

HB 7238

PA 865

1971

General Laws 302-306

(5)

House 5239-5332

(94)

Senate 3356-3396

(41)

140

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GENERAL
LAW**

**PART 2
297-629**

1971

have a lottery but you've got to have a daily policy game, and let's call a spade a spade, if you're going to go for gambling, you've got to go all the way, don't be hypocritical. Once you overcome those arguments, go all the way. So, I say, the revenue is one purpose, and the other purpose of this bill certainly is to try and stamp out organized crime because its feeding on our people today. You know, Mr. Chairman, and I know, I could call up anyone and place a bet right today, its being done illegally, and the money that is obtained from this illegal operation is being used to buy drugs that are sold to your children. I'm not waving a flag but its being done and you know it. So once again I would say if you're going to go and overcome the arguments, go the whole way, you can put this in operation July 1st, try it out for a year, see what happens, see what the practices are, see what happens, we're going to come back here next Session and we'll have almost a year of operation to see how this is going along. At that time, if its not going along well, we can always repeal the law. I say we have an opportunity today, again, if you're going to do it, don't just do it piecemeal because that's hypocritical. I say go all the way and I ask for favorable consideration, If you're going to go for gambling, on H.B. 7761.

Rep. Webber: One other question, Jack? Your bill, although I'm familiar with its contents and haven't seen it, does it necessarily call for a race track per se?

Rep. Carrozzella: No, there is no provision in my bill for the establishment of a race track...off track betting, there is no race track in my bill whatsoever.

Senator Strada: Thank you very much. Rep. Miscikoski?

Rep. John A. Miscikoski, 174th District: Distinguished Chairmen, distinguished members of the Committee, Today reminds me of 1961 when I first introduced my first lottery bill. It was snowing that day but I didn't make the hearing, and the only ones that appeared at the hearing was the P.T.A. Association that opposed it, and thats what really got things rolling. From that time on, we had another hearing started at another date, so we presented our side of the story. So today, its snowing again and I made it on time. What I would like to say is the bill I'm going to speak on is #7238. this is AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE OPERATION OF A STATE LOTTERY. Its co-sponsored by 114 legislators and 20 senators, and the Governor has indicated that he will sign the bill so I think this is probably the first bill that I've seen in 14 years that I've been here thats been passed before we even took the vote. For ten long years....I might make the remark that when I started

5
RSW
THURSDAY

GENERAL LAW

MARCH 4, 1971

speaking for the lottery bill, I never wore glasses and I was younger and I think I had more curls, I don't know. For ten long years since 1961 when I introduced my first lottery bill I have firmly and sincerely believed that the state of Connecticut would profit from the institution of a state lottery. During the past five sessions and the current one, I have sponsored many lottery bills. They have not met much success, despite the fact that 85% of the people of the state population favor such a program as a voluntarily painless form of taxation. In my opinion the state of Connecticut has lost millions of dollars by not adopting a lottery ten years ago when my bill was first introduced. Since that time, three states have established lotteries as a means of raising money, New Hampshire in 1964, New York in 1967, and New Jersey in 1970. The small state of New Hampshire holding drawings twice a year has raised almost \$11,000,000 for education. \$11,000,000 may not be a substantial amount of money in other states, but we must bear in mind that the state of New Hampshire has a population of only 606,921 people, with about 125,000 students in its public school system. New York which has monthly drawings has raised \$101,675,302. for education during a period from June, 1967, through and including October, 1970. New Jersey's tickets went on sale for the first time on December 16th of 1970. In one day, a million and a half tickets have been sold. It had been anticipated that only 300,000 would be sold on the first day. According to Ralph Batch, Executive Director of the State Lottery Commission, the reaction of the public has been just fantastic. We in Connecticut were the first to propose a state lottery. Had we been the first to adopt it, maybe we wouldn't have the financial situation that we have today. Although Connecticut does not yet have a legal state lottery, I would like to quote you some figures from the State Police Permit files, the moneys realized from bazaars, raffles, which are held in our fair state. During a five year period from 1966 through 1970, the total receipts were \$27,095,458., while the net profit came to \$15,374,760. Just a little food for thought for the Committee. One of the major arguments against a state lottery in Connecticut is that it has failed in other states to bring in the expected revenues. To argue this legislation just because of this reason is facetious. We could use this type of reasoning against all taxation. How many of our taxes bring in the expected revenue?, but we don't reject them because of this. We continue to go on collecting taxes anyway to help pay the bills. So what's wrong with a state lottery. Its money will help to pay the bills and give us a chance to get some of it back in winnings. Over the years, I have stated and restated my facts concerning the many good things that were accomplished through lotteries and I am sure that Co-Chairman Al Webber, I inserted his name in there, he's a nice

1111

fellow....and the Committee, have heard all of them but I would like to call to their attention once more the following: During the colonial periods and during the years prior to 1825, the official lottery was an apparently accepted and widely used method of financing public projects, private projects important to public interests of this state. Proceeds from the Connecticut lotteries were used to finance many worthwhile projects, among them, in 1793 the proceeds from a state lottery was used to finance construction of our first old State House. In 1760, a lottery was authorized by the Legislature to build the first lighthouse at New London. In 1815, a lottery authorized by the Legislature financed construction of the First Congregational Church at Lyme. In January of 1778, this is for Charlie Morse again, the Hartford Courant's paper mill burned down with a complete and total loss of all its machinery and printing paper. The mill was rebuilt that spring due to a state lottery. Education was an early beneficiary. The University of Pennsylvania was a lottery supported college from the beginning, as were Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Columbia, and Princeton. When the New York, Connecticut, and Delaware State Houses were raised, thanks in part, to lotteries. Between 1790 and 1860, more than half of the states ran lotteries for streets, water supplies, fire equipment, toll bridges, turnpikes, and wharfs. Despite all the good that has been accomplished by lotteries, some people would lead you to believe that lotteries are immoral, and some go so far as to say that it would lead us to crime. A lottery isn't any more immoral than taxing a man without asking him first and then taking his property away when he can't pay his taxes. The lottery would be under strict government control and this would eliminate entirely any possibility of abuse, fraud and mismanagement. If a person does not want to gamble, fine, but he should not impose legislation on someone who does. In closing I would like to mention something which has nothing to do with lotteries but which I thought would be of interest to the Committee. Acting State Tax Commissioner of the State of New York, Norman Gallman, said that the total revenue from the 1969 racing season was \$163 million. In 1970, it was \$172 million - an increase of \$9 million. Since betting became legalized in New York 31 years ago, \$24,959,221,578 has been bet at the tracks. During that time, the state collected \$2,308,959,421. Just imagine, all the good things that the lotteries, and the certain bad things the so-called gambling has done for our country. We can check our history books in any state capitol and find going back to periods years ago of all the good things that lotteries have accomplished. Its true that in our colonial days that we had corruption and all kinds of things that went on, they were run by private organizations in those days, and the tickets sold for \$5.00 a piece. I don't know how

they got \$5.00 in those days, that was a lot of money. Not only that, they had problems of distribution, the horse and wagon couldn't get around throughout the whole part of the state, so I still would like to go on record in favor of supporting #7238, this bill sets up the operation of the lottery, it has 25 sections and it is 10 pages long in all detail, and I'm sure that we have all the safeguards in there, and with the moneys that I read from the State Police Permit files they have made, I am certainly sure that State of Connecticut will benefit very well for the people, and I don't like to make estimates on how many millions of dollars that we're going to make. Now when I first started, I said \$25 million dollars, we would have been the first state, but today with the competition, but even with the competition I feel that every state in the United States should have a lottery and give the people an opportunity to strike it rich in his lifetime, because today its almost impossible for a poor man to strike it rich, and I see nothing wrong with it and I feel that if some people say that people on welfare will be buying tickets, I say fine, we'll get some of our money back and I hope they win so we get them off the welfare. Thank you.

Senator Fauliso: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, just one observation. May I have your permission? First of all, I want to compliment you on your presentation. You've been a pioneer in this particular field, but did you intentionally overlook the arguments about the daily gambling on the stock market, Representative Miscikoski.

Rep. Miscikoski: I have used that for five sessions past. I made my speech very brief, I think you and I had a problem once when I used to come in with the big speeches.... I think there are other people here that want to speak... that's right, we became very good friends, in fact, he's one of my co-sponsors.

Senator Strada: Tony, may I ask you this, you heard Rep. Carrozzella testify that if we intend to move in this direction, we should move all the way and legalize off-track betting, policy, etc., on sports events, would you mind commenting very briefly on that position?

Rep. Miscikoski: Well, I think the people are in favor of it. I personally am not a gambler and the only time I've been to a race track was with the Legislature three times. It cost me \$100. every time I went....a lot of lottery tickets, but I see absolutely nothing wrong with the general public opinion which is strongly in favor of it, and if there is any way that we could take and set it up properly and not abuse anything, I'm definitely for it.

Senator Strada: Would you be kind enough to leave your statement?

Rep. Miscikoski: Yes....thank you.

Senator Strada: Rep. Ruby Cohen, do you want to come up front? No..... Our distinguished Minority Leader, Rep. Collins.

Rep. Francis Collins, 165th District, Minority Leader in the House: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am here today speaking on behalf of the House Republican Leadership and the Meskill Administration in support of the passage of a State Lottery. After many years of discussion and very little action on the subject, I'm happy to note that for the first time, the outlook for a state lottery in the immediate future is excellent. Governor Meskill has called for the adoption of a state lottery in his budget message and it is an integral part of his attempt to provide Connecticut taxpayers with every possible non-tax source of revenue for the state. I don't have to alert the Committee members of the urgency in acting upon a state lottery during this session. The Governor's budget includes revenue to the state in the next fiscal year from this source of approximately 2.5 million dollars, an estimate that I happen to feel personally is extremely low. If we are to realize this revenue as projected by the Administration, we must pass a lottery bill and set up the procedure for putting the lottery into effect in rather a short period of time. I would like to point out that the state of New Jersey is reaping unexpected millions in its first venture with a lottery, and I would note that there appears a rather interesting article in this morning's Hartford Courant on the experience of the New Jersey Legislature in its lottery proposal. The success of the New Jersey lottery has been so great that officials were required to schedule additional prize drawings to give away surplus money. The net return to New Jersey is now expected to be 30 million dollars in the first year. Hopefully Connecticut can examine and benefit from the New Jersey experience. In addition to the lottery, I would like to briefly comment on behalf of both the Meskill Administration and the House Republican Leadership on proposals that would establish horse racing and pari-mutual betting in the state of Connecticut. We are in accord that this Committee should give favorable consideration to bringing out a bill which would establish a commission, a pari-mutual and horse racing commission for the state of Connecticut. The Governor's projected budget for the next fiscal year does not

H-119

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 12
5163-5554**

Monday, June 7, 1971

77

So ordered.

djh

MR. SARASIN (95th):

And, Mr. Speaker, on page 30, third item from the top, Calendar No. 1593, I would ask that that be placed on the consent calendar again. It was placed on, we took it off and we'd like to put it back on.

