

<b>Act Number</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Total Number of Committee Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of House Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of Senate Pages</b>
PA 71-807	veoted	5204	5	28	17
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reapporitonment Committee [Subject matter only] 1-5</i></li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4652-4679</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3272-3288</li> </ul>

**H-117**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

Thursday, June 3, 1971

86.

MBS

the widows and the children of the teachers who have died within the course of their service and, of course, many years have elapsed and many inequities have been placed upon these people who have survived where they weren't able to fend for themselves, where their amount of pension was nill, where they were forced to live on \$125 a month, which we realize today is an impossibility. It has been a long time in coming, it is a good bill and I would support it and I would ask everybody else to, too.

RICHARD EDWARDS, 155th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise also to support this bill. When the subject was first introduced I was quite shocked to find that a teacher could serve his proper time, could have earned his retirement and through a technicality his family be deprived of it. I think it is an excellent bill and I fully support it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

THE CLERK:

Page 14, Calendar No. 1121, Substitute for House Bill No. 5204, An Act Concerning the Redistricting of Connecticut's Congressional Districts, file 1218.

ROLLIN METTLER, 96th District:

Mr. Speaker, having failed to get this matter on the

Thursday, June 3, 1971

87.

MBS

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

ROLLIN METTLER, 96th District:

Mr. Speaker, last January this House appointed a committee on reapportionment and redistricting and one of its duties and responsibilities was to realign our Congressional districts to bring them in accordance with existing court guidelines of the one-man, one-vote rule. Based on the 1970 census the existing Congressional districts are drastically malproportioned. There is a 63,000 population discrepancy. The committee met often and had many discussions and finally, in accordance with counsel guidance, requested work to be done for us by the computers at the University of Connecticut. These computers were directed to give us a plan which was mathematically equal as possible. This is the plan which is currently in your files. Mr. Speaker, after this plan was submitted and considered, it was noted that in many cases throughout the plan small enumeration districts, or e.d.'s, were cut out of individual towns. In order to correct that, I'm getting a little ahead of myself, so I'll stop and remind or remark that the Clerk has an amendment, Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

Thursday, June 3, 1971

88.

MBS

The Clerk will call House Amendment Schedule "A" and the Clerk begs the gentleman to outline it.

ROLLIN METTLER, 96th District:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Amendment Schedule "A" merely deletes all references to enumeration districts in your file copy. Every member of the House should have received from the messengers the following information: a map showing the districts as spelled out in your file copy, House Bill 5204, you also should have a map which shows you the resulting effect of House Amendment Schedule "A". The amendment which eliminates all enumeration districts, maintains the integrity of town lines. Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A" and I would move that when the vote be taken it be taken by roll call.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, a roll call will be ordered. The gentleman has moved adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A", will you remark on Amendment "A". Rep. Collins, do you want me to announce an immediate roll call so there will be more people in here?

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

No, Mr. Speaker, I may go on long enough so they will all be here by the time I get through. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think, Mr. Speaker, that

Thursday, June 3, 1971 89.

MBS

although Rep. Mettler gave rather short shrift to a rather long detailed history of the particular plan that is before us, I think it is significant to note: (1) this plan is before us from a meeting that in my opinion was improperly and quite possibly illegally called. I happen to be a member of that committee, I did not receive notice of any such meeting until one day after this proported meeting took place. The bill in the file which, as the gentleman indicated, cuts several town lines is now before us with an amendment to take out these little excursions into various towns that this committee, or at least the majority members of this committee, passed several weeks ago. At that time, it was proportedly said that it was the best proportional plan that the majority members of this committee could come up with. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this amendment only clarifies exactly what the problem in this entire committee has been. That's been an inability to come up with a plan that not only makes sense, from a political standpoint, a population standpoint and a party standpoint. But it also indicates that although this committee has spent the last four months trying to reach some agreement, it has come out with a plan after all of this time, and all of this study, the plan is here before us now, with another amendment. I submit to you, sir, this amendment, in spite of the fact that the gentleman from the 96th indicates that it is merely a housekeeping matter to clean up the

Thursday, June 3, 1971 90.

MBS

the excursion into some enumeration districts from congressional districts. I submit, Mr. Speaker, it's symptomatic of the entire problem we have had in congressional reapportionment. It indicates that at this late date in the session, almost total disagreement is the weather of the day on congressional reapportionment. I think the amendment is bad, I think the plan is bad and I intend to vote against the amendment.

CARL AJELLO, 118th District:

Mr. Speaker, I never thought he'd do that. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is largely a technical one as explained by the gentleman from Hamden and therefore, I would prefer to reserve certain remarks for our conversations concerning the bill itself. The gentleman from the other 163rd in Brookfield, 165th, sorry, sir, well, I figured Herb would say something sooner or later, Rep. Collins, at any rate, has made some remarks concerning the bill, which I would like to speak to but I think I'll reserve it for later on. Suffice it to say that, for the reasons specified by the gentleman from Hamden, the amendment makes sense and it is designed to get the plan properly before us in whatever form we desire to discuss it further.

NICHOLAS LENGE, 13th District:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose this will come as no surprise. I think the amendment is bad and I oppose it. But the inference in the amendment, I think is something all of us ought to

Thursday, June 3, 1971 91.

MBS

seriously take into account. The inference is that the basic bill needs improvement. Now, the gentleman, Rep. Mettler, spent some time stressing meetings. Meetings of this unprecedented, unusual committee, the number of meetings, the discussions, those concerned with the mathematical factors involved and other factors of necessity in drawing a valid plan. And what he said was that after it was submitted, quote, "It was noticed that there was something wrong with the plan." Now, I'd like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this plan saw the light of day by a certain amount of infusion. Actually, the most that took place on the underlying plan, was what with no plan whatsoever before the members of that committee. They actually voted on something that was not before them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 96th, for what purpose does the gentleman rise? Please state your point of order.

ROLLIN METTLER, 96th District:

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are discussing the amendment and the gentleman from the 13th is discussing the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm sure the gentleman from the 13th will soon get to the amendment.

NICHOLAS LENGE, 13th District:

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying, sir, in short, and as clearly and as unequivocally as I can state it, that we are

Thursday, June 3, 1971 92.

MBS

now witnessing from the floor, the first of what will be amendments, what we are proposing to do by action of the full body in this amendment is what the committee itself did not do and could not do. I oppose the amendment specifically, sir, because it attempts to right wrongs and in doing that it makes it even worse. Now look, there are no mysteries about this, what is at stake is really the election system for the next 10 years ahead. You saw the disastrous effect of amendment, after amendment yesterday from the floor on what was basically a good bill. We are now starting the same procedure with this one. This amendment still leaves little circles, little pockets and it refers to enumeration districts. What can be wrong with the plan? The amount of deviation from a norm, high and low, this has high deviation, it's not on target, what we're really talking about with the amendment, sir, and we're talking about it with the basic bill because the amendment will become the bill, is the validity. What is at stake? And that is the process, is it valid, is it sound, will it bring people into the system, does it make the election process itself a sham? In other words, why go through it at all, if its so set and so predetermined in its end result. I think, sir, that this belongs back in a committee and the committee, in and of itself, and that was stressed in the presentation, was an usual committee, unprecedented, sir, as committees go because it was an equal committee. And why

Thursday, June 3, 1971

93.

MBS

was that necessary? Equal in membership because in the days of cooler thinking the members and the leaders saw fit to make the membership equal and I say, sir, that if we are to give validity to that basic proposition then we ought to give it equally here and the vote ought to be reflective of that equal membership. This is not a valid amendment and I submit, sir, it ought to be defeated.

