Members of the Transportation Committee, I'm William E. Luttell, Vice President in charge of the security department for the Connecticut Bank and Trust Company. I was formerly a special agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for 27 years, prior to my retirement in 1968 and going with the bank. I haven't been asked to speak before you in support of the principle that Connecticut should have colored photographs laminated onto their driver's licenses. I've been asked to speak not only on behalf of the Connecticut Bank and Trust Company but the Connecticut Bankers Association and all of the commercial banks in the State of Connecticut. Photographs would be of great benefit to many people, definitely to banks,

FRIDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 2, 1971

whether commercial, savings, or otherwise. It's a necessity that the citizens of our states have in their possession a good, positive, untamperable, means of identification. About a year ago the senior citizens of Hartford, numbering 18,000 strong, felt so strongly about a good identification that they on their own had _____ before photographs, colored photographs that were laminated so that they would have this identification. In fact, they paid one dollar apiece and went out of their way to locations designated in order to have these photographs taken. This was an instant type of photograph, and they were exceedingly happy to have them. I'm certain that other citizens, all of the citizens of the state, who have ever had difficulty in positively identifying themselves in attempting to cash checks, or otherwise, would certainly appreciate having this means of identification, and would be willing to pay an additional fee of a dollar or that set by the legislature, in order to obtain this. It would cut down on the delays they experience when they are not known in a given area. The banks certainly would like to see it. The tellers use driver's licenses as a means of identifying a known check presenters. The driver's licenses which we presently have as previously pointed out here can be counterfeited it, they're often fictitious, or they are altered, or stolen. Definitely photographic means of _____ laminated onto the driver's license would help to prevent this. Thus when a citizen presents a check to a merchant or to a bank for cashing they could be identified quickly and the delay in cashing them cut to a minimum. I'm also a member of the Connecticut Chiefs of Police Association, the New England Chiefs of Police Association, the International Association for Chiefs of Police and also International Association for Identification. The Connecticut Chiefs of Police I know unanimously support this principle of having a laminated photograph, colored photograph on a driver's licenses. I feel that no one would be opposed to this type of legislation. I'm in favor of S.H. bill 1530 or any other bill which the Transportation Committee may promulgate, which will accomplish this fact. If, I believe, that the idea of an instant photo, one prepared by the Bureau of Motor Vehicles would be the best means, and definitely it should be in color because we have all observed photos before now which did not present a good likeness of the individual and I believe that because of the very shadings in our ~~complextions~~ that color would do a much better job and would accomplish this fact. I thank you very much and I trust that this type of legislation will become and accomplished fact as soon as possible. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Anyone else appearing in support?

Mr. Parendes: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Richard Parendes. I'm speaking in support of the Board of Directors of the Hartford Better Business Bureau. They have unanimously voted in support of the bill which will provide a colored ID license. I think the speakers who have preceded me have covered the areas very thoroughly. I would like to bring to your attention two things, you'll be striking an indirect blow at the drug problem in the State of Connecticut, by this bill. There are organized rings operating within our State that have up to date check writing machinery and are very well equipped to produce a fraudulent check that looks exactly like the original. In the city of Hartford alone last year the losses to merchants exceeded a million dollars. The majority of which went into the illicit drug traffic trade. The other point I feel has not been covered, there's been discussion of cost, I assure you Gentlemen that when a merchant losses two percent of his gross business to bad checks, he has no alternative but to incorporate that loss into his pricing of merchandise. Therefore, you and I as a consumer will pay an additional two to three percent for our groceries and so forth as a result of this problem. Thank you.

FRIDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 2, 1971

Sen. Mondani: Anyone else in support?

Mr. Patterson: I'm Garry Patterson, Harford National Bank and Trust Company. I'm representing Herbert E. Welsh, our Vice President in charge of security who's unable to be here this morning. We too favor this type of legislation specifically Senator's Alfano's S.B. 1530. I feel that Mr. Luttell has certainly put forth our feelings as well as the feelings of all bankers that are confronted with this very vital subject, and we certainly hope that you'll give it favorable consideration. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Anyone else in support?