THE SPEAKER:

Unless there is objection, this whimsical bill will now go back on to the consent calendar.

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 48, I would like to move suspension of the rules and adoption of a resolution that is presently before us congratulating, a House Joint Resolution ²⁴⁵ Congratulating the Town of Winchester on its Two Hundredth Anniversary introduced by Rep. Groppo of the 176th.

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection to suspension of the rules? Hearing none, the rules are suspended. Do you wish to move adoption of the resolution?

MR. SARASIN (95th):

I would so move, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Do you wish to remark? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The resolution is ADOPTED.

THE CLERK:

Page 11, Calendar No. 1334, substitute H. B. No. 7238, An Act Concerning a Commission on Special Revenue, File No. 1560.

THE SPEAKER:

Try again, Tony.

Monday, June 7, 1971

78

djh

MR. MISCIKOSKI (174th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Torrington who today appropriately has his blue shirt on, Rep. Miscikoski.

MR. MISCIKOSKI (174th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Would you remark?

MR. MISCIKOSKI (174th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of substitute House Bill--

THE SPEAKER:

I think the gentleman has waited this long. With only two and a half days to go in the session, he ought to have our full attention.

MR. MISCIKOSKI (174th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, again. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of substitute for H.B. No. 7239, An Act Concerning a Commission on Special Revenue, which shall oversee the operation of a state lottery, state racing, off-track betting within the state.

Mr. Speaker, this is a measure which I have supported and fought for over the past several years. This is a measure which I am convinced will benefit the people of Connecticut and the State of Connecticut's government. Mr. Speaker and members of the legislature, for the benefit of all the members, I will now outline the provisions of this bill.

Sections 1 through 10 deal with the establishment of the commission

its makeup, its procedures and its powers.

djh

Section 1 states there shall be nine members of the commission, outlines their qualifications, their manner of appointment, their term of office and their salaries.

Section 2 requires that each member of the commission must take an oath of office and must submit a bond to the state in the amount of \$25,000. This section also states that any decision reached by the commission must be based on at least six affirmative votes.

Section 3 authorizes the commission to hire an executive secretary.

Section 4 authorizes the commission to require any of its employees to submit a bond.

Section 5 forbids any member or employee of the commission to have any financial interest in the gaming enterprise.

Section 6 extends powers to the commission to carry out the provisions of this act.

Section 7 requires the commission to publicize--

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 174th.

MR. MISCIKOSKI (174th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Section 7 requires the commission to publicize its decision and regulations.

Section 8 requires the commission to make an annual report to the Governor.

Section 9 extends investigative powers to the commission.

Section 10 requires the commission to keep an accurate record of its proceedings and to make those records public.

Section 11 states within the commission, there will be established

Monday, June 7, 1971

80

separate divisions on the lottery, horse racing and off track betting and that each division will be administered by an executive director. djh

Section 12 through 14 deals with the establishment and administration of the state lottery.

Section 12 authorizes the commission to determine the number of times a lottery shall be held, the price of the tickets and the amount of prizes and the drawing of the prizes.

Section 13 describes the procedures for distribution of the lottery tickets.

Section 14 cites the definition of counterfeiting and classifies the crime as a Class A misdemeanor.

Section 15 authorizes the commission to establish and conduct a system of off track betting on races held within the state.

Section 16 authorizes the commission to establish branches for the purpose of off track betting.

Section 17 requires the commission to give periodic accounts of the revenue brought in from the off track betting.

Section 18 forbids any individual or group from betting on horse racing unless licensed by the commission and outlines the procedures of licensing.

Section 19 authorizes the commission to permit racing events under the provisions of this act and outlines certain restrictions on those racing events.

Section 20 through 27 repeals certain sections of the existing laws to make them consistent with this act.

Section 28 forbids anyone under the age of 18 from participating

Monday, June 7, 1971

81

in any gambling activity and forbids anyone from knowingly permitting individuals under 18 from participating in gambling events. djh

Section 29 states that the act will take effect on July 1, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentleman of this House, I would like to give you a rundown on what happened in 1961. An act concerning a state lottery, the roll call vote on June 6th was rejected by 190 to 64 with 40 absent; in 1963, the operation of a state lottery roll call on May 29th was rejected 198 to 73 with 23 absent, we're picking up here and there; in 1965 to authorize a referendum on the question of establishing a state lottery, the roll call on May 11th rejected the bill 161 to 104 with 29 absent; in 1965, establishment of an operation of a state lottery system, the roll call June 7th rejected the bill 127 to 126 with 41 absent, that was a race day that day; in 1967 to authorize a referendum on the question of establishment of a state lottery, roll call May 17th rejected the bill 98 to 63 with 16 absent; 1967 the establishment of a state lottery system, roll call, June 1, bill passed as amended, 85 to 65 with 27 absent, no action in the Senate; 1969, establishment of a state lottery system, voice vote, May 20, passed as amended, no action in the Senate; 1969 requiring a referendum on a question of establishment of a state lottery, roll call, March 6, bill passed 107 to 49 with 21 absent, Senate roll call, April 3, accepted committee's unfavorable report 21 to 13 with 2 absent.

Today's the day, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Speaker,

THE SPEAKER:

Commissioner!

MR. MISCIKOSKI (174th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is ironic to note that I started the

Monday, June 7, 1971

82

boom for adoption of a lottery in Connecticut before New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey and they now have it but the Nutmeg State hasn't got it yet, but we're hoping, we have great hopes today. I feel the State of Connecticut has already lost over \$200 million because of hypocrisy. It is a therapy for the people to look forward to a happiness happening by buying a state lottery ticket and hoping to be a winner. Today, all they have to look forward to is taxes and more taxes and there seems to be no end to taxes. We all know that.

djh

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if anyone buys a state lottery ticket, he is voluntarily participating in a government fund raising project. Some people object to a lottery on moral grounds but I have never been able to find anyone who could really explain why a lottery is immoral. Anything is, anything that is immoral is covered in the Ten Commandments and I say there's nothing in them about lotteries.

For ten long years, since 1961, when I first introduced my first lottery bill, I firmly and sincerely believe that the State of Connecticut would profit from the institution of the state lottery. During the past five sessions and the current one, I have sponsored many lottery bills. They have not met with much success in spite of the fact that 85% of the state population favors such a program as a voluntary form of taxation. In my opinion, the State of Connecticut has lost millions of dollars by not adopting a lottery ten years ago when my bill was first introduced. Since that time, three states have established lotteries as a means of raising money. New Hampshire was our first state in 1964, New York in 1967 and New Jersey in 1970. The small state of New Hampshire, holding drawings twice a year, has raised almost \$11 million for education. Now, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman, \$11 million may not be a substantial amount of money in other states but we must bear in mind that

Monday, June 7, 1971

83

New Hampshire has a population of only 606,921 people with about 125,000 students in its public school system. New York, which has monthly drawings, and they are going to make more changes coming up in the near future, have produced \$110.9 million for education during the period from June 1967. New Jersey, tickets went on sale for the first time on December 16, 1970, in one day, one million and a half tickets have been sold. It had been anticipated that only 300,000 would be sold the first day. According to Ralph Efthatch, executive director of the state lottery commission, the reaction of the public has just been fantastic. New Jersey is reaping unexpected millions from its first venture in legalized gambling. The state lottery is proving so successful that Governor William T. Cahill predicts profits for the first six months ending July would reach fifteen million. Originally, the estimate has been only five million. For fiscal '71-'72, the Governor is hoping for twenty-five million in state profits after prizes and administrative expenses are deducted. Governor Cahill of New Jersey noted that the lottery windfall could pay for a projected increase of 17,000 students at a state college without new taxes.

Mr. Speaker, for forty years, the Irish Sweepstakes has been very successful and has scattered fortunes around the world and provided Ireland with some of the finest hospital facilities in the world. And incidently, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of this House, Andrew Mulcriskie, nice Polish boy, I think he comes from New Britain too, in the State Capitol Superintendent's Office, won \$140,000 in 1965 in the Irish Sweepstakes. Congratulations! We in Connecticut were the first to propose a state lottery. Had we been the first to adopt it, maybe we wouldn't be in the financial situation we are in now. Although Connecticut does not yet have a legal state lottery, I'd like to quote you some figures taken from the State Police permit files on monies realized from bazaars and raffles which are held in our fair

djh

state. During a period of five years from 1966 through 1970, total receipts were \$27,095,458, net profits came to \$15,374,760. Just a little food for thought.

One of our major arguments a state lottery in Connecticut is that it has failed in other states to bring in the expected revenues. To argue against this legislation because of this reason is facetious. We could use this type of reasoning against all taxation. How many of our taxes bring in the expected revenues but we don't reject them because of this. We continue to go on collecting taxes anyway to help pay the bills. So what's wrong with a state lottery? This money will help to pay the bills and give us a chance to get some of it back in winnings. Over the years I have stated and restated my facts concerning the many good things that were accomplished through lotteries.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of this House, during the colonial periods and in the years prior to 1825, the official lottery apparently was an accepted and widely used method of financing public projects and private projects important to the public interest of this state. Proceeds from Connecticut's day lotteries were used to finance many worthwhile projects and among them, in 1793, the proceeds from a state lottery was used to finance construction of our old State House. In 1760, a lottery was authorized by the legislature to build the first lighthouse at New London. In 1815, a lottery authorized by the legislature financed construction of the First Congregational Church in Lyme. In January 1778, this one is for Charlie Morris again, the Hartford Courant's papermill burned down with the complete and total loss of all its machinery and printing paper, the mill was rebuilt that spring due to a state lottery and if Charlie Morris would forgive me, he's heard this so many times and yet his editorials from his newspaper says how bad it is. Education

djh

was an early beneficiary. The University of Pennsylvania was a lottery sponsored college from the beginning as were Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Columbia and Princeton. The New York, Connecticut and Delaware State Houses were raised, thanks in part, to lotteries. Between 1790 and 1860, more than half the states ran lotteries for street, for streets, water supplies, fire equipment, toll bridges, turnpikes and wharves. In spite of all the good that has been accomplished by lotteries, some people would lead you to believe that lotteries are immoral and some go as far as to say that it would lead us to crime.

A lottery isn't any more immoral than taxing a man without asking him first and then taking away his property when he can't pay his taxes. The lottery would be under strict government control and this would eliminate entirely any possibility of abuses, fraud and mismanagement. If a person does not want to gamble, fine, but he should not impose legislation on someone who does.

Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of this House, in closing I would like to mention something which has nothing to do with lotteries but which I thought would be of interest. Acting State Commissioner of the State of New York, Norman Golman, said that the total revenue from 1969 racing season was, 1969 right, was \$163 million; in 1970, it was \$172 million, an increase of \$9 million. Since betting became legalized in New York, thirty-one years ago, they have bet \$24,959,221,578 has been bet at the tracks in New York during that time. The state collected in revenue \$2,308,959,421. Boy that's a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, Tax Foundation Incorporated, a private non-profit research body said, the amount of time you must work to pay your federal, state and local taxes in an eight hour day is two hours and forty-three minutes. Now,

Monday, June 7, 1971

86

djh

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of this House, let's give the poor man something to look forward to besides taxes. Let's give him some hope and happiness and his only chance to strike it rich through voluntarily painless taxation.