IRVING STOLBERG, 112th District:

As a professor of political geography I'd like to offer a free entry into my class to Rep. Lenge with whom I usually agree. I don't think he was referring to the amendment because, indeed, the whole purpose of the amendment is to do away with the conclaves, the little marks on the map, and to round it out in terms of towns. In that sense, I should like to congratulate whoever is responsible for the amendment because it is an admirable job and as a professor of political geography I would have to give it an A.

MR. SPEAKER:

Students, will you remark further? I'll announce an immediate roll call. Does the Clerk have business to be read in?

THE CLERK:

Favorable reports. Appropriations. Substitute for House Bill No. 6716, An Act Creating a Department of Youth Services.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar and printing.

THE CLERK:

Finance. Substitute for House Bill No. 6843, An Act Concerning Motor Fuel Tax.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar and printing.

THE CLERK:

Appropriations. Substitute for House Bill No. 9233, An Act Concerning the Treatment of Persons Arrested for Violation of the Controlled Drug Statutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar and printing.

THE CLERK:

Judiciary. Substitute for House Bill No. 8852, An Act Concerning Equipment Requirements for Motor Vehicles Used in Making Highway Safety Motion Pictures.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar and printing.

THE CLERK:

Judiciary. Substitute for House Bill No. 6762, An Act Streamlining the Bondsman Statute.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar and printing.

THE CLERK:

Thursday, June 3, 1971

95.

MBS

Judiciary. Substitute for House Bill No. 9021, An Act Concerning Qualifications for Motor Vehicle and Motorcycle Operators' Licenses.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar and printing.

THE CLERK:

Introduction of bills, with emergency certification.

House Bill No. 9257 An Act Concerning Solicitation of Charitable Funds Act. For reference to the Committee on Corrections.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar and printing. Excuse me, referred to the Committee on Corrections.

Will the members please be seated. Members will you please be seated. The aisles cleared so we can proceed with amendment schedule "A". For the benefit of the members who have just returned to the Hall we are on page 14, Calendar No. 1121, An Act Concerning the Redistricting of Connecticut's Congressional Districts. Pending before us presently is Amendment Schedule "A", will you remark further on schedule "A"?

NICHOLAS LENGE, 13th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment. Basically the amendment attempts to straighten out, by removing the excursion into certain town boundry lines and presumably it gets an A. Well, let me tell you, there is more at stake

Thursday, June 3, 1971 96.

MBS

than just the integrity of town lines. We are talking about the contingent membership in the Congress. We're talking about the validity of an electoral process for the next 10 years and the question, more basically, Mr. Speaker, is how sound and how balanced and how valid is the underlying plan that is presumably corrected here with minor technical improvements. The fact is that there's no altruism in any of this. We all know what's at stake. That committee and this housemembership is being asked to preserve what is staked out as certain political domains. I think I would be a little bit foolhardy to expect you to be altruistic but I also think though that I could be valid in asking you to use good judgment. Why must we go through this frustration, this futile effort when the committee should have, and still could have worked it out as it should. What's at stake? What the whole plan here is, it assumes that the original plan, the original House districts as established in the prior redistricting is valid. And it starts to move from there. What we fail to take into account is the health of the system for both parties and more important, for the people who are asked to participate in the process, if it is to have meaning at all. We are talking primaries, we are talking election reform, we are talking about all kinds of improvements in our election system and what do we want to do -- not have a valid possible swing election anywhere, we

Thursday, June 3, 1971

97.

MBS

want to anchor into an existing system for the next 10 years. And I say that that's the basic inherent defect. The word jerrymander hasn't been used at all. The fact is, you can jerrymander by any arbitrary action. It isn't just a matter of cutting lines. We've got deviations here that are wider than they should be. It's questionable as to whether or not they will stand the test of a court test and I think that this work should be done by the committee. The committee that was charged with the action. There's no emergency here this afternoon, only to go through the frustration and have it back again next year and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I move at this time for recommitment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman has moved to recommit. Will you remark on recommitment? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye....

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit. I think it's been evident, not only in the last four months, in the attempted negotiations to come up with a workable plan, a Congressional plan within the committee, that the efforts have been long difficult and frankly futile. The fact the reapportionment committee did not appear to be perfect by any means, that sliced several town lines and was at best somewhat proportionable and consistent with Constitutional

Thursday, June 3, 1971 98.

MBS

standards, I think empathsizes the absolute necessity that this particular piece of legislation needs drastic reworking. We are not bound here by any Constitutional deadline to come up with a Congressional plan. It is entirely possible that if this matter is further considered by the committee, it can report back to this General Assembly next February, hopefully with a plan that not only would fulfill the Constitutional requirements but a plan does not attempt to jerrymander, that takes political facts of life into account and is not a Democratic plan nor a Republican plan, but a plan that is best for the people of this state for the next decade. I think, and I would reemphasize what the gentleman from the 13th has said, this plan does create, this amendment before us that we now have, creates wider variations than the plan in the file. This poses obvious Constitutional problems. People who have been dealing in this field know the very, very narrow limits that court decisions are required in Congressional reapportionment. The amendment before us does an injustice to those limits. I think the obvious and the best answer to recommit is to recommit this bill and I strongly support his motion.

CARL AJELLO, 118th District:

Mr. Speaker, I don't wonder that the gentleman wants it recommitted. I think it is fair to say that the reason that it was brought out in the first place, is because of the

Thursday, June 3, 1971 99.

MBS

vacillation and the difficulties that we found in the Republican members in attempting to put any kind of a plan together. Now, it has been alluded to that the meeting itself was improperly called and there was not proper notice and I think this is a good time to bring that out as it bears directly on the question of recommittal, as to whether or not this bill should be before us. The meeting was proper, notice was given, I was given both oral and written notice and I had the notice on my desk before the meeting started. In fact, some Republican members were there, they just didn't quite bring enough and I think that's the problem. But it seems more important to me that we have a responsibility here and the responsibility is to do something about this redistricting. It is a Constitutional mandate, Mr. Speaker, and we have a duty to do. But it seems that the only negotiations that make any sense to our counterparts are plans that make it a Republican plan. Now, there's nothing wrong with their trying to gain every advantage they can in a political situation but to try now to say that this bill should be recommitted because it is not their bill, because they want to change it in their favor, what they really want to do is nothing unless we do exactly what they want to do. I oppose recommittal, I think we should get on with our business and this is our responsibility.

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Thursday, June 3, 1971 100.

MBS

Mr. Speaker, I move, sir, that when the vote is taken it be taken by roll call.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, a roll call will be ordered.

NICHOLAS LENGE, 13th District:

Mr. Speaker, on recommittal, I concur with the distinguished Majority Leader that it is our responsibility to do something but embraced in that concept is the responsibility to do something good, something wise and something correct, something meaningful for the voters. Not just do something. I think, sir, that it is unfortunate that we appear to be hassling, that the committee which did work diligently, did not really give this a full consideration and a joint favorable and all I'm suggesting there by recommitment is that we return it to the place of origin and let a committee, an even numbered committee, come out with something constructive and I think not only is this possible but I think it should be done that way. I think strongarming at this point will only go to defeat the overall purposes and the constructive purposes of reapportionment itself.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on recommitment. If not, will the members be seated and the aisles cleared. The motion pending before us is the motion to recommit. If you favor recommitment

Thursday, June 3, 1971 101.