Mr. Spangle: Mr. Chairman, I'm C. Vance Spangle representing the Insurance Association of Connecticut. I'd like to draw the attention to the committee and I'm sure we're aware there are several bills pertaining to the photographic identification driver license, as well as there are several bills pertaining to other aspects of driver license features, many of them not repetitious, but individual bills concerning the same subject. We'd like also to draw the committee's attention to S.B. 696, which in a sense deals across the border with many of these separated individual bills being presented today including the bill for, including the part for a positive means of identification of the operator by photograph on the driver's license. The bill itself is not going into the details as to instant, wet photo, color, black and white, as we felt this could be left up to the Rules Committee to determine which are the best means, the most economical means for the State. But I would like to support bill 696 in that it is a complete bill, it includes many of the needs presently being introduced separately, S.B. 696 provides for not only positive means of identification by means of a photographic license, but it also provides for the examination of operators according to different classes of vehicles that was very briefly given today. It also provides for separate license requirements for motor vehicle operators, it also provides for the need to understand English in respects to identification of road signs, highway signs, symbols, and signals. It also provides for the testing of visual acuity, tunnel vision, and color blindness of each operator and it also provides for the reexamination of each operator on a four year basis. In addition S.B. 696 conforms with requirements of the Uniform Vehicle Traffic Code and also the Federal Highway Safe Standards. I believe we have to recognize that the reexamination of drivers in itself which would include the private identification aspect is needed to insure that operators are qualified to operate a vehicle on our highways. Today's increased speeds, increased traffic densities, the influx of new highways, new highway markings, all require continued updating of the person's knowledge of the rules of the road. An operator must also be kept abreast of his own visual capabilities in regards to the susceptibility, tunnel vision, color blindness and must be made to realize the urgent need for maintaining healthy vision while driving on our highways, is part of his responsibility. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Anyone now speaking in favor of photographs on driver's licenses?

Mr. Eden: My name is Donald Eden, Assistant Secretary to Savings Bank Association of Connecticut. I would like to appear on behalf of the 69 savings banks in the State in favor of the concept covered by S.B. 1530 or any of the other various bills on this subject in reference to the testimony we have heard from our good friends in the commercial bank system, I'm glad to note that we finally found an issue with the savings banks and the commercial

FRIDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 2, 1971

Banks can agree. I urge your favorable consideration.

Sen. Mondani: Anyone else?

Mr. Brezzo: My name is Raymond Brezzo, I'm President of the Connecticut Package Store Association. I wish to go on record for the, all of the retailers in the State of Connecticut, not only in the liquor industry, as favoring Senator's Alfano's bill of 1590. I think everything has been said by everyone else and I'll not take up any more time. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Thanks. Anyone else wish to register his support.

Mr. Doherty: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I'm Don Doherty, Manager of the Greater Hartford Better Business Bureau. I'd just like to come out and say that we are definitely in favor of any bill that will put the laminated color photograph on the driver's license. Bill 1530 appears to be concise and cover the basics. We've been interested in the subject now for a number of years through a system we call ~~tele~~-warning, which involves various police departments, financial institutions, merchants, as well as individuals. People who have their individual checks stolen are put out through this system and we feel that a positive identification will eliminate the loss to the individuals, as well as making it possible for an individual to be recognized any time that he wants to cash a check of for other purposes. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Anyone else, anyone who wishes to oppose all of these bills?

Mr. Carroll: Good morning. Edward A. Carroll speaking on the behalf of the Department of Motor Vehicles. The Department of Motor Vehicles is opposed to the adoption of any legislation which would require operator licenses to have operator's photographs incorporated into such license. The bills this committee is considering are intended to establish the Motor Vehicle Operator's license as a catch-all identification card for use in cashing checks, obtaining liquor, and other cases in which identification is necessary. An operator's license is not intended to be an identification card however, it does for motor vehicle purposes adequately identify the operator through age, height, and signature. There may be in some other state agencies, there may be some other state agency which would be ready to assume the task of producing identification cards for all Connecticut citizens or for certain specified groups. To single out Connecticut Motor Vehicles operators for such treatment, seems a **entirely** unfair and discriminatory. An enactment of legislation of this nature would impose a tremendous inconvenience on the motoring public. Since it would be necessary for one million, eight hundred thousand licensed operators to present themselves to the department of motor vehicle offices to be photographed. Problems would certainly be encountered with students, service men, and business men, who are not in the State at the time when they were due to have their pictures taken or affixed to their licenses. The Department of Motor Vehicles has encouraged the uses of mails to renew licenses and this operation would have to be discontinued, should photographs be required. We have long contended that for renewal purposes the nearest mailbox is also the nearest branch office, of the Department of Motor Vehicles. Many of the motor vehicle offices have barely enough room to accommodate the public and would certainly be unable to handle the volume of people who would come to our offices to be photographed. Parking which is already difficult would find that some offices would become impossible should this legislation be enacted. We have developed costs for implementing the adoption of various photographic license plans

FRIDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 2, 1971

called for by these bills. Many of the bills are similar, and therefore, we have grouped them into several categories, for costing purposes. In order for any system calling for photographs on operator's licenses to be workable it would with one exception, and I'm referring to the bills that are under consideration this morning, it would mean the adoption of an operator's license which would be valid for a period of four years. This would mean that those operator's who are required to have their photos on their licenses would be required to have a new photograph and a new operator's license every four years. The following bills all require the operator to furnish the department with a picture, S.Bs. 91, 124, 1252, 1530, H.Bs. 5128, 5144, 5499, 6158, and 6607. It is estimated that the first year cost of administering the program called for in these bills would be one million, eighty four thousand, six hundred and eighty six dollars. The second year cost nine hundred and sixteen thousand, seven hundred and eighty six dollars. Third year costs and fourth year costs remain the same at eight hundred and fifty three dollars, eight hundred and fifty three thousand, four hundred and forty two dollars each year. The next group which was considered calls for all operator's licenses to have a photograph for the purposes of computing the costs of the program the department envisioned, excuse me, for the purpose of computing the costs the program which the department envisioned would involve the production of an instant color photograph without a negative file. Bills falling into this category, would be S.Bs. 385, S.B. 696, and H.B. 5346, again based on a cycle of four years, the first year cost would be one million, two hundred ten thousand, two hundred and sixty two dollars. Second year one million and forty nine thousand and six hundred and forty two dollars. Third year nine hundred and eighty six thousand, two hundred and ninety eight dollars, and the fourth year nine hundred and eight six thousand, two hundred and ninety eight dollars. The third group involves two bills, S.B. 1374, and H.B. 8290. Both of these bills specify the size of the picture, that such license shall be plastic, shall contain a colored photo, and require the commissioner to maintain a negative file. They also provide that a license issued to anyone who's under the age of 21 shall be different in color from that issued to persons over the age of 21. Again based on a four year program the total cost for the first year is estimated to be one million, three hundred and thirty two thousand, two hundred and sixty two dollars. For the second year, one million, one hundred and eighteen thousand, and forty two dollars; And again for the third and the fourth year, and the figure for each year would be the same, and that figure would be, one million fifty four thousand, six hundred and ninety eight dollars. The last bill is H.B. 7305, this bill would require anyone between the ages of 16 and 21 years, who is issued a license to present a picture to be affixed to such license. The estimated costs in this instance are figured over a two year period, rather than a four year period contemplated with the other bills. First year costs would be eight hundred and ninety one thousand, four hundred and thirty dollars. Second year costs eight hundred and twenty five thousand, four hundred and thirty dollars. This concludes my remarks.

Rep. Reinhold: Representative Reinhold. Did I understand you to say the cost figures which you quoted were over and above the increase cost of the licenses in each case.

Mr. Carroll: Am I understanding you to say now that you anticipate an increase in the licensing fee? There's only one of those bills that calls for this. I think Senator Alfano's bill calls for a dollar increase. This is not figured in at all.

FRIDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 2, 1971

- Sen. Mondani: I know. What your giving us are pure costs. The other thing, Mr. Carroll, it's about the use of the license for motor vehicle. I admit that that's what it's designed to do, and yet most places use it as an identification. I was at a store here in Hartford and I very proudly displayed my State Senate card which bears my signature, and laminated and the girl just said to me "do you have a driver's license" which deflated me some what. Then I took out my driver's license and she used that, so they use it as a thing, even though this has a signature. I
- Mr. Carroll: I don't think we deny this, but we just don't want -----.
- Sen. Mondani: Have you ever had instances where they've used a license and they have called motor vehicle and say that there was this license number, and they give it to you, and you later found it wasn't that person's, Have you evern encountered this at all?
- Mr. Carroll: I haven't personally, but I suspect that I think your assuming that's happened, and I would assume so.
- Sen. Mondani: Do you know whether the department would answer this type of inquiry, on the part of the store?
- Mr. Carroll: Within the limits of our ability to do so, I would say, yes, and I may be in error. I honestly don't know.
- Rep. Holdsworth: Mr. Chairman, Earl Holdsworth, 125th. The costs that you quoted Mr. Carroll, are these costs above and beyond what existing costs of licenses are?
- Mr. Carroll: Oh yes, as a matter of fact, in the long run these costs, and I will furnish the committee with copies of the manner in which we arrived at the costs. We actually subtracted in some instances for reduction in mail processing and things of that nature. But our strongest reason is the fact that people are going to be herded into our offices and I don't know whether you proposed me, but some of the other Representatives have from time to time and they've complained about the ladies in our offices. They complained that I had to go down there and I was sent back and this and that and this is only going to add to the publics complaints against the service that they already get at the motor vehicle department. We like to think we're doing a good job, we're there trying, but when you have a person come down and he stands in line, and the camera breaks down, or there's a malfunction, or perhaps some of these bankers call up and say "gee, I got a very important meeting and I'm supposed to get my photo taken today, it's the last of the month, can you squeeze me in somehow" we can't do that. Everybody is going to have to wait their turn, and our offices are not presently equipped to handle this type of operation. We certainly cannot do it without incurring the displeasure of the public in general. And, frankly I don't like to see my Mother and my Wife, and others having to come down there and stand in line waiting to be photographed.
- Mr. Connors; My bill is 7305, I'm George Connors, from Stamford, 160th, District. I purposely put this bill in for the way it reads, AN ACT CONCERNING MOTOR VEHICEE OPERATOR'S LICENSES FOR PERSONS UNDER TWENTY-SEVEN, REOUIRING PHOTOGRAPHS ON SUCH LICENSES. Now if we had it up to 27 years old you could save considerable money because it's been known to be a fact that they have swapped licenses, and many police officers will tell you they have been swapping licenses. They pick up somebody and its not there