Mr. Speaker, when the roll call is taken, I wish to have it taken by--

THE SPEAKER:

It seems to me the motion is to take a roll call by machine! All those in favor of taking the roll call by machine, indicate by saying aye.

Before going too much farther, I would indicate for the benefit of the members, knowing your interest in this bill, that there are ten amendments pending and after that, the bill itself and then 132 calendar items including the budget. So, as you consider the length of your speech, I would hope you would take this into consideration.

MR. MISCIKOSKI (174th):

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to our Majority Leader, Rep. Carl Ajelski!

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Not from New Britsky! Mr. Speaker, this is an historic occasion in one sense of the word because this is the first time that this General Assembly and in particular, the House of Representatives, take up matters which will allow legal gambling in the State of Connecticut with some assurance and some hope that it will pass and be signed into law. We've adopted in this particular bill which, as most people know by now, has been worked over very hard in the last few days, we've adopted an overall approach and in coming in behind our neighboring states and some other states in the United States, we

Monday, June 7, 1971

87

djh

have had the benefit of their experience and we have drawn extensively on statutes of other states where we have found good things for us to model our actions upon. Our counsel has examined minutely all of the statutes in all of the states that conduct any form of gaming and have tried to, as I say, extract the best of those to insure that Connecticut's approach will be tightly structured. As anyone can readily see in a matter such as this, there are great opportunities in existence for abuse of the power and the processes that are involved in the licensing and the handling of monies, in the account for some, because large sums of money generally can be expected to be handled by this type of operation. We have tried to guard against this sort of thing by providing extensive investigatory procedures. We are going to indicate in at least one of our amendments today the basic considerations we feel should be followed by the commission in adopting its rules and regulations which again will be a further extension of this legislation. And I can say to you now, that contrary to what may or may not have been suggested by newspaper articles dealing with this subject, I think it will be a case of many are called but few are chosen. There has been some speculation in the newspapers that certain individuals or firms have assurances that they can become the operators or owners of racetracks or what have you in the State of Connecticut and I would like to repeat something that I have said earlier which is, that the commission has not yet been appointed, no rules or regulations have been adopted, so obviously no person or firm has been able to apply and we hope with the safeguards that we have built into the licensing procedures that none, no one need fear that assurances have been given to any person, because, insofar as I can say or as I know, there are absolutely no grounds for anyone to claim that he has the inside track, if you will, on the track.

Moreover, in the process of reaching various agreements on the

5250

djh

structuring of this operation, we have come to an agreement which insures that all matters of licensing will be conducted on the basis of a two-thirds vote of the commission being required for passage of any vote which has to do with licensing and related matters. This amendment, I'm sure, is one that's been thought about and discussed at great length and we feel that regardless of which political party is in control of the situation and has the majority of the appointments to the commission, that the public has a right to expect that there will be a bipartisan approach and, moreover, that each licensing will be carefully approached and carefully thought out. We expect also to receive amendments, a number of them this afternoon, one of which will grant a local option in the matters of off track betting so that if a community should decide that it does not want to have the off track betting operation within its confines, it will have the opportunity to refuse it.

Also, in another amendment, the accounting procedures will be tightened up so that there will be an outside audit provided for, but we'll get into those in just a moment.

I'd like to point out also that while the revenue to be expected from this is certainly conjectural at this point and time, whatever revenue we make from this operation will certainly be, in a sense, found money because no one has counted on it up to this point and I feel that the operation will be extremely successful, that it's something that the people of the State of Connecticut are largely in favor of and have supported strongly.

I would just point out also in passing, Mr. Speaker, that as far as a racetrack in and of itself is concerned, there are many benefits that flow from having such a facility within the state. For a long time, it's been viewed apparently in some circles here in Hartford, as some sort of an evil

Monday, June 7, 1971

89

djh
while on the other hand, states and countries which enjoy racing as a form of diversion, advertise it as a tourist attraction. So, it seems to me that we can look at it in the same way and indicate that today we are adding a feature to the State of Connecticut which will make it more attractive to people who may want to come here to visit or vacation.

Certainly the monies which will flow into the state from without Connecticut as well as from our own citizens can be brought to the centers of this kind of operation, will be beneficial. There are other benefits which are equally important--the employment of thousands of people in these operations is a very significant factor and particularly again in a racetrack operation, many of the people whom we seek to employ daily, with whom we have the most trouble in terms of retraining, in terms of displacement without further opportunity, the unskilled, the uneducated, there will be many jobs available at this kind of facility for this kind of person. Just think of it for a moment, the janitorial work, the grooms, the ticket takers, attendants at the parking areas, all of these things will add to the employment picture very significantly. We're not talking about ten or twenty jobs, we're talking about hundreds and perhaps thousands.

Again, the establishment of a racetrack in a given area will add to its local property rolls. The operation there of concessions and facilities and sales of different personal property items will bring the State of Connecticut even further revenues than can be generally anticipated purely from the gambling that's associated with the racetrack.

So I think that all of these factors have been considered and should be considered in our approach to this. Now to those that feel that there is something immoral about this action, I would simply say that it's a personal

Monday, June 7, 1971

90

decision which each person has to make for him or herself and most of us feel today that we are doing the right thing for the State of Connecticut in adding something that has long, that has been long overdue and long in coming and with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to indicate that the Clerk has an amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk call Amendment Schedule "A" of those on file, "A" through "J"? The Clerk will call Amendment Schedule "A".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. Ajello of the 118th, Mr. Hannon of the 16th.

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, may I have permission to outline the amendment?

THE SPEAKER:

I'm sure that no one would object.

MR. AJELLO (118th):

In the interest of saving time, sir, this simply is the amendment which does what I indicated pursuant to an agreement among the leaders. It provides that an affirmative vote of at least six commissioners shall be required, this, I may be explaining the wrong amendment. Perhaps I should have the Clerk read it.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will call "A" and provide a copy to the gentleman from the 118th.

MR. AJELLO (118th):

We'll find out which one we're doing, Mr. Speaker, and I'll explain it. Very well, I have the correct one at this time, Mr. Speaker, and I would

Monday, June 7, 1971

91

beg the House's indulgence. We don't have these numbered here at my chair.

djh

This particular amendment is the one I referred to earlier which will require the commission to include in its rules and regulations, as a minimum standard, that the persons making application to be licensed, and there are a vast variety of licensings under this, not only the owner of a racetrack but anybody who sells anything there, people who sell lottery tickets or handle money in most of these instances, will have to be licensed and approved by the commission before they can become employed in any capacity. So that we will require in this amendment that the commission give due attention to the moral character, criminal record if any, previous employment, corporate partnership or associate, association affiliations, ownership of personal assets and any other information deemed to be pertinent to the issuance of such license.

I move the adoption of Amendment "A", Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Amendment Schedule "A"?

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. I think it adds a necessary element and necessary ingredient to the licensing factors.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on "A"? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? House "A" is ADOPTED.

The Clerk will call House Amendment Schedule "B".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B" offered by Mr. Ajello of the 118th and Mr. Hannon of the 16th, Mr. Collins of the 165th, Mr. Gaffney of the 29th.

Monday, June 7, 1971

92

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, since I'm all primed up to explain this, I'd ask the Chair's permission to do that.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk is ready, Mr. Ajello.

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, this is the amendment I mentioned before and to which I referred earlier in my remarks, which would require that any licensing to be done by the commission, be done by the affirmative vote of at least six commissioners and that any person who operates any concession, parking facility, food and beverage service, souvenirs, all of these things, would be included within the purvue of the licensing provisions of the statutes. I move adoption of Amendment "B".

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Amendment Schedule "B".

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of this amendment. The original wording in the bill in our file presented a requirement for two-thirds vote on all actions. After some discussion and some consultation between the leadership on both sides of the aisle, the amendment was arrived at as outlined by Rep. Ajello, which would only require the two-thirds vote in licensing matters and a majority vote in all other matters, which is the usual case in every board and commission in this state. I think that the amendment before us is one that recognizes that while this is a standard commission in most senses, the licensing factors, particularly in the area of horseracing is a unique thing that does require additional consideration. I support the amendment.

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

93

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. HANNON (16th):

Mr. Speaker, this is the particular amendment that for whatever their reasons, got most of the press for the past four or five days in the state. It was worked out after a multitude of hours spent with the leaders on the other side of the aisle. It was felt in this most sensitive area of licensing of people to do business in the State of Connecticut for the purposes of gambling that both major political parties in the State of Connecticut should have their fingerprints indelibly marked on the licensees. And agreement was reached most recently, a mood of compromise and understanding. The amendment does have the fingerprints of the leaders on both sides of the aisle.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The Amendment "B" is ADOPTED.

The Clerk will call House Amendment "C".

THE CLERK:

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

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of House Amendment Schedule "C".

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman outline it?

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the amendment is rather simple. It just refers in line 8 where the appoint power at present would be five in the Governor's

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

94

office and four, two by the Speaker of the House and two by the President Pro Tem of the Senate. The amendment would just change the latter part on the appointments by the President or the Speaker to cover the situation where the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House and Governor should be members of the same political party, then the appointments made by the President or the Speaker, as the case might be, would then be made by the Minority Leader of the respective Houses. This is just to insure that the minority representation provision as contained in the bill is carried out in any event. I move adoption, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANNON (16th):

Mr. Speaker, we offered to, when we take over the Governor's Chair in four years, we offered to make the minority appointments in accordance with the wishes of Mr. Collins and Mr. Gaffney but they assured us that they would like to have reciprocity in as much as the four minority members to the proposed commission are going to be made by the Speaker and President Pro Tem, it would be only fitting that if the Democrats control both branches of government, the minority representatives would be appointed at the suggestion and the names would be given by the minority leaders in both houses.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment Schedule "C"? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Amendment "C" is ADOPTED.

The Clerk will call Amendment "D".

THE CLERK:

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

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption. I think if the Clerk reads this one,

Monday, June 7, 1971

95

it would be just as brief as an explanation.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will break his pattern and outline by reading the amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "D".

In lines 57 and 58, strike out the words "Any commissioner unable to be present may vote by a written proxy. Seven" and insert the word "six".

In line 60, after the word "quorum", insert the following: ", or in instance of vacancy, a majority of the members remaining qualified".

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, in moving adoption of this, it doesn't require too much explanation other than to say that we are eliminating by this amendment the use of a written proxy and changing the quorum requirements from seven of the nine commissioners to six of the nine commissioners and in addition, where there happens to be a vacancy, a majority of the members remaining qualified would be the only number required for a quorum.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Amendment Schedule "D"? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Amendment "D" is ADOPTED.

The Clerk will call Amendment Schedule "E".