MBS

vote yes, if you are opposed vote no. The machine will be opened. Has every member voted? Is your vote recorded in the fashion you wish? The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will announce the tally.

## THE CLERK:

Total number voting		165
Necessary for recommitment		83
Those voting Yea	74	
Those voting Nay	91	
Absent and not voting	12	

## MR. SPEAKER:

Recommitment is lost. Pending before us with a roll call already ordered is House Amendment Schedule "A", will you remark further on House "A", if not, will the members be seated and we will proceed with an immediate roll call. Further remarks on plan "A"? If not, will the members be seated and the aisles cleared and we'll proceed with the vote. Before we proceed I have an announcement to make. I've been requested by the Shakespeare Festival to announce The Merry Wives of Windsor, scheduled for tomorrow evening, Friday, June 4th, in view of our schedule has been postponed until Friday, June 11th at 8:30, all the tickets that were reserved will be honored on that occasion. That might make a few of our wives merry, too.

Will the members please be seated. If the members will be seated we'll proceed with the vote. The machine will be opened. Has every member voted? Is your vote recorded in

Thursday, June 3, 1971 102.

MBS

the fashion you wish. The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

ASTRID HANZALEK, 40th District:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that my vote was recorded because the light was out at one point and then it went on again. I wish to be recorded as no.

MR. SPEAKER:

On the machine, at least on the board, it indicates you as present and voting no. The Clerk indicates that it is not punched out. On the Assistant Clerk's copy, the Clerk may have a different copy. We'll allow a conference between the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk and then the tally will be announced. I'd indicate to the members that Amendment "B" is next to be offered and then we'll vote on the bill itself.

THE CLERK:

Total number voting	164
Necessary for adoption	83
Those voting Yea	91
Those voting Nay	74
Absent and not voting	12

MR. SPEAKER:

Amendment "A" is adopted.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B" offered by Mr. Collins of the 165th.

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of House Amendment Schedule

"B" and request, sir, that it be printed in the Journal in accordance with Rule 10, and if it's agreeable to the members, rather than having the Clerk read it, I would attempt to summarize it.

MR. SPEAKER:

And at the same time, you wish to move for a roll call, too?

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection to outlining the amendment. If there is no objection, the amendment will be outlined.

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the amendment before you is the alternate version of the bill that is in the file, as amended. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that very briefly and very simply what this plan does is attempts to minimize the deviation between Congressional districts. Under the amendment before us, the maximum deviation that any one of the Congressional districts would be 940. It has an average deviation of 206 and that respect, Mr. Speaker, I submit it is as mathematically precise as any amendment or any Congressional plan that we will be able to adopt. We offer this plan, Mr. Speaker, as an alternative to the "Democratic Congressional Plan" which we have before us and is present in the files.

Thursday, June 3, 1971 104.

MBS

The plan in the file would only perpetuate the inequities that we now have in our Congressional districts. It is only a slight variation from what we already have. The amendment before us would make a significant change in the Congressional districts and yet be totally in accordance with our Constitutional requirements. It would also, sir, recognize the political facts of life that we have. Right now, the districts have been in effect since 1964, have gone at least 4 to 2 Democratic in every election. During the last election the Republican party carried this state at the top of the ticket by over 80,000 votes yet only two out of six Congressmen are Republican. On the total vote in this state the Republican party got 49.7% but still only obtained two Congressmen. We feel, sir, that the plan embodied in this amendment is much more equitable as a redistricting plan, it more accurately reflects the way people vote, it maintains the deviation problem at an absolute minimum. I believe that the plan before us in the form of this amendment would prevent perpetuation of the inequities that we now have in our Congressional redistricting system, and I would now move you, sir, that when the vote be taken it be taken by roll call.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, a roll call will be ordered. Are there announcements or introductions while we await our members?

Thursday, June 3, 1971 105.

MBS

RONALD SARASIN, 95th District:

Mr. Speaker, while we are awaiting the return of the members I wonder if I might make two changes in the Calendar with regard to the Consent Calendar. I don't know if the Clerk is ready, I believe the Assistant Clerk is. Mr. Speaker, on page 26, second item from the top, Calendar 1366, Substitute for House Bill No. 8896, file 1558, I would ask that that be removed from the Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your objection is noted and Calendar No. 1366 will not appear on the Consent Calendar.

RONALD SARASIN, 95th District:

And on page 28, Mr. Speaker, middle of the page, Calendar No. 1386, Substitute for House Bill No. 6674, An Act Concerning the Maintenance or Construction of Overhead Transmission Lines in Line with and Within One Half Mile of Either End of any Public Airport Runway, file 1586, I ask that that be placed on the Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Page 28, Calendar No. 1386, the gentleman has moved to place this item on the Consent Calendar. Is there objection? Hearing none, so ordered. Let me announce the roll call again. Are there further announcements or introductions?

JOSEPH COATSWORTH, 76th District:

Mr. Speaker, just for the purpose of an announcement.

I'd like to announce a meeting of the freshmen Democrats tomorrow at 11 o'clock in the Environment Room.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question now is on Amendment Schedule "B", will you remark further?

JOHN MAIOCCO, 133rd District:

Mr. Speaker, through you, Mr. Speaker, if I may a question to Rep. Collins, I'd like to ask Mr. Collins if he could tell me, I do not have the amendment before me, if he could tell me which district the city of Bridgeport is in, in his plan?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 165th care to respond?

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Yes, sir, the third congressional district.

JOHN MAIOCCO, 133rd District:

Wholly the third?

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Yes, sir.

JOHN MAIOCCO, 133rd District:

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

ROLLIN METTLER, 96th District:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on Amendment Schedule "B", I have just received a copy and since I was honored a few moments ago with an A in geography I think my friends across the

aisle should at least get an A in artistic endeavor. But, seriously, Mr. Speaker, the amendment "E" which is before you at the moment creates a veritable horror in my opinion, in point of view of Congressional Districts and point of view of true jerrymandering and I oppose the amendment most strongly.

NICHOLAS LENGE, 13th District:

Mr. Speaker, thank you, Mr. Speaker, we seem to be preoccupied with graves and I think the grave we ought to be most concerned with is the one we get from the public and I submit that our stubbornness and our unwillingness to compromise what is admittedly political concern does not gain us an A but the bill as now before us with the proposed amendment, we are indulging in generalities, sir, and I submit that the amendment before us is superior and far superior in terms of the guidelines mandated by the courts of this nation. It is superior also in that it really gives viability and purpose in terms of swing elections and that's what this is all about. And so, sir, being brief, I stand here to say I favor Amendment "B".

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I miss the boat, Mr. Speaker, but I think I've missed the amendment. It has been referred to as the amendment before us. Are those of us who are expected to vote on this Republican amendment supposed to have an amendment before us. I've got a lot of maps but they

Thursday, June 3, 1971 108.

MBS

look like Democratic maps.

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment is properly before us, it has been outlined, it's been introduced and it's been remarked on.

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, I was not trying to be entirely humorous, I was trying to make a somewhat serious point and that is, I think that if we are going to serve the public we have an obligation to know what this redistricting plan does and frankly, I don't have a map of Amendment "B", I don't know what towns are put where and I don't think it is proper for the leadership on either side of the aisle to expect us to vote yes on an amendment that hasn't been placed before us. It may be in the Clerk's hands properly but I don't have a reapportionment map showing what you are doing with Amendment "B" and on that basis alone, I'd have to vote against it. I don't even know what district my town is in.