THE CLERK:

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

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of House Amendment Schedule "E" and would ask the Clerk to read it.

Monday, June 7, 1971

96

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will read Amendment Schedule "E".

THE CLERK:

Amendment Schedule "E".

In lines 347 to 350, inclusive, strike out the words: "The commission may at its discretion appoint deputies, not exceeding twenty, to perform such duties as such regulations of the commission may require."

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, this amendment as the Clerk has just read is rather simple. In the original bill that had been agreed by the, both sides of the aisle, that particular sentence was left out when it came back from the Legislative Commissioner's Office, it was inadvertently omitted. It is the joint feeling of both sides that there is no need to set requirements or numbers in terms of the deputies that the commission might find necessary. I think it's a healthy amendment and move adoption.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment Schedule "E".

MR. AJELLO (118th):

I'd simply like to indicate that the gentleman is quite correct and we do support the amendment. As is generally known, we've made an effort to make this as flexible as possible and the feeling is that there's no sense in tying the commission to a specific number which it may not need so that they will have the power to determine in fact what the circumstances and numbers shall be.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment Schedule "E"? If not, all those in

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

97

favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Amendment "E" is ADOPTED.

djh

The Clerk will call Amendment Schedule "F".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "F" offered by Mr. Lavine of the 73rd.

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

Would the Clerk read the amendment please?

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will read the amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "F".

In line 285, after the word "operation" and before the period, insert the following: "provided the establishment of such an office in any municipality for the purpose of receiving moneys on the results of races, shall be subject to the approval of the legislative body of such municipality which shall be given only after a public hearing on the same."

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

Mr. Speaker, this amendment speaks to the concern that some legislators have about the off track betting provision of this bill. There is only limited experience with off track betting in this country, in New York City, and the bill gives wide latitude to the commissioners to establish the nature and the type of off track betting establishments as they see fit. This amendment seeks to say to towns that if they feel the nature of these off track betting parlors are not within the character of the town, that they can, after a public hearing, turn down the off track betting parlor or whatever the commission is going to determine to call them.

I'd just like to make one final comment, while I'm talking about

Monday, June 7, 1971

98

this particular amendment. New York's experience has been a successful experience but it has also had one disturbing note as far as I'm concerned and that has been the nature and type of advertising that they've done. I think that individuals should have the right to wager on the lottery, should have the right to attend a horseracing track, should have indeed the right to wager at off track betting, if they so wish. I think that's different than the state getting involved in shilling for this and I just would hope that if off track betting becomes a reality, that we will not see what New York has, which is advertisements in the busses, along the streets, urging people to dig into their pockets and to bet. If people wish to bet, that's fine but if they don't wish to bet, I hope that the state won't be urging them to do it. That's just my own personal reflection.

I would move the adoption of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of Amendment Schedule "F".

MR. HANNON (16th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the adoption of this amendment. It, in fact, imposes the local option I like to this, to off track betting. As Mr. Lavine has said so aptly, there are those in this hall who have serious reservations about the principle of off track betting. Mr. Lavine's concern is obviously legitimate and I think the adoption of this amendment to have a ratification by the local legislative body speaks to the issue. It goes a long way in insuring those towns and cities in the State of Connecticut who, in fact, do not wish to avail themselves of offices of off track betting, do not have to do so.

THE SPEAKER:

Monday, June 7, 1971

99

Will you remark further on the amendment?

djh

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment. I think the explanation by Rep. Lavine was certainly thorough and I don't see any necessity for us, in putting a bill of this nature into the force of law, to require any community that does not want to have off track betting in its community to do so. It does require the affirmative vote of the community if they want to have such offices or branches within their community and it's wholly consistent with I think our concern for local autonomy.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. TUDAN (42nd):

Mr. Speaker, when the bill was described to us and I think the motion at the time was devoted to the lottery as such, of course, we're concerned also with horseracing and off track betting, in regards to this particular amendment if we do have a referendum and a particular community does vote to allow it, are there any benefits that will be derived to that particular community from these funds?

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

I would assume that the commission has such wide latitude that this is going to be a decision that the commission is going to have within its purvue but one of the sponsors of the bill can correct me.

MR. TUDAN (42nd):

Is there anyone here who can answer that? Are any revenues going

Monday, June 7, 1971

100

to be the town's or any towns going to receive any separate revenues as a result of off track betting if they have it, let's say, in a particular community? Or, is it all going to the state and we can hold it in our particular towns, is that the idea?

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 16th care to respond?

MR. HANNON (16th):

Mr. Speaker, through you, sir, the legislative intent of this bill that all revenues derived from this act will be that of the State of Connecticut.

MR. TUDAN (42nd):

Mr. Speaker, then I suggest in view of the fact that the basis for off track betting is the State of New York because I believe that's the only one that has it, that presently, presently in the New York legislature, there is an amendment being offered on off track betting whereby these communities will receive a certain percentage which they can use for their own general funding. I wish they'd look into it.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. LENGE (13th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment but perhaps for a different reason. My hope, sir, is that local grassroots wisdom will be so widespread in the state that all of the communities will say no.

MR. EDWARDS (155th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, a question to Rep. Hannon. Following up what Rep. Tudan has said, would the town that did not decide to indulge in

Monday, June 7, 1971

101

off track betting, would there be any prejudice against them in the receipt of funds which are retained from them?

MR. HANNON (16th):

I know of no prejudice, sir.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment? If not the question is on--

MR. CAMP (163rd):

A question to Mr. Lavine and that is, as I understand it, the local zoning commission could refuse under present law to allow a gambling house within its confines. Is that not correct?

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

Well, this isn't talking to a gambling house. This isn't talking to a gambling house, Mr. Speaker, through you. This is speaking specifically to one aspect of this bill and it says that the legislative body in this particular case shall, after a public hearing, have a determination as to the acceptance of this.

MR. CAMP (163rd):

Well, I don't mean to get into a snapping question but whether you have a gambling house or whether you have an off track betting parlor or whatever you have, it seems to me that this is in the framework of the local zoning board. I'm just wondering if the town in this way overrules what the zoning board does.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

It's always been my thought, gambling is illegal in Connecticut.

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

102

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment? The gentleman from the 16th for the second time.

MR. HANNON (16th):

Mr. Speaker, just so that question doesn't go totally unanswered. It was the thrust of this amendment to impose in addition to any planning and zoning restrictions adopted or present in any town, to impose this further restriction notwithstanding those zoning requirements, notwithstanding that the particular town involved might allow an off track betting office, an office of the State of Connecticut to be situated in that town and in addition to that, that the local legislative body would have to vote yes after a public hearing.

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. Camp? The gentleman says thank you, Rep. Hannon.

MR. CRETELLA (99th):

Mr. Speaker, a question through you to Mr. Hannon or Mr. Lavine. Are we talking now about only off track betting parlors or are we talking about places which would sell, for instance, the lottery tickets.

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

Mr. Speaker, off track betting, not the lottery portion. It says quite specifically in the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment? Question is on adoption of Amendment Schedule "F". All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Amendment "F" is ADOPTED.

The Clerk will call Amendment Schedule "G", on our way to "J".

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

103

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "G" offered by Mr. Blumenthal of the 56th, Kablik of the 22nd, Donnelly of the 46th. One and a half pages.

THE SPEAKER:

The House will stand at ease.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk will recall the amendment. The Clerk was in error. House Amendment "G" offered by Mr. Kablik of the 22nd, Mr. Blumenthal of the 56th, Donnelly of the 46th, consisting of one page and two lines on the second page.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 22nd to outline the amendment.

MR. KABLIK (22nd):

Mr. Speaker, to outline this amendment is very simple. Basically what the amendment does is that it allows, delete if you wish, the authorization for this Special Revenue Commission to commence with horseracing or on track betting in the State of Connecticut. It further asks that the executive director of state racing inquire, study and report as to the desirability of establishing state racing, the social and economic effects of establishing such racing, the possible methods and other factors relating to the operation of racing. The other portions of the amendment are merely technical in terms of remuneration. The line does not delete the executive director of state racing. Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark on adoption of Amendment Schedule "G"?

MR. KABLIK (22nd):

Mr. Speaker, it is not my primary intention although I do not desire to have racetracks in the State of Connecticut to oppose solely on the

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

104

merits. I think it's ironic in a way, and this amendment by the way is sponsored by two other gentlemen and there'll be a second amendment in reference in offtrack shortly, it's ironic I believe that the local residents will have an option, if you wish, on off track betting but yet this afternoon, we're not having an option as to the three elements of this bill, the lottery, the horseracing or on track betting and off track betting. Most of the enumeration and debate and so forth and I congratulate Commissioner Miscikoski. I'm all in favor of the lottery, I think it's a great idea, Tony. I only think though that we should have an opportunity to, we have a responsibility to vote on each of the items, the on track and the off track, and frankly, I resent to some degree intellectually the fact and also feel that we have a responsibility to our voters whom we represent to state I was in favor of on track, I was opposed to off track, vice-versa. There's no particular compelling logical reason why we should be required to vote in all or nothing and it is basically on that point and for that reason that I was prompted to sponsor and co-sponsor these two amendments. Frankly, in terms of racing, which is the amendment here, I believe that Connecticut can do without the experiences of a racetrack and frankly I was dismayed and disappointed, if you wish, in the events that transpired as entrepreneur who's only concern is their dollar, not the State of Connecticut's, start scrambling where to put the track and who gets the first entry into the pork barrel. I'll pass to other speakers, Mr. Speaker, as to further merits of racing or on track betting, I don't claim to be the expert in the General Assembly on it, but I think we should have our option on the three elements of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment.

Monday, June 7, 1971

105

MR. BLUMENTHAL (56th):

djh

Mr. Speaker, speaking for the amendment, this is not a stalling tactic. The amendment is written so that the executive director and the commission can come back to this General Assembly at any time to give us a report as to these factors and better make a determination. I am fortunate or unfortunate in living in a corner of the state where the traffic to the track in Rhode Island goes through our town quite readily. I know and I have visited tracks in Rhode Island and New Hampshire and Massachusetts and know there are many problems associated with racetracks and I just think that we're trying to do here a little too much, too fast, and we ought to just do it in a logical well-thought manner and do it in the right way. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment and to the first gentleman who spoke, I would simply point out that he does have an option and all of us do have an option to vote on the entire proposal and it's precisely what we're doing in this amendment. However, I think that most of us who have been here for some period of time have developed an attitude toward all of these forms of gaming and I don't think it's at all unfair to have reached an agreement on a package which we put before the House in order to expedite the matter and he certainly is free, as he has done, to offer an amendment to counteract any part of that and we will determine by the vote whether or not a majority of the members feel that way. But I do submit that I think that most of us know how we feel about these subjects by now and to the gentleman who spoke more recently about the problem of having a lot of traffic go through his town to get to the track in Rhode Island, I hope that by establishing one

Monday, June 7, 1971

106

in Connecticut, we can reverse the flow of some of that traffic and keep it out of his town and I would further point out that I don't think he need fear having the track located in or near his town since it's close to the ones in Rhode Island already. So that it doesn't seem to me to be too significant an objection. Hopefully, the matters of traffic flow and convenience to the citizenry will be considered by the commission in deciding what location they will allow.

djh

MR. RITTER (6th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment. I hadn't expected to speak until the final measure was before us but neither did I know that this amendment was coming in. The chief reason that I support this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm against the bill in its entirety but I'm specifically also against on track and horsetrack racing in Connecticut and I will try to keep my remarks very brief.

It occurs to me that indeed this is an historic day as has been suggested. Only time will tell whether it is a lamentable one, however. My own judgment is that it will be some later date considered to be a very sad day for the citizens of this state and here is the reason. I think that with the flow of traffic that will come to Connecticut if we establish horseracing will also come a major special interest group which will impose its will on this council, on the commission and on this legislature as no other special interest group in the history of this state has even dared tried to. Throughout the country, the history is clear that the most aggressive, effective, uninhibited lobbying group in each of the states in which you have horsetracks is the group that ultimately moves in and takes over. And I believe, Mr. Speaker and members of this House, that we should defeat the bill today and

Monday, June 7, 1971

107

one way of doing that, of course, is by supporting this amendment. And I hope people who are concerned for the nature of our political democracy in this state will recognize that we can't afford the heavy weight of additional special interest groups buying legislators, having legislators represent them as special interest in this legislature and corroding the whole contemplative nature of our democracy. And that's the reason why I support this amendment.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment and it's my intention to oppose the next two amendments which will in any way limit the effects of this bill. Mr. Speaker, I do so with some concern since the amendment is proposed by a member on my side of the aisle but I do not share with him his belief that the Commission on Special Revenue would be better served by having an executor director who would study the application of horseracing in this state. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, those of this body who were here will remember there was a rather thorough study done by a select group of legislators, including our present Lieutenant Governor, who examined in detail, and I might add, in minute detail, every aspect of horseracing and its effect on this state. I think the recommendations are available now. I think they're still as timely as ever, and I think that their recommendations basically can be found embodied in the bill before us. I do not see any great problem in the commission going ahead, establishing horseracing and pari-mutuel betting in this state. I think the time is right. I think that this bill is the vehicle and I would oppose any limitation in the bill before us.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. TUDAN (42nd):

djt

Monday, June 7, 1971

108

Mr. Speaker, Rep. Collins you made reference to that commission I had in 1965 and rightfully so but you neglected to say one thing, they didn't approve of horseracing. Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking on the amendment, if we can go back to our local communities for their consideration and approval of off track betting, and incidently, I'm in favor of off track betting, I can't understand for the life of me why we can't do that for horseracing because that's one thing I don't want. Give me an industrial plant in my town of Windsor, not a horserace track. And while we're on the subject of horseracing, now where are you going to get the horses to run? That will, that will, now Mr. Speaker, that will show up. They went to intensive study on this. They travelled all over and the dates, you're going to run plug-uglies in this state. That's not a big money maker. That's one more thing needs to take into consideration. You want to make money on gambling? Do it with offtrack gambling, not with horseracing.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. MORANO (151st):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment. I have before me the ten thousand dollar report that was presented to the 1965 members of this House and I'd like to quote from the second paragraph in response to the remarks made by Rep. Tudan. In paragraph two when they say, we do not wish our vote to be interpreted to be in any way against the sport of horseracing, of pari-mutuel betting. However, since that time, just perhaps seven months ago, the State Revenue Task Force was the beneficiary of a report prepared by the deputy member of the New York State Off Track Betting Commission. At that time, he was on the pari-mutuel commission in the State of New York and the State of

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

109

Connecticut was the beneficiary, those of us serving on the Task Force, of a study made by this gentleman and I think it was quite a lucrative return to this state if we were to pass pari-mutuel betting. I oppose the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise just for the purpose of clarification. A certain question was raised by Rep. Tudan. There is nothing in this bill anywhere that in any way suggests that the State of Connecticut is in any way interfering with the right of any municipality within the state to do what it wishes by means of its planning and zoning statutes and ordinances to assure that no racetrack can be built within that community. And as an aside, and I think, a rather compelling thing to consider is the fact that for those communities who don't want it, there are many communities who will want it and I'm sure that the racing commission, that the Commission on Special Revenue will have more than an ample number of communities to consider. And I'm certain that when they have to make that decision, they're going to take into account the wishes of the individual community.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. KING (48th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment as I will rise to oppose the bill. I have been interested, Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of the pros and cons with respect to this legislation. What I haven't heard discussed this morning is the place of the pros and the cons after we pass it which we surely will. Mr. Speaker, the history--

THE SPEAKER:

Monday, June 7, 1971

110

The history of our neighboring states who have adopted all or any part of this legislation is replete with the fact that easy money draws the gamblers. The pros, the professional gamblers, and the cons, the people who have been habitually associated with the type of activities that go on at racetracks, will be there. The pros and the cons, Mr. Speaker, will take over the operation to a very great extent. Up to this point, the argument seems to be that the state needs the revenue and because the state needs the revenue, we should have it. Closely associated with this argument is the fact that people are doing it anyway so why not legalize it. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this then is only the beginning. I strongly expect that prostitution is going on, there is a sure bet, let's tax that. I am reasonably sure, Mr. Speaker, that murder is going to continue to be committed, and here, too, is a very fruitful source of revenue.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair would indicate with the negotiations that have gone on over the past couple of weeks, maybe we should have some of these plans!

MR. KING (49th):

And I'll give you another one for consideration, Mr. Speaker. As long as we are up to our necks in narcotics, why not tax that? What not legalize that? It's all a source of revenue and the same argument applies, it's probably going on anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to turning Connecticut into Reno East. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the long history of Connecticut deserves a better fate than that. A few minutes ago, the subject of the 1965 study--

THE SPEAKER:

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

111

Rep. King has the floor and I'd remind the members that we still have amendments "H", "I" and "J" and the bill itself. Rep. King.

MR. KING (48th):

A few minutes ago, the question of the 1965 studies on pari-mutuel racing was raised. I happen to have been a member of that study and indeed, Mr. Tudan is right, the recommendation of the study was not to adopt pari-mutuel racing in Connecticut. And again Mr. Tudan is right, because he said where are you going to get the horses and coincidentally enough, this is one great problem because all of the major racetracks in the east have the good stables, the primary stables sewed up so that it is literally impossible at this late date to start a racetrack in Connecticut or anyplace else and attract the kind of horses that are necessary to make it a first class operation. So that in this connection, Mr. Speaker, in horseracing, we are doomed to become a second rate operation even before we get started. That was the primary reason why the committee rejected the idea in 1965 and as far as I know, the facts in that respect have not changed.

Mr. Speaker, this to me is a, one of the saddest days in the history of Connecticut because I have no doubt in view of the cooperation we've seen on both sides, that this bill is going to be passed. I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that the land of steady habits today could have a tranquilizer. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when we pass this bill, that Connecticut will have lost the influence, the considerable influence, that it has had on the rest of New England and on the United States. We are lowering ourselves, Mr. Speaker, to the lowest common denominator. This, as Mr. Ritter has said, will indeed be a day in infamy, a day of infamy. And, Mr. Speaker, without citing all of the numerous articles that have been written, may I point to just one and conclude with that. And quoting--

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

112

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman is not being heard, if he would just lift his microphone.

MR. KING (48th):

And quoting from the column With Malice For None by Bill Lee of the Hartford Courant and reading one paragraph, Mr. Speaker and he says: "So there is no hesitation now in looking the General Assembly of Connecticut right in the eye and telling them individually and collectively that if they open the throttle wide on gambling, it will mean the people of this state have elected too many irresponsible people to their legislature." I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that when this vote is taken it will be taken by roll call so that the people of Connecticut can make its own judgment on who or who is not acting responsibly here today.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment Schedule "G".

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, I think that's the same Bill Lee who picked the Red Sox to win the world's title last year. But without wishing to belabor the point, I would just like to take issue with something the last speaker has said and that is this, it's been said for a long time that we'll have a second rate operation because the major tracks will get the glamorous horses, if you will, and there won't be sufficient attraction. I submit (a), that that's not true in the case of places like Green Mountain which seems to enjoy considerable support, Narragansett, Suffolk and all of the other tracks which are in existence and which don't have Cannon Arrow running at them every day. As I understand it, and I've made some investigation of this, a group of which I

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

113

was a member thought that it would be a wise business investment to purchase some racehorses last year. We subsequently found out that it would be an extremely unwise investment, but in doing so, we found that horseraces are matched up according to the ability of the animals which are entered and they are very tightly structured system of classes so that at all times the competitors in the given races are roughly even in their ability because if they win or lose a certain number of races in a class, and it's very few, they're immediately raised or dropped according to their standards, so that it's the competition, I think, that makes for interest in the outcome of a race and I think that's been borne out with humans and with horses. People enjoy seeing a good match regardless of the relative levels of ability. If that were not true, I think very few people except the parents would ever be interested in the Little League or Amateur Baseball or anything of that sort. So that, I think it's a falacious argument to say that Connecticut's operation would be second rate. I think again and in further extension of what I've said, that the offering of purses determines the kinds of competition that you attract and Connecticut can be just as good in this regard as it wants to be.

THE SPEAKER:

I'd further remind the members that we have have Amendments "G", "H", "I" and "J" and the bill itself, 132 other bills, including the budget, the direct primary and teacher negotiations.

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th):

Mr. Speaker, I know the day is getting later but I rather resent the onus of immorality being placed on us by Rep. King and others. I'm personally not an advocate of horseracing from the point of view of having enjoyed or experienced it. I've only been to the track once. I lost the

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

114

first eight races and my jockey fell off in the ninth and broke his leg. But, my jockey, Mr. Hannon.

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. King was right. We are discussing morality!

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th):

But I want to say in response to Rep. King and Rep. Ritter who said it's a bad day for Connecticut that I'm sure if this bill passes with horseracing in it, I don't know about the other 169 towns, but it will be a happy day in Naugatuck because I've personally taken a poll over the last few years and 9 out of 10 of my constituents want a horsetrack, so despite my very poor experience at the track, I'm heartily in favor of it. And I also add to the sponsor of this amendment, that if the busses and cars that have been travelling through your town get to the track from Naugatuck alone are eliminated, your traffic problem is going to be alleviated. I think that the analogy to prostitution, murder, drugs, is so outrageous, it really deserves no comment. I don't think that those areas of criminal actions can be compared to any evils you might anticipate from the track and I don't look at this as providing gambling for the State of Connecticut. I consider it providing for the enjoyment of my constituents and your constituents. I oppose the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LENGE (13th):

Mr. Speaker, the issue raised by this proposed amendment is a rather narrow one and I think that the merits of the bill itself are now being debated and I personally, while I will reserve my remarks on the bill itself, would try to keep my remarks upon the amendment. As presented, the bill presents a total package, three sources of operation. This one would segment it. It

Monday, June 7, 1971

115

would take out one of those sources. That's the issue. I, for one, favor the amendment. I reject any proposition that because Connecticut would not be a first rate or would be second rate or third rate or fourth rate operation, as not having a thing to do with it. I'm against it fundamentally and the only reason that I favor this amendment is that it would give me the alternative of considering the one feature, if left in it, the lottery that I might reconsider my previous positions on. That, notwithstanding, I will oppose the bill if this amendment is not adopted.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment before we vote?