NICHOLAS PANUZIO, 134th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise and am going to vote against the amendment. I do so with a lot of regret because I thought what we were going to come up with in this General Assembly was a plan that was going to be fair to all the people in the state of Connecticut. Obviously, our political intentions and our political feelings have taken priorities. I thought the committee was comprised and was set up to try to come up

with compromises. Compromise is not usually something that is thrown and is shoved through a legislature. I object to the way it is being done today. I think the motion to re-commit was a proper one. I think it is unfortunate that the people of Connecticut have to watch on television the way we seem to be bantering around rather than trying to come up with the best possible compromise for their interest.

IRVING STOLBERG, 112th District:

Mr. Speaker, without attempting to drag out what will probably be very close to a party line vote, I would suggest to my colleague from Naugatuck, if he wants a geography lesson we can come over to the Republican side, there are a few maps over there and they are very interesting because of the lack of geographic cohesion on those districts, which I think would make it very vulnerable.

MR. SPEAKER:

I suggest that the members be seated so we can proceed with the vote. Question is on amendment schedule "B", the machine will be opened. Has every member voted? Is your vote recorded in the fashion you wish. The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

THE CLERK:

Total number voting	161
Necessary for adoption	82
Those voting Yea	68
Those voting Nay	93
Absent and not voting	16

MR. SPEAKER:

Amendment "B" is lost.

ROLLIN METTLER, 96th District:

Mr. Speaker, I now acceptance and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

ROLLIN METTLER, 96th District:

Mr. Speaker, we have had some interesting dialogue here this afternoon regarding this plan, I'd just like to make a few points very clear, for the record. The prime concern of the committee has been to meet court guidelines. In the opinion of the committee, and our counsel, plans that you will be voting on in a moment or so, does meet the existing court guidelines. You have congressional districts which have a less than 1% deviation, less than 1%, well within the guideline. At the same time, we have maintained town line integrity and the reason that is quite so important is that our entire election system in the state is geared to town lines and by maintaining that integrity we have helped to maintain the system. It is a good plan and a plan that will be good for Connecticut and a plan that will serve the people of this state. I was a little bit shocked to hear talk across the aisle of political consideration because, as I said here on April 1st, our committee has never given consideration to the

political aspect of the thing, we have been concerned only with the one criteria that of population....Mr. Speaker, I think we should have a little more respect.

MR. SPEAKER:

I think they are showing their respect.

ROLLIN METTLER, 96th District:

That's what I'm afraid of. Well, to close down, Mr. Speaker, it was so long ago and far away I can't remember but in case I didn't I move the vote be taken by roll call.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion is on a roll call, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. An immediate roll call will be ordered.

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the passage of the amended bill before us. I think Mr. Mettler's comments were very interesting and, of course, somewhat humorous when he talked about the fact that the plan before us was not politically considered. Any plan that gives a 5 to 1 break on 6 congressmen and in Mr. Mettler's favor, I think deserves a little more consideration than he attempted to give it. But I do think in all seriousness, M. Speaker, there is one major objection to this plan. In spite of the fact that Mr. Mettler indicates that the deviation is not significant, I think it is significant. I do not think that it meets the

Thursday, June 3, 1971 112.

MBS

standards set forth in the recent U. S. Supreme Court decisions. Recent decisions have indicated that the population deviation between congressional districts must be kept to an absolute minimum because of this restriction in the Supreme Court decisions many other states over the past 12 months have adopted plans where the maximum deviation between districts is less than 1,000 people. This can be easily achieved in Connecticut and I would like to go on record as saying that the reapportionment committee has considered more than one plan which sets such a standard. I submit, Mr. Speaker, just briefly, the state of Arkansas has had a .26 deviation, the state of Iowa...Idaho has had a .10 deviation, the state of Iowa has had a .6% deviation, the state of South Dakota had had a 1.4% deviation, Utah, 1.8, West Virginia, 7.8, and Connecticut .87%. It appears that we are exceeding the deviation as set by other states, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that we are beyond the limits as set by the Supreme Court. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is also proper to say at this time, that in a recent decision of the Supreme Court among other reasons stated by the court for rejecting a Missouri congressional plan was that the legislature had before it other plans which were considerably better in achieving population equality among the districts. In Connecticut, a rather small state, heavily populated, but it comparatively easy to draw plan without crossing town lines

which would substantially reduce the deviation as set forth in the amended plan before us. Under these circumstances, this legislature would make a mistake in adopting this plan, it is open to challenge in the court, it is not a substantial deviation from the existing Congressional lines although even attempt, I think in fairness to Mr. Mettler, has been made to minimize the problems, including the political problems on his side. I oppose the plan.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there further remarks? Let me announce the roll call again. Will the members please be seated. Will the members be seated and the aisles cleared we can proceed with the vote. The machine will be opened. Has every member voted? Is your vote recorded on the board? I won't ask if your vote is in the fashion you wish. The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

THE CLERK:

Total number voting		161
Necessary for passage		82
Those voting Yea	88	
Those voting Nay	73	
Absent and not voting	16	

MR. SPEAKER:

The bill, as amended, is passed.

THE CLERK:

I've been asked to return to page 10 on the calendar. Second from the bottom, Calendar 538, Substitute for House

S-82  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1971

VOL. 14  
PART 7  
2874-3413

June 8, 1971

35.

SENATOR MURPHY:

It is my understanding of the bill Mr. President that its essentially as its title indicates. This is optional and it will allow communities to designate a water authority or a regional water authority. As their sewer authority. And as I indicated its optional.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

On the same page Cal. 1180, File 1218. Favorable report joint standing committee on Reapportionment, Substitute for H.B. 5304 An Act Concerning the Redistricting of Connecticut's Congressional Districts.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Murphy from Norwich, NO Franklin.

SENATOR MURPHY:

You were close the first time. Right the second time.

Mr. President I move for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill, in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR MURPHY:

Does the Clerk have an amendment?

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has an amendment. From Senator Ives of the 32nd.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ives. Mr. President, I will waive the reading of the amendment. And move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark on the amendment?

June 8, 1971

36.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, the amendment that is being offered is the same amendment that was offered in the House. It is as far as population deviation very similiar to the plan that was in the file. But the major objection is that we think the plan in the file is enough difference that it will fail to meet the constitutional standards as set forth in the United States Supreme Court decisions. But more than that Mr. President, and being very realistic. We think that the plan in the file is a Democratic plan that produces five Democrats and one Republican. Or five Democrats and one swing plan. Realistically, based on the last election where we received 49.7% of the vote. Or 50% in a total number. We feel that we deserve representation on that proportion. And our proposed plan based on the 1970 vote would yield three Democrats, two Republicans and one swing seat. We feel that this is a fair and equitable plan.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Murphy, Will you yield to Senator Eddy?

SENATOR MURPHY:

Yes.

SENATOR EDDY:

Mr. President this matter of reapportionment is one that is so often baffling to the public. They wonder why we all just plain can't get together and come up with a plan. Now this really is the essence of the political process. This reapportionment. And this is one of the reasons its so difficult sometime as wek have discovered in our negotiation to arrive at plan that both sides can accept. Now the Republican position has been all along that we only want what we earn at the polls. We are not seeking a built in advantage. We are not seeking a plan which will give us automatic victory when we don't win. By the same token when we do win. When we carry the state by 80,000 votes. As we did the last election. And when we carry it on the Senatorial District by a substantial plurality. We feel that we should have a

June 8, 1971

37

chance to have that reflected in our Congressional Districts. And in a nut shell and not to prolong this. The Democratic proposal which we will consider builds in a Democratic advantage. We cannot accept it. We will not accept it. Our amendment we feel offers the more equitable plan. A plan that when we get the votes we will have a chance to win. And when we don't get the votes we won't win. And we shouldn't win. All want. I repeat all we ask for on all these reapportionment plans is what we earn at the polls. Now this is a matter which need not be prolonged any longer. We are offering this amendment. I urge its adoption. And I ask the members here to support it.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the amendment. Senator Dowd.

SENATOR DOWD:

Mr. President. I rise to support this amendment. My colleagues have pointed out several of the advantages of the Republican plan before us in this amendment over the Democratic plan in our files. One of them of course is that we sincerely believe this Democratic plan presents an unfair political alignment. As my distinguished colleague from the 9th has pointed out. All we seek is what we have earned at the polls. But I would suggest to the circle that the Republican plan has two other advantages going for it also. There are no cuts in town lines here. We feel that in districts of some 525,000 each. That we should try to limit the number of cuts in our town line. An inspection of our plan would indicate that ours are not cut. Secondly there is near mathematical procession in the equality among districts. Which is the guide line that we all must try to meet under the Federal guidelines. And I submit Mr. President that our plan comes very very close in that regard. But I rise to speak for a third basis for the superiority of our plan over that of our Democratic colleagues. And that is the matter of community of interest. Of course equality of population is the major point we must seek. But I submit that the consideration of community of

June 8, 1971

38.

interest among towns is of particular importance. And I invite your attention to the contrast in my own Fairfield County. Mr. President, the Democrats treat Fairfield County like a step-child. I submit to you that such obviously Fairfield County towns in terms of community of interest, in terms of community to New York. In terms of the entire interest and business and social outlook of the county. The towns such as New Canaan, Wilton, Weston, Trumbull and Easton. In the Democratic plan are thrown. Flung into a district which is dominated by towns such as Waterbury and the Naugatuck Valley towns. Fine towns all. But hardly with the same community of interests as the Fairfield County locations. If you look at the Republican plan for Fairfield County you will find a much more fair distribution. A much more realistical alignment. The towns of New Canaan, Wilton and Weston along with my own town of Trumbull and the town of Easton are where they belong. There with their sister towns in Fairfield County. Sharing a common community of interest.

As a Senator from Fairfield County. As well as one who like all my colleagues in this chamber. Are interested in a just reapportionment plan for the entire state. I urge adoption of this amendment. Mr. President when the vote is taken I urge that it be taken by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Through you a question to the distinguished Senator from the 25th. Is this the same plan that was advanced by the Republican during the committee meeting?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Dowd. If you wish.

SENATOR JACKSON:

At the committee meetings the Republicans moved the adoption of a Congressional redistricting plan. And I'm wondering if this is the same plan.

June 8, 1971

39.

is the same plan?

SENATOR DOWD:

Mr. President, my recollection is that the essence of the Republican plan as discussed in the reapportionment committee is embodied in the amendment before us.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

In that event Mr. President, I would say that this is one of the worst cases of so called gerrymandering since the Governor Gerry originated the term many years ago. I have a copy of the map which would portray this particular plan and it is significant that this very fair minded plan which has been presented. Contains the town of Bethel down in the southwestern section of the state of Connecticut. It goes all the way up the western side of Connecticut to Salisbury. Across the entire top of Connecticut to Massachusetts and down to Ashford. Which is over in Windham County in the northeast section. Now this is the plan that was presented to the reapportionment committee on the same day that the plan was presented by the Democrats was voted upon. This is the plan I am asking. And it appears to me that if the Republicans are sincere in this effort. Which they try to voice on us at the committee meeting. I think this horrible. And I can't say that anyone that had anything to do with this. Could really present this with a straight face.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Dowd.

SENATOR DOWD:

Mr. President, my apologizes to my distinguished colleague in the 5th District. Not for the Republican plan but I inadvertently mislead the Senator. This is the plan of which he speaks. I'd be happy to present him with a map of the plan under consideration at this time. My apologizes I misunderstood you.

June 8, 1971

40

SENATOR JACKSON:

In other words then. The plan that was presented at the committee meeting has now been abandoned by the Republicans?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Dowd.

SENATOR DOWD:

The question speaks for itself sir. Our amendment is before us at this time. And I would be happy to show Senator Jackson the contents therein.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Thank you. The question has been answered. And I have not had an opportunity to see the map that is presented in this amendment, as yet. But if it is anything like the one that was presented in the committee meeting. I will certainly have to vote against this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Mr. President, in deference to Senator Jackson. I think one of the problems here has been pointed out by what Senator Jackson had to say. And learning that this is not the same plan that the Republicans had offered to the Reapportionment Committee. As a matter of fact this is a plan which was never offered to the committee but through that party they have seen fit to offer it as an amendment both in the House and now here in the Senate.

Continuity of interest between the towns brought up by Senator Dowd. And I strongly take issue with his claim in this regard. Certainly there may be some validity to what he has to say in reference to Fairfield County. But Fairfield County is a peculiar problem in and of itself. Because of the statistical nature of necessity coming so close in making these Districts even in population or as close as possible thereto. Because of

June 8, 1971

41

the geographical arrangement for Fairfield County. And the so called arm of Greenwich and Stamford edging off. One must start the district there and end up coming along the shore line until you have the proper number of people for a Congressional district.

I point out for the consideration of the circle that the district which deviates the greatest from norm is only sixty four one hundredths of 1%. And in doing this we have maintained whole town integrity. Now the computers at the University of Connecticut Data Center had given us some other plans which cut into various town. Particularly down in the Fairfield County area. And took a few numeration districts out. But because of our elections set up and our system of holding the elections where everything is run through towns. This was not felt to be feasible. And so this minor deviation from one district to another is found in this plan.

Also I want to point out is a serious consideration. That in the realignment of towns from one district to another. Only 13 of our 169 towns changed from the district that they were in to the district that they would be in under this proposal. I think all considerations have been effected here. And this plan is a good plan. And a fair one.

Now reference has been made also by a previous speaker that this plan would really be five Democrats and one Republican. Or five and a swing district. The election returns for both 1970 and 1968 would indicate the result based upon this plan as offered to be four and two. And it would not be the same four and two which points out the importance of candidates. And this is becoming more significant as we go on in the future. The better people are coming forward to run for office. And the people going to the polls are reflecting upon this. And giving greater consideration. And we have more in the way of voter splitting their ticket. So that the so called solid districts just aren't there. This plan is not five and one. As I have indicated its four and tow. Both of the last two times out. And in the

June 8, 1971

42.

statistics which were handed out to all members of the circle yesterday. You can see on there what the results would have been in the 1970 election. And you see that two of the districts are won by the Democrats. And per that statistical analysis two of them would have been close. Admittedly the first it was an unusual year and maybe more difficult in fairness to the Republicans to run that close again. But it still indicates at least to me, that we conceivably could have a 50-50 proposition. Also I want to point out for your consideration this comment about carrying the state with 80,000 votes as Senator Eddy indicated. This was the Governor who carried the state by 80,000 vote. An analysis of the vote tabulation as to the six congressional candidates show that the six Democratic candidates received more votes than did the six Republican candidates. I think upon that balance this is a fine and equitable plan. It allows for the least number of towns to be shifted from one district to another. And it continues a continuity of interest. And also a continuity of representation. Not necessarily in their congressman or congresswoman. But a continuity in representation in that these people feel that they are a congressional unit. And I urge the circle to adopt this plan.