MR. BLUMENTHAL (56th):

Mr. Speaker, speaking for the second time and I'll make it short, this is not an anti-horseracing amendment. The only reason this amendment is in here is so that the commission and executor director can't go off on a false start, off and break the gate too early. We want to make sure that when we, if we do have horseracing in Connecticut, that all the resulting and correlative problems are faced up to and that we do it so that we can be proud of horseracing in Connecticut, if and when we have it, and they can go back to us in the next session and we can give them the go-ahead and get started.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks before we vote? I'd remind the members to deal with ...to continue debate, that while debating this amendment, two more have been filed.

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment. I think it was an intelligent move. I also resent the fact that we are being presented with a

djh

djh

package without a choice as to the different methods of revenue producing measures we would like to support. Now, as chairman of the 1964 horseracing study commission, I did submit a report to this General Assembly of 1965 and it is true that we made the observation that there was nothing wrong with the sport of horseracing. However, it is also true that the majority of that commission voted against horseracing in this state because we felt that it would not produce the revenue that you seek and we felt that it will bring with it headaches, such as traffic, such as increased need for state police, such as environment in communities that may not be desired by all persons. I wholeheartedly support a lottery. I wholeheartedly support off track betting and I think we're jumping too quickly into the icewaters, if I may quote a colleague, that deserves more study. I think that the racetrack itself is a bigger project than the other two measures being moved and I, therefore, urge support of this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. DONNELLY (46th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm conscious and sensitive to the desire to get going here this afternoon, get off this amendment, get on to the others, but I was one of the co-sponsors of this amendment and I felt a duty to speak and secondly, I think there is something that ought to be said that perhaps has not been emphasized sufficiently. You all know that there are three sections in the bill, three divisions of the special, so-called Special Revenue Commission. The one to which this amendment is addressed is distinguishable in my opinion on a very basic ground from the other two. The lottery and the off track betting can be and will be, as I understand it, operated by state

Monday, June 7, 1971

117

officials, that is, people who are employees of the State of Connecticut. This third division will be charged with the responsibility of granting a monopoly, a franchise to private interests to operate a form of gambling that is in one sense very different from the other two. I implore you to consider carefully this distinction and to bear in mind the remarks of Rep. Ritter on the deleterious effects that can be felt and no doubt will be felt in this state if we adopt this bill without this amendment. The first are operated by employees of the State of Connecticut and can be, thereby, subjected to strict controls, not only by the members of the Special Revenue Commission and the directors thereof, but by our very fine State Police force and other criminal enforcement bodies of this state. I question whether that same degree of control is present in the case of the commission on racing, that is pari-mutuel betting. It's one step further removed from this direct proper control. I personally have no moral hangups on this question in any of the three divisions personally. I don't think it's a question of morality but the amendment directs the director of the division of horseracing to report to this General Assembly on the social and economic effects which I think can be undoubted. There will be such effects. I think we should be seriously concerned with the effects that can be predicated to be derived or to pertain from this third division.

And lastly and in conclusion, there's been a number of allusions here this afternoon to the study of some five or six years ago and to the fact that that commission did not recommend the step that we are about to take here this afternoon if we fail to adopt this amendment. Can anyone point to a change of facts that has been, that has pertained in this state, to change that recommendation or to change the failure of that recommendation? I don't

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

118

think so. No one has come forward so far to show it and I think it would be a healthy thing to have this state racing division make the study and make a report to us two years hence. I support the amendment wholeheartedly. I implore you to think about the difference between this division and the other two in voting on the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. FABRIZIO (147th):

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this amendment. There is strong support for a racetrack here in Connecticut as all the polls taken have indicated. As a matter of fact, one town has already zoned 600 acres ideally located for a racetrack, right off of a main highway, Route 84. Based on 200 racing days at 7½% tax, it is estimated that 12,000 people per day will be in attendance, which would raise \$15 million year to the state. The state would not have to invest any money at all in the track. It has been reported that one organization has \$8 million to invest in this track which would cost \$25 million for the stadium and the track. By offering minimum purses of \$2500 and up, they feel they will attract good stables and 12,000 people per day plus the state would raise \$75,000 per day. Racetrack will also create thousands of jobs here in Connecticut to operate the track and to take care of the stables. We have racetracks in all the states surrounding us, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania. Connecticut should also have a racetrack. I oppose this amendment, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

119

THE SPEAKER:

djh

Are we ready to vote? Rep. Donnelly from the 46th speaking for the second time.

MR. DONNELLY (46th):

I'm only rising in my place, sir, to move you that when the vote be taken, it be taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call. All those in favor indicate by saying aye. An immediate roll call will be ordered. The House will stand at ease while the members return. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

MR. KING (48th):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the Speaker and to the House that I will change my vote on this amendment, that I will support the amendment. Very frankly, in the hopes that if the situation goes as we may suspect that it will, that that will help kill the entire measure.

THE SPEAKER:

Are there announcements or introductions during this period of time? The House will stand at ease while the members return. The Clerk has business to be read in during this period of time. Please give your attention to the Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Monday, June 7, 1971

120

Communications from the Governor.

djh

To the Honorable House of Representatives:

This is to advise you that pursuant to Section 2-44 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I am withdrawing my nomination of Mrs. Eleanor Gonzalez of Greenwich, to be a member of the Commission for Higher Education.

Signed/Thomas J. Meskill
Governor

THE SPEAKER:

Referred to the Committee on Education.

I notice that during the recess much of the Hannon family has come in so that we now have many more members than we started with. Good afternoon troops.

For the benefit of the members who have just returned, we are considering still Amendment Schedule "G" which relates to horseracing on the gaming or Special Revenue Commission bill. We have following this pending, Amendments "H", "I", "J" and "K" and then the bill itself. Will you remark further on Amendment Schedule "G"? Will the members please be seated and the aisles cleared? If the members will be seated, we'll proceed with debate and the vote on the bill.

MR. TUDAN (42nd):

Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Monday, June 7, 1971

121

Not until the members are seated, Rep. Tudan. Members of staff will please come to the well of the House. Rep. Spiegel, I won't start until the staff comes to the well of the House. Will you remark further on the amendment?

djh

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

Mr. Speaker, in 25 words or less, for the benefit of those who were not in the room, I support this amendment because it will permit the state to continue into off track betting and the lottery but it will direct the state to hold off on the racetrack until they have studied it further. As the effect of the amendment, I think it's a good amendment. We shouldn't jump into horseracing too quickly.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks before we vote?

MR. LA ROSA (4th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment as one of the gentleman has said, there hasn't been any additional information given in regards to horseracing in Connecticut. I would just like to remind this General Assembly that we have racetracks all around us and in the last six or seven years, the handles have increased from 300,000 in one day to one million. What does that mean in revenue to the State of Connecticut? From my observation and some of the information that I have received from different

Monday, June 7, 1971

122

people, there is a provision where they receive 15% right off the top, as far as that handle is concerned. In Vermont, which is a small state and does not have the population as the State of Connecticut, it doesn't have the economy of the State of Connecticut, it doesn't have the attractiveness to the people as the State of Connecticut, has a track, Green Mountain Park which runs Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday and they have seen fit where they have run in handles of close to six and seven hundred thousand dollars. And I think that the State of Connecticut can really receive some revenue that they are looking for, therefore, we're not jumping into something. I believe that the Commission on Special Revenue will scrutinize and do the job that the State of Connecticut and that the people of this great state of ours are entitled to. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Before we vote, Rep. Ajello wish to make an announcement?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to indicate that there will be a caucus of the Democratic House members immediately following the announcement of the vote on this particular bill, whenever that should come, in the Judiciary Room which has been suitably air-conditions by opening the windows, and if people will not flap their lips too much, we should be able to get out of there relatively quickly. So we would appreciate prompt attendance as soon as

Monday, June 7, 1971

123

the vote on the bill itself is concluded.

MR. MORANO (151st):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce there will be a Republican caucus in 409a immediately following the passage of this bill, I hope.

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. Stolberg from the 112th speaking on the amendment.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

A point of inquiry to the Chair. Mr. Chairman, could you tell us if this amendment were to pass, would it be possible for the commission to return with the recommendation to the 1972 session?

THE SPEAKER:

I don't think that's a question that the Chair could answer. You might direct it to one of the proponents of the amendment or one of the proponents of the bill.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

Could I direct that to the Honorable Mr. Miscikoski. Mr. Kablik,

o.k.

MR. KABLIK (22nd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the language is on or before January 1, 1973, yes, they could report back whenever they deemed it appropriate.

THE SPEAKER:

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

124

Further remarks?

djh

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

I presume then it would be possible for the 1972 term of this legislature to act on this. On that basis, I will support the amendment because I choose to support a lottery. I think Mr. Miscikoski has worked hard and long for a lottery and I think that has almost universal support in this House. I hate to see it complicated by the other aspects. I think the amendment would tend to solve that problem.

THE SPEAKER:

The machine will be open. Has every member voted? Will you check the board to be sure that your vote is recorded in the fashion that you wish? The gracious lady from the 40th, Rep. Hanzelek?

MRS. HANZELEK (40th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my button now is functioning again but for a while it wasn't and I was so worried. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

We were worried for you. The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, may I make an introduction at this point?

THE SPEAKER:

Monday, June 7, 1971

125

Please proceed.

djh

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, with us in the well of the House this afternoon and seated right along the front here are some members of the family of the distinguished Assistant Majority Leader, George W. Hannon, Jr. of East Hartford, and national fame, and I'd like to indicate the names and respective ages of all except Mrs. Hannon and have the House greet them and meet them. Of course, his lovely wife, Elaine, is here accompanied by her children, David 16, Margaret 15, Beth 14, Kate 13, Colleen 11, Tommy 10 and Jimmy 6. There are two more Hannon children who couldn't fit into the car today. If they will all rise, I'm sure we will give them our usual welcome.

THE SPEAKER:

I think Bruce Morris would understand that at this point I can only say, powers of people, because there are plenty of them in the Hannon family.

MR. MORANO (151st):

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't say power of people, I would say power of Hannon.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will call the next amendment, following the announcement of the result.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting	171
Necessary for Adoption	86
Those voting Yea	43
Those voting Nay	128
Absent and Not Voting	6

djh

THE SPEAKER:

The amendment is LOST. The Clerk will call Amendment Schedule "H".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "H" offered by Mr. Blumenthal of the 56th, Mr. Kablik of the 22nd, Mr. Donnelly of the 46th.

MR. BLUMENTHAL (46th):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on the adoption of Amendment Schedule "H". Would the gentleman outline the amendment?