THE CHAIR:

He's talking about the plan. But it's proper to talk about the amendment and the plan the same time since they relate to the same subject. Will you remark further on the amendment? Or the plan or the plan and the amendment? Senator Eddy.

SENATOR EDDY:

Briefly Mr. President, reference to what Senator Murphy had to say about the Democratic Senatorial candidate carrying, taking more votes than the Republican Congressman. He's quite right. The Republican's took 49.7% of the vote but received only 2 Congressman. So this is the point we make when we say it is an unfair arrangement. One other thing Senator Jackson opened an interesting point speaking of was this the plan that the Republican Committee attempted to foist on the committee. I might add that

June 8, 1971

43.

there is some question of the legality of the meeting in which the Democratic plan came out. The Reapportionment Committee has joint chairman. It does not have a majority chairman. It has joint chairman. The meeting was not called by the joint chairman and as is well known to this circle, it was a really a railroad job. And I needen't prolong this . But merely to say that there is a great question of legality as to whether this plan was legally brought out.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President thru the kindness of Senator Dowd I now have a copy of the plan that is before us. And the amendment. And all I can say is that its even worse than the plan that was foisted on us at the committee meeting. In addition to going from Bethel down to the southwestern corner of the state. We now go all the way to Union. And up in the northeastern part of the state in a curving arch. I think that Governor Gerry would have been very proud of this plan.

THE CHAIR:

I'm not trying to over-rule you. Its my firm memory that he was a Congressman. Maybe he was also a Governor too Senator.

SENATOR JACKSON:

I believe he was a Governor prior to being a Congressman.

THE CHAIR:

I thought that....

SENATOR JACKSON:

He had many titles during his long and lustrous career. Which I am sure he was able to bring forward by his adept re-apportionment scheme.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much.

Senator Caldwell.

June 8, 1971

44.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, a question thru you to either Senator Dowd or Senator Eddy, I don't see Senator Ives. According to the plan that your putting forward. Would the city of Bridgeport be placed in the same Congressional District namely three, as the city of New Haven?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Dowd.

SENATOR DOWD:

Mr. President, thru you to the distinguished Majority leader. Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Caldwell.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President on that basis, I certainly have to rise to object to this particular amendment. Your placing the second largest and the third largest cities in the state. In the very same Congressional Districts. What we did in this session was make an honest attempt to have a fair reapportionment. Mr. President I remember sitting around a table not too many years ago when we had to reapportionment the Congress of this State. I remember the way it was done. And I am certainly glad that we now have Federal Court guide lines to show us how it should be done properly. Because those very towns about which Senator Dowd was complaining a few moments ago. Namely, Wilton, Weston and New Canaan were placed into the Fourth Congressional District over my objection. To be sure that it would be a Republican District to spite the fact that it already had far too many people in the reapportioning that we were doing at that actual time. Now when Senator Dowd refers to community of interest. I wonder if he isn't really saying that Wilton, Weston and New Canaan would like to disassociate to themselves from the problems of the city of Bridgeport. Put Bridgeport in the other Congressional District with New Haven.

June 8, 1971

45

It would seem to me that Bridgeport being the very largest city in the fourth Congressional District should remain. And its only logical that these other towns should move into the Fifth Congressional District where they originally belonged when we first started redistricting some four, five years ago.

I also would like to ask a question of the Clerk. I noticed that this reads the Title of this House Bill reads An Act Concerning the Redistricting of Connecticut's Congressional District. And I'm wondering if it shouldn't read as amended by House Amendment Sch. A.?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk;

THE CLERK:

The Clerk would note that because of some of the difficulties last night. That we do not have in the label as amended by House Amendment Sch. A. There is a House Amendment Sch. A. as adopted on the bill. And it is in the Clerk's possession. The Clerk will read it if.

THE CHAIR:

The record will note that the Clerk meant difficulties with the Computer, not with the Clerk.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

No I wouldn't want you to read the amendment, Mr. Clerk. Because I was on the floor of the House when the amendment was proposed. And I am very familiar with it. I just wanted to make sure that it was part of this bill. And part of the file that we will be voting on here this evening. And I can assure Senator Dowd that I too wish this vote to be taken by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Dowd, Macauley and DeNardis.

SENATOR DOWD:

Mr. President, speaking for the second time. I cannot let the remarks of my Democratic friends go unanswered on a key

June 8, 1971

46.

question such as this. The distinguished Majority Leader tell us that he is interested in a fair and just plan. And I ask him to be measured by his actions. Those of us who were on the reapportionment committee on the very day that this alleged fair and just Democratic plan was presented. I can recall that Senator Eddy and I walked down to a 2 o'clock meeting at 11 minutes after two. To find out that the meeting was over. The 12 Democrats had voted promptly and had railraoded this thing through. Without even the courtesy of waiting for our Republicans. And to show you further that there was every intention of railroading this plan through because they knew that any fair appraisal of it would only result in a committee rejection. Was the fact that when I asked for what was going on, I was handed a press release. A press release. That indicated that the committee today voted the favorable reportk on the Democratic plan.

Mr. President that press release could only have been pre-written. There was absolutely no other way that such finality of action of the committee could have been predicted.

Secondly we're told that somehow or other the New Canaan, Wilton, Weston, Easton, and Trumbull complex is far more at home in the Waterbury, Nagutauck Valley District. Than in the Fairfield County District. And that somehow by fiat of political leaders in 1964, somehow, Mr. President, such obvious Fairfield County towns in mode and every aspect of their community life, New Canaan, Wilton and Weston, somehow would be decreed out into the Waterbury district. I reject it just as any fair minded person would. As far as community of interest goes. What great community of interest could the city of Bridgeport have than with the city of New Haven? They share common problems in housing, in population decrease. In big city problems. And here they could have a congressman who could specialize and represent their views with a single hearted, single minded concern without having to be concerned with the, primarily with the problems of suburbia. It makes real sense Mr. President, in terms of community of interest,

June 8, 1971

47.

And finally I draw your attention to the number one mandate of our Courts. And that is for equality of Districts. And I invite your attention to the facts that the amendment before us at this time, the Republican amendment. Has an average deviation of only 206 persons. Two hundred and six persons, Mr. President out of a average districts of in excess of 505,000. The maximum deviation from absolute equality. The maximum deviation on any one of these districts is less than 1,000. In contrast to the Democratic plan that we are told is fair. It is just and equitable in every way. Has a maximum deviation of nearly 4400, and I submit to you Mr. President, this is nearly five times the maximum deviation of the Republican plan. The hour is late. The facts are clear. I urge adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Caldwell, earlier I committed the mike to Senators Macauley, DeNardis and then Caldwell.

SENATOR MACAULEY:

I yield to Senator Caldwell.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, I've heard quite a bit about this famous or infamous meeting which was held. To spite the fact that I have many duties during this session of the General Assembly. I did attend that particular meeting. The reason I attended it is because I came here when the Session opened one day and sat down and saw a notice that there was going to be a meeting at 2 o'clock. And Senator Ives the Minority Leader was sitting next to me when Senator Murphy, the Senate Chairman of the Committee came by I asked Senator Murphy what this meeting was all about. And was it important enough that he thought that I should attend it. And he indicated that it was a meeting in which a plan was going to be adopted. Now these just happen to be the facts. With respect to the fact that 49,7% of the vote elects only two congressmen, thats not our fault. If some of the Republicans would like to move back into the cities with the rest of us. I think that

June 8, 1971

48.

perhaps you could straighten the whole thing out. You wouldn't have any problem. If most of the Republican votes come from Fairfield County, don't fault us for that. Shift them around a little bit. I'm very satisfied that this plan will meet the tests of the Court. The Democratic plan that is. And I intend to vote against this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Macauley.

SENATOR MACAULEY:

Mr. President, members of the Senate, as a freshman Senator here, I must say the way this reapportionment is worked has been rather curious. As have some other things. We were in the committee working out the Congressional plan. And I can say very honestly that suddenly and out of nowhere there appears a Democratic plan which is put forth as a plan supposedly of the joint committee. I can say that it is nothing but that. And I can say in defense of that the Republicans have come out with a plan which I look at it objectively as I can. Seems to be a better plan. However, in both of these plans, there seems to be one key problem. That is they seem to have ignored the people of the city of Bridgeport. I feel inclined. I feel I must under these circumstances vote against both of these plans. The people of Bridgeport, the Republicans of Bridgeport under both of these plans have no chance in the foreseeable future of ever seeing or hearing from a Republican Congressman as we have at this time. The only feasible solution and this has been well known. Since the beginning of this session is to split Bridgeport. I know its a hard thing to take. But its the only thing that can really treat the city of Bridgeport, which is one of the major cities of this state fairly. I think Bridgeport would benefit by it very greatly in having two Congressmen. Perhaps one Democrat and one Republican. I can see no harm coming from it. And I can see a great deal of benefits in that the Republicans of Bridgeport will at least have a chance of having one of their people in Congress.

June 8, 1971

49.

THE CHAIR:

Senator DeNardis.

SENATOR DENARDIS:

Mr. President, the hour is late so I will yield my remarks so we can get on with the action.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator. Senator Caldwell.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, speaking for the third time, if I may have permission to do so?

THE CHAIR:

I recognized that, Senator Crafts is momentarily distracted. You may proceed.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

The only reason..

THE CHAIR:

However he is giving you the eye.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

I know its past 11 o'clock and he gets itchy at that hour. The only reason for my rising I had not planned on speaking a third time. The reason was when my colleague from Bridgeport arose and suggested that we divide our city in half. And it would be better off if we had two Congressmen. Probably one Democrat and one Republican. I suppose the Republican would have the entree to the White House and perhaps if we had the majority in one of the. In the House of Representatives we'd have the entree there. But I suggest to him why he doesn't propose an amendment where they all run at large. Then we would have six congressmen.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? It having been noted by all speakers that the hour is late. If not the motion has been made for a roll call vote. All those in favor of a roll call vote signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? More than 20% having signified a roll call will be ordered after the usual 3 announce-

June 8, 1971

50.

ments out in the hall. You want to adopt the amendment you vote yes.  
You want to defeat the amendment you vote no.

Results of the roll call vote on Senate Amendment Sch. A.  
to H.B. 52040

Whole number voting 35  
Necessary for passage 18  
Those voting yea 15  
Those voting nay 20

The amendment is defeated. The question is now on the main  
bill. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Mr. President, I believe I've already moved for the adoption  
of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

You have sir.

SENATOR MURPHY:

And I think we have already discussed quite thoroughly and  
I won't remark any further.

THE CHAIR:

I believe so too. That was the chair's intent that the  
discussion on the amendment hopefully would be the discussion on  
the bill also. Senator Eddy.

SENATOR EDDY:

I will go along with the brevity of this plan. I merely  
wish to repeat we are opposed to it. We feel that it is not a  
fair plan. And I would like to add one thing more. The Repub-  
licans in this chamber and all the Republicans in our General  
Assembly stand ready to negotiate on a sincere basis. We are  
ready. And I just say that because we want to settle this thing.  
We don't want to prolong it. We think the voters have a right  
to have a fair plan. And we're ready to get together on a serious  
basis anytime that the other side is equally ready.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator. The Chair doesn't want to over stress  
the brevity. We're all here to listen to any Senator who wishes

June 8, 1971

51.

to be heard. Certainly the Chair is. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY:

I merely request Mr. President, that when the vote be taken, it be taken by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the bill itself? If not all those in favor of a roll call vote signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? More than 20% having so voted, a roll call is ordered after the customary three notices in the hall.

Results of the roll call on Substitute for H.B. 5204 as amended by House Amendment Sch. A.

Whole number voting	35
Necessary for passage	18
Those voting yea	18
Those voting nay	17
Those absent and not voting	0

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Please turn to page 5 of the Calendar.

Cal. 1212, File No. 1430 Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Insurance and Real Estate Substitute for H.B. 6495 An Act Incorporating Connecticut Vision Service Inc.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Dinielli.

SENATOR DINIELLI:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR DINIELLI:

Mr. President, this bill from its title should be self-explanatory. I am sure that most of here are aware of what this does. It merely sets up, its a special act providing for a corporation to provide optometric, optician services contracts for the provision of these services including eye glasses, and treat-

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**REAPPORTIONMENT**

**1971  
Index**

REAPPORTIONMENT

MONDAY

FEBRUARY 1, 1971  
1:00 P.M.

PRESIDING CHAIRMAN: Representative Rollin Mettler

Committee Members: Senators: Murphy (Chm.); Jackson, Dupont;  
Fauliso; Mondani; Caldwell, Eddy; Rome;  
Macauley; Petroni, Ives  
Representatives: Mettler (Co-Chm.); Motto,  
Gudelski; R. Cohen; Ajello; Groppo; Berberich;  
Frate; LaGrotta; Lenge (Co-Chm.); Orcutt;  
Collins

Rep. Mettler: Will the Committee members please be seated. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would now like to officially convene this public hearing of the Joint Legislative Committee on Reapportionment and Redistricting, and the topic of discussion today, "The Congressional Redistricting for the State of Connecticut". For those of you who may not be familiar with the public hearing in the Connecticut General Assembly, I would like to familiarize you with a couple of our rules. I will begin by introducing myself. I am Representative Mettler, House Chairman for the Committee, and this other gentleman behind me is Senator Murphy, who is the Senate Chairman, and we will be alternating in the chair this afternoon. When you wish to testify, we would ask that you go to either seat 99, on my left, where this young lady is standing, or to seat 100, on my right, where that gentleman is standing. At those two desks there are copies of maps of existing Congressional Districts in this State, if you wish to use one for reference. We would ask, when you are prepared to speak, that you go to one of these two seats, and when you are recognized by the chair, please identify yourself by giving us your name, your street address, and your town. If you have a written statement, we would ask that you merely summarize it and not read it to the Committee. Summarize the written statement, and then if you will give the written statement or any exhibits or maps that you may have to the young ladies down in the well of the House, they will be made part of the permanent record of the Committee. I should like to emphasize that this public hearing is by topic. We are holding a public hearing on the question of Congressional Redistricting. We are not holding a hearing on any specific plan of redistricting. Needless to say, if you have a plan, please submit it; if you wish to comment on such plan, please do so. When you are finished with your testimony, there may be questions to you from members of the Committee, such members as are located behind me on the podium, in the well of the House. Therefore, we would ask you to please stay at the microphone for a moment in case there are any questions. We sincerely appreciate those of you who have showed up today to speak to us on this particular subject, and it is the courtesy of hearings of this type to give first preference to some of our public office holders. So I would first begin the hearing by asking if there are any spokesmen here for the Congressmen of the State of Connecticut if they would please go to one of the two microphones. There is no one?

REAPPORTIONMENT

MONDAY

FEBRUARY 1, 1971

I would now ask if there are any members of the General Assembly present in the Hall who wish to address the Committee.