MR. BLUMENTHAL (46th):

Yes, I will. Basically this is a .. amendment to the one that was just defeated. This puts off in a sense until our next session or as soon as the executor director and the State Revenue Task Force wants to report to us a report on off track betting. I feel we can learn a lot. Basically that's the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of Amendment Schedule "H". Will you remark

Monday, June 7, 1971

127

further?

djh

MR. BLUMENTHAL (56th):

Basically again, this is not an anti-off track gambling amendment. All this amendment does is to let the commission and executive director come back to this body and make aware to us the social and economic and other problems involved in off track betting, realizing at all times that we can learn by New York's mistakes and benefit by their mistakes and the hope would be to have a better off track betting when we do adopt it. Again, they can come back to us at our next session and we can get this moving. I move adoption of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Amendment Schedule "H"?

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, through you a question to the gentleman who moved the amendment. Is this the Governor's Revenue Task Force that he's referring to in the amendment?

MR. BLUMENTHAL (56th):

Through the speaker, no, this is the, this is the Special Revenue Task Force set up to the executive, we have not changed the composition of this board at all. All this does is say that the director of off track betting shall report back to this Assembly prior to 1973 as to the desirability,

Monday, June 7, 1971

128

the social and economic affects of establishing off track betting. It's for us to get another look at some of the problems and, associated with off track betting.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MR. EDWARDS (155th):

Mr. Speaker, I supported the previous amendment but the amendment was put to me by the proponents that it would take horseracing out of the bill but it would allow off track betting and the lottery to proceed. I accepted that in good faith so, therefore, I will oppose this amendment.

MR. MORANO (151st):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment. Those of us who live near the New York State line and receive the New York newspapers, are fortunate enough to view the New York television have been enlightened by just the last three major races, Kentucky Derby, the Preakness and the Belmont which yielded over almost \$4 million in action in off track betting. It has been a tremendous success in the City of New York and I can't wait until we bring it to the cities of this state.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. FABRIZIO (147th):

Monday, June 7, 1971

129

Mr. Speaker, I also oppose this amendment. I predict that off track betting will create a major source of revenue for the State of Connecticut in years to come. Boston's Mayor, Kevin White, has estimated that his off track gambling bill will raise \$100 million a year. Howard Samuels has estimated his off track betting corporation within two to five years will raise \$100 million. Connecticut could take advantage of New York's million dollar research and development by simply patterning its off track betting operation after New York, which has patterned their off track betting operation after Australia which has been in operation for the past ten years. We have legalized gambling in Australia, and off track betting in France and Puerto Rico. In 1966, New York, in New York, there were ten thousand arrests for gambling and only one person went to jail. It is estimated that \$2 million is bet illegally in New York. Off track betting is a big business in the same category as General Motors. One percent on each dollar bet goes to the track, 6% goes for expenses to operate, 10% goes to the state and 83% of every dollar bet goes back to the winners. We could have a direct hookup with pari-mutuel system at the track which would continually receive and send information to the track, thus affecting the track odds and payoffs. This is a good bill, Mr. Speaker, and I oppose this amendment because there is already local option and the towns could turn down off track betting if they so desired on their own.

THE SPEAKER:

Monday, June 7, 1971

130

Further remarks on Amendment Schedule "H"?

djh

MR. OLIVER (104th):

Mr. Speaker, it will take less time than it did to get button, because this amendment bears similarity to Amendment "I" which I will offer after this one, I will support it.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. DOOLEY (47th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment. The off track betting provision is, in my opinion, the worst part of a very very bad piece of legislation. I find it ironical that just a few short days ago, we enacted here in this House a model anti-gambling bill which would make bookmaking in Connecticut a Class A or B misdemeanor---

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman cannot be heard. Rep. Dooley.

MR. DOOLEY (47th):

The model anti-gambling bill states "all gambling (or common nuisances) in the State of Connecticut". At that time, members of this House spoke about the problems created by bookmaking and organized gambling in our state and how it preys on those who are least able to afford to wager, the head of families, workingmen in our state and particularly, welfare recipients.

5293

Monday, June 7, 1971

131

Today we find ourselves putting our state in the bookmaking business and I believe we are making a very very bad mistake. The argument in favor of off track betting proposed are said to be to raise revenue and to curb illegal bookmaking according to the bill. I am not at all persuaded by these arguments. From a revenue standpoint, the proposal of this bill cite New York as an example. I'd remind them that the New York off track betting system is in its infancy and much revenue will have to be raised in New York to--

djh

THE SPEAKER:

May I ask that some of the various conferences going on take place in the hall. I understand further that it's cooler out there anyway. Rep. Dooley.

MR. DOOLEY (47th):

As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this bill have cited the New York off track betting operation as an example. I'd remind them that the New York system is now in its infancy and much revenue will have to be raised by New York to pay the number of people now working in that system and I believe here in Connecticut, we also would have to raise substantial revenue to pay off the enormous bureaucracy we create by this bill. New York City is a city unto itself. It relies heavily on the millions of commuters and tourists that pour in and out of the gates of New York each and every day to place their bets. We have no such city in Connecticut, fortunately. I can assure

you, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill is passed, the losers will not be from out of state, the losers will be from within Connecticut.

djh

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill indicates it will curb illegal bookmaking in Connecticut. About three or four weeks ago, the Wall St. Journal in an article in two parts indicating that with the off track betting operation now in New York City, bookmakers are still going hard and fast. There are two major reasons for this; number one, bookmakers extend credit which the New York State off track betting system does not; and two, if an individual is fortunate enough to win, there's no tax to be paid if he deals through the local happy bookmaker, which is not the case with the state. I do not personally oppose gambling, Mr. Speaker. What I oppose is the creation of a gambling atmosphere in Connecticut and all that goes with it. It is inconceivable to me that a state as prosperous as Connecticut, with one of the highest incomes in the United States must now turn to this activity which I believe unfortunately will tarnish and cheapen the atmosphere that is Connecticut, all in the name of financial need. This amendment would at least, as I indicated earlier, take the worst part of a very bad bill and remove it. I urge its adoption.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment. If not, all those in favor, indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The amendment is LOST.

Monday, June 7, 1971

133

The Clerk will call Amendment Schedule "I".

djh

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "I" offered by Mr. Oliver of the 104th.

MR. OLIVER (104th):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of House Amendment "I". I ask that it be printed in the Journal under Rule 10.

THE SPEAKER:

So ordered. Will the gentleman outline the amendment?

MR. OLIVER (104th):

Pure and simple, it completely eliminates off track betting and requires no study therefor. Mr. Speaker, I have no particular illusions as to what will happen to this amendment, given the prior vote, but I wanted it clear what my position was and let the members have a chance to stand up again and vote against off track betting. Mr. Dooley made an excellent speech and I stand with him.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The amendment is LOST.

The Clerk will call "J".

THE CLERK:

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

Monday, June 7, 1971

134

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of House Amendment Schedule "J" and would move that the reading be waived, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

The weeding has been waived for a long time!

MR. COLLINS (165th):

I ought to be out weeding today instead of in here weeding! And summarize the amendment if I may, sir.

THE SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, this is a very technical amendment.. It was brought to our attention by the Tax Department that passage of the bill as originally in the file would cause a few problems so the amendment before us very simply would allow the Commission on Special Revenue to keep the funds as they receive them on a daily or weekly or whatever it might be basis and would give the Tax Commissioner the power basically to audit on a periodic basis the books on the Commission on Special Revenue and so on. This was simply to give the Tax Department the subsequent review and leave the handling of the funds on a daily basis up to the Commission. I move its adoption.

THE SPEAKER:

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

135

Question is on adoption of Amendment Schedule "J". Will you remark?

djh

MR. HANNON (16th):

Mr. Speaker, the creation of the Commission on Special Revenue and implicit in that creation of course, is the creation of the accounting and audit department and the internal audit, which we hope will be done accurately, but the implementation of this amendment will provide for an external audit on an annual basis to be conducted by the department, State Department of the Tax Commissioner. We think it's a good amendment. It's a provision that tightens up this act and makes a good act even better.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment? If not, the question is on adoption of Amendment Schedule "J". All those in favor will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? "J" is ADOPTED.

The Clerk will call the last amendment on his desk for this bill.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "K" offered by Mr. Coatsworth of the 76th.

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman outline the amendment or does he wish it read?

The Clerk will read the amendment.

Monday, June 7, 1971

136

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

No, I'd rather outline it if I may have your permission.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk would rather have you outline it also.

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Thank you. The amendment merely states in towns where a racetrack might apply for permission to locate, that the town's legislative body would have the right to approve or disapprove of such application. I think it's an important amendment in so far as I think the character of these towns must be determined and preserved by the people within them and that I would not like the state to mandate a bill such as this which will provide that racetracks should only have to meet zoning requirements. I think that there's local autonomy. The legislative body of the town should be the agency which would approve such an application and I would urge adoption of this amendment.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Unlike the previous amendment of Rep. Lyons that this House approved, I think, almost unanimously where it might occur that each individual community in the state would have the option of either accepting or rejecting an off track betting branch office, this is a completely different situation. If there is a track in the State of Connecticut, I cannot conceive that it would be located in any

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

137

more than one or two communities. This would certainly be a duplication and possibly impose a direct conflict with local zoning ordinances. It's entirely possible that any local community that wishes could adopt ordinances which would keep racetracks out. I really see no need for this amendment. I think it differs substantially from the other one and I think it may just tend to cloud up the bill.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, I would rise in opposition to the amendment. I think we went through this before and I must concur in the remarks just made by the Minority Leader. As a matter of fact, before any act that is passed by this Assembly becomes effective, there is no reason why any community within this state, any one of the 169 can through the action of its planning and zoning commission see to it that it would be physically impossible for the construction or operation or use of any racetrack within the boundaries of that community. That can be done immediately. There is absolutely no bar to its being done by this act or any of the existing state statutes. And for that reason, we are opposed to the amendment.

MR. FRAZIER (10th):

Mr. Speaker, I too rise to oppose this amendment because, Mr. Speaker, we'll have a similar condition that exists locating the racetrack as we have locating the Hartford jail. Thank you.

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

138

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. DONNELLY (46th):

Mr. Speaker, I'm not totally persuaded of the validity of the arguments just advanced by Rep. Papandrea as to the ability of the local communities to exercise some substantial measure of control over the location of a racetrack within their bounds and I hope I can frame a question to him that will help me to make up my mind whether he's right or wrong. I will attempt to do so, sir, with your permission, through you.

THE SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

MR. DONNELLY (46th):

It's common knowledge, I believe, that any number of syndicates or groups of people are attempting to find properties that would be, that would lend themselves to development as racetracks. Is it not true, sir, that if they've done so that property rights may have already as of this moment come into existence but unless this amendment is adopted, it would be impossible through the medium of the zoning ordinances for municipalities to have a say so on the location of a racetrack in that town.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 78th care to respond?