Representative Holdsworth: Mr. Chairman, I am representative Holdsworth, from the 125th District, which is Trumbull, and I also speak for the First Selectman, Mr. Clarence Neiman. We very much would like to have serious consideration to placing Trumbull back in the Fourth Congressional District. All of our interests of the town basically are in the Fourth District and Long Shore area, and being in the Fifth District we are in the valley district, with which we don't have too much in common. We formerly were in the Fourth District -- were continually in the Fourth District until the last go-round which changed the set-up. Mr. Chairman, I know that this is a very trying problem, and we hope that things work out so that Trumbull will be back in the Fourth District.

Representative Mettler: Thank you, Representative Holdsworth. Are there any questions? Are there any other Legislators in the room who wish to speak to the Committee? If not, the hearing is now open to the public.

Mr. Robert H. Franklin: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am Robert Franklin, Executive Director of the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council. Council appreciates the opportunity to appear before the Committee and present data regarding the re-districting of Connecticut's six Congressional districts on the basis of the 1970 census. To form Congressional districts that are exactly equal as possible is the current task of this Committee in the Connecticut General Assembly. Equal representation, based only on population figures was established as the ultimate criteria for Congressional redistricting by the U. S. Supreme Court in Gray v. Saunders case in 1963. The degree of variance from the average was suggested in two ensuing cases - Wells v. Rockefeller (N.Y.) and Kirkpatrick v. Preisler (Mo.) - when the Court ruled out plans in which the maximum deviation of one district from another was less than 3 per cent! The deviation could be smaller; therefore, it had to be smaller, according to the Court.

Thus, no longer are concepts of compactness, natural barriers, county lines, city and town lines, etc. considered to be of paramount importance in redistricting. To prevent political gerrymandering and to adhere to the "one man, one vote" principle, the only valid criteria remain: (1) that the territory within a district be contiguous, and (2) that the population totals be "as equal as possible." Yet if a plan that works within such limits can also preserve municipal boundaries, it would facilitate the handling of procedural matters, thereby assuring greater accuracy and efficiency in such areas.

The accompanying plans outlined on the maps and compared in Table 1 accomplish both. They retain city and town lines as

REAPPORTIONMENT

MONDAY

FEBRUARY 1, 1971

district boundaries, and the deviation percentages are significantly less than 1 per cent. Plan I has the advantage of having district boundaries closer to existing ones. However, in Plan II, the deviation between the largest and the smallest districts is less than one-quarter of one per cent. Nevertheless, the mathematics of both plans appear to fall well within the Supreme Court limits. The small difference between them would not seem to affect fair and equal representation.

Another aspect of reapportionment involves gerrymandering. In a speech entitled "Reapportionment in the 1970's: The Problem of Compliance" given on December 6, 1970, William J. Boyd stated: "In both New York and Missouri the legislatures had obviously tampered with Congressional lines for purely political reasons." And this was a factor considered in the rejection of the plans. Table 2 indicates that only contiguity influenced the formation of the proposed district.

Thus, we submit Congressional Plans I and II for your thoughtful consideration. Both plans present district population figures that are very nearly equal, and thereby facilitate the fair and equal representation in Washington of the people of Connecticut.

Thank you.

Representative Mettler: Thank you, Mr. Franklin. Any questions from the Committee? The next person who wishes to address the Committee, please go to one of the microphones.

Mr. James J. Valenti: My name is James Valenti.

Representative Mettler: Do you want to stand up, Mr. Valenti, please, and hold the mike?

Mr. Valenti: My name is James Valenti. I reside in New Haven, Connecticut. I was under the wrong impression evidently, that the hearings Friday were going to be a continuation of today's hearing, and, accordingly, I have prepared several notes in which I combined my thinking on redistricting for the Congressional and the Legislative districts at the same time. I have, however, filed my comments with the secretary of the Committee, and I will complete the comments at Friday's hearing. But the start of my comments deals with the Congressional District, and the one point that I would like to bring out in the redistricting of the entire State into Legislative and Congressional districts is that the Congressional districts be divided first. In other words, as I've got down here in my notes, and I think, in following the outline that I have filed with the secretary, that if we were to reapportion ... let us say, District Three, we will be able to get, by following the plans, an equal division of Senatorial Districts and representative Assembly Districts. And ... well,

REAPPORTIONMENT

MONDAY

FEBRUARY 1, 1971

I don't wish to take the time of the Committee to read these, because, as I say, I have left a copy with them, but I would just like to go over the two or three paragraphs that I have here. I am presenting these three plans as suggested redistricting of the Third Congressional District, along with suggested redistricting of the State Legislative and Congressional districts, using 1960 Census figures throughout. It is my contention that if it is possible to divide the state into six equal population Congressional districts, then it should be possible to divide each Congressional district with an equal number of Senatorial and Assembly districts. It is essential, therefore, that the line drawers of the Congressional districts be given the initial task of dividing the state into six equally populated areas. Line drawers for the Senatorial districts should then experience little difficulty in establishing equally populated areas within the Congressional district. The number of Senatorial districts in the state can be determined by using any multiple of Congressional seats that will give us a multiple of Congressional seats that will give us a Senate ranging from 30 to 50 seats, as prescribed by law. For example, let us take the present number of Congressional seats -- six. We could then, by simple arithmetic, devise the multiple, which must range from 5 to 8. The multiple 6 was arbitrarily chosen in the attached plans to form a Senate of 36 members. I'll continue with further testimony on that at Friday's hearing. I would like to repeat, the one point that I would like to make is that it is important that the Congressional districts be divided first, and that will give us an equally populated Congressional set of districts, and, following that, it will be an easy matter to sub-divide each Congressional district into the Senatorial and Assembly districts. So that it is possible, by using a simple formula, to constantly have the same number of Senatorial districts and Legislative districts (Assembly districts) within the one Congressional district.

Thank you.

Representative Mettler: Mr. Valenti, you have given your plans to the secretary. Is that correct?

Mr. Valenti: Yes, I have.

Representative Mettler: Thank you very much. Any questions?

Senator Murphy: First of all, I would like to ask if you think any consideration in organizing these districts should be given to the present county lines.

Mr. Valenti: No, I haven't explored the county lines at all.

REAPPORTIONMENT

MONDAY

FEBRUARY 1, 1971

Senator Murphy: So you don't have any feelings as to whether county lines should be given any greater consideration in the organization of Congressional districts as compared to Senate districts?

Mr. Valenti: I wouldn't ..... as I say, I haven't considered the county lines, and these were taken really from the present location, more or less. In other words, when the Third Congressional District, by deducting Stratford and Milford and adding the Town of Clinton, we get an appropriate number of about 418 persons, and, as I say, dividing the other five is just a matter ... it's an arbitrary thing, of course, depending on how the line drawers start the task. In other words, if they were to follow, say, in District Four, and say our population is going to be three million, we would have in District Four, starting with the center radius in Fairfield County and then going out, spreading out north and east, and stopping drawing the line when we get five hundred, more or less, of population.

Senator Murphy: Are there any other questions of Mr. Valenti?

Representative Mettler: Thank you, Mr. Valenti.

I'm shocked to see no one at the two microphones. Is there anyone else in the room who wishes to address the Committee? I suggest the Committee stand at ease for a few moments while we wait to see if anyone else shows up, gentlemen. We'll stand at ease for a few moments.

Last opportunity for anyone who wishes to address the Committee. Is there anyone else in the Hall of the House who wishes to address the Joint Committee on the subject of Congressional Redistricting and Reapportionment? If not, I hereby declare this public hearing adjourned.

Hearing Adjourned: 1:28 P.M.