Monday, June 7, 1971

139

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

djh

As best I can, through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with any zoning ordinance of any of the major communities within this state which deals with the use of land for the purpose of conducting a raceway or a racetrack, specifically for horseracing. Now regardless of who may own what land which is zoned whichever way it may be necessary for that purpose within the town, there is nothing to my knowledge that would prevent any one of the communities from affirmatively amending its ordinance to preclude the use of any land for a racetrack or raceway purpose.

MR. DONNELLY (46th):

Precisely the point of my question, Mr. Speaker, that because until this moment pari-mutuel betting has been illegal, I say to this moment, I assume the bill will pass here and upstairs, because of that, none of the zoning ordinances to my knowledge either, Mr. Papandrea and ladies and gentlemen of this House, address themselves to this very question. That being the case, if property rights have come into existence by means of contracts for the purchase of land for the purpose of a racetrack presuming that this bill will pass, that an amendment even today or subsequent to today...the zoning ordinances by these municipalities, it seems to me will be ineffective in cutting off those pre-existing property rights.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Monday, June 7, 1971

140

Mr. Speaker, through you, private contract rights between parties cannot in any way bind or effect the zoning laws or the planning regulations of any community within this state. I think that's pretty clear and its been decided many times. I think unless we can point specifically to the existence of any zoning or planning regulation which deals with the proper use of land within that community under the existing zoning ordinance of that community for the purposes of a raceway or racetrack, that there is still nothing, and I would stand by this statement, there is absolutely nothing that would preclude any one of our local communities by going to, in most what is its legislative body, asking for an amendment to the ordinances to affirmatively preclude the establishment of any raceway and racetrack. Now regardless of what local options may have been taken up, regardless of what contractual rights may exist between the parties, I think the fact is that all of those are conditioned upon the ability to use land within the community for the purpose of a raceway or racetrack.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment.

MR. DONNELLY (46th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. That being so, Mr. Speaker, and I am unable to contravert my good friend from Meriden, I will assume his word is, as usual, good on the law, I simply would continue to speak to advise that the word

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

141

should go forth from this hall today that the law being as he explained it, that our local communities and their councils and their boards of selectmen and their planning and zoning commissions should be apprised of this fact and should act immediately to prepare the town in question for the advent of an application of a racetrack within the community. I personally support the amendment. I see no harm that can accrue to any applicant by submitting directly to the legislative body of the town in question, the proposition, whether or not a racetrack should be located within the bounds of the community. I think it's wholly consistent with the arguments and ideas advanced in support of the original amendment concerning off track betting parlors and I can see no reason why anyone in this House would deny any of the municipalities the right to speak on the question. I support the amendment.

MR. LENGE (13th):

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to support the amendment. There's little question that zoning speaks in terms of prohibitive regulations and I dare say that there is not a municipality in this state whose zoning regulations bar racing because heretofore it has not been legal and if you're talking about racing, you're about to see one of the biggest on the books, whether this bill gets into law first or whether local zoning regulations get corrected first and I think Rep. Donnelly was right, they better be on guard and moving now. And I don't know whether it will be legal to gamble on that one. But at any rate,

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

142

I think that if the intent is genuine, if the purpose is to give local option and local protection, then there is no arm whatsoever in this amendment and it ought to be supported.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, just to get into the zoning fight, as a former corporation counsel and having done some zoning work, it seems to me that the zoning ordinances generally say that the following uses of land are permitted and, of course, the converse is true, that others are excluded. So that while it's fair to say that probably very few, if any, of the ordinances in this state say that you can't have a racetrack, I doubt very seriously that very many of them do. So that, I think really we're making a tempest in a teapot here to a certain extent because this is not likely to be a problem in more than one municipality as I see it. I doubt very strongly that Connecticut is going to entertain more than one racetrack, horserace track at least so that for the vast majority of communities, it will not be a problem.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks before we--

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, just to add my two cents on the zoning. I completely

Monday, June 7, 1971

143

agree with Rep. Papandrea and Ajello on this matter. I do think it's a matter djh
that can be totally covered under a prohibitive or permissive zoning use,
whatever the community happens to have. I do not share the concern of either
Rep. Donnelly or Rep. Lenge on this matter.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 76th speaking for the second time on Amendment
Schedule "K".

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Mr. Speaker, all this amendment seeks to do is allow the people of
the towns that may or may not be affected by such a racetrack the option of
voicing their views on an issue which is all encompassing. It certainly
strikes the vital nature of any town or city in this state. If you're going
to place a racetrack there, I think the people ought to have something to say
about it, who live there now. So I would support this amendment and ask
others to do so also. I don't see any harm in extending some, what I would
consider, democratic rights to these people would have already just by being
citizens of this state. So I would support the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. RITTER (6th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment and to urge people who

Monday, June 7, 1971

144

have properly expressed concerns about local autonomy in many lesser matters to recognize that if this amendment does not go through, they indeed may well have done their locality a great disservice--

djh

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 6th has the floor.

MR. RITTER (6th):

As a note of caution to the holy alliance between the leaders of both sides, I would say to them with love and tenderness that we all recognize this bill is likely to be enacted. Please make it the best bill possible and please don't let it possibly be said later that the best legal minds of our House were wrong or at least that some judges did not agree with them, which is more likely to be the case if that happens, so I hope that the leaders on both sides will recognize the proper concern here of their constituents and will withdraw their objection and urge everyone to support this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Are we ready to vote?

MR. GENOVESI (18th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment although I think the whole bill is a terrible piece of legislation, I can't see how this General Assembly can possibly pass it without giving the towns that are going to be affected by this type of legislation, the option to say whether or not they

Monday, June 7, 1971

145

want it in their towns and I urge everyone to vote in favor of this option.

djh

MR. DELLA VECCHIA (26th):

Mr. Speaker, I come from the Town of Southington and it has been talked there is a track of land there that will soon be zoned for a racetrack. And I support this amendment. I think that the people in the Town of Southington who will be most directly affected should have a voice in expressing their feelings on the matter.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of Amendment Schedule "K".

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Mr. Speaker, thank you. I rise to oppose the amendment. I think the argument made by Rep. Papandrea is an extremely good one. Any attempt to enact this amendment would, in fact, take powers away from the local zoning authorities which they now have. The existence of a racetrack anyplace in Connecticut is not now illegal without this bill. The existence or the possibility of betting at such a track, however, is. I would point out if the communities and some of them may very well have taken this factor into consideration and may have already provided for the existence or non-existence of racetracks. To repeat myself a little bit, to attempt here to take this power from the local zoning authorities and place it into the hands of the local legislative body would be to do a disservice to the zoning authorities

Monday, June 7, 1971

146

as they are constituted in the community.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of amendment Schedule "K". All those in--
Rep. Donnelly from the 46th speaking for the second time.

MR. DONNELLY (46th):

For the second time and very briefly to make a point that I neglected to make the first time I was on my feet and that is to remind everyone that in speaking on the previous amendment concerning off track betting, I may be wrong on that, I think it was on the amendment to eliminate the racing division or to require it to report rather than to go into effect immediately, and in setting of that debate, Mr. Papandrea said there was no lack of communities in this state that would be more than glad to have a racetrack. That being so, I cannot understand his opposition to this amendment. And I move you sir that when the vote be taken, it be taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call. All those in favor indicate by saying aye. A roll call will be ordered. The House will stand at ease while we await the return of our members. Does the Clerk have further business? The House will stand at ease.

For the benefit of the members who have just returned to the Hall, we are on amendment Schedule "K", the Commission on Special Revenue, A roll

Monday, June 7, 1971

147

call vote has been ordered. Will you remark further on this amendment?

djh

MR. KING (48th):

Mr. Speaker, we allow local options on many matters in this state, in the state, including whether or not liquor shall be sold in a particular community, in a particular town. Now regardless of what your views are on horseracing, in comparison with the sale of liquor, there are some matters that you ought to give very serious consideration to, not the least of which is the traffic which will be involved if a racetrack is located in the particular community. It seems to me to make just as much sense if we must have this abomination--

THE SPEAKER:

Will the members please be seated?

MR. KING (48th):

It seems to me--

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. King, refrain. Would the gentleman refrain until he has some order? Will the members please be seated? Rep. King.

MR. KING (48th):

To continue, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to make just as much if not more sense to say with respect to the tremendous disruption that the racetrack would have in any community, that the public, the people who live

Monday, June 7, 1971

148

in that community, should have the last word exactly as they do today. And this, incidently, is regardless of zoning, with respect to the sale of liquor in the particular municipality involved.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of Amendment Schedule "K". Will the members be seated? We'll proceed with the roll call. The members be seated in their own seats, the aisles cleared. If the members will please be seated, we'll proceed with the vote. Would the gentleman from the 34th please be seated?

MR. GAFFNEY (80th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment. I feel that the legislative body is the proper legislative group that should address themselves to action on a racetrack and not the planning and zoning commissions. I urge support of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The machine will be open. Has every member voted? Is your vote recorded on the Board in the fashion you wish? The machine will be locked. The Clerk will take a tally. Let's try it again. Will the members check the board. Is your vote recorded in the fashion you wish? The machine will be locked and the clerk will take a tally. If the members would remain with us, we still have to complete action on the bill itself. The Clerk will

Monday, June 7, 1971

149

announce the tally.

djh

THE CLERK:

Total number Voting	169
Necessary for Adoption	85
Those voting Aye	73
Those Voting Nay	96
Absent and Not Voting	8

THE SPEAKER:

The amendment is LOST. The question now is on acceptance and passage as amended by Amendments "A", "B", "C", "D", "E", "F" and "J". Will you remark on the bill as amended?

MR. LENGE (13th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the bill. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the presentation at the outset in glowing terms of revenue possibilities, the advantages that it posed for job opportunity, that it was the glittering pot of gold that was going to be a great solution, I thought that this probably was one of the great humanitarian pieces of legislation and a landmark in terms of social justice and social legislation.--

THE SPEAKER:

Those members who are going to leave, please do so so the gentleman from the 13th can be heard. Rep. Lenge.

MR. LENGE (13th):

Thank you, sir. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that I might be able to vote strictly on the question of a lottery. As Mr. Miscikoski spoke, he said,

Monday, June 7, 1971

150

today is the day and that is about the only part of his remarks with which I must regreably say I can agree. Today is the day because when the history of this state is written, it will be marked that on this date we acknowledged that we no longer have the fortitude to face up to the responsibilities of funding free government, free society and all the blessings that we know in this state as we should with forthrightness on an honest and just tax system. There is no substitute. This is not one and it has been posed as a revenue raiser. I'm not a moralist and I don't think anybody in this Chamber is a moralist and I think we better stop using that one here and now. But if you want an answer of what's wrong with this morally, it's a proposition of the ends justifying the means in the name of the state. And what is wrong with it? The thing is simple. There are 30% of the people in this state who are at the poverty level and what you're doing is holding out an enticement. I've heard it said it was therapy, therapy for the people. Where's the therapy in this, holding out a glittering pot of gold and saying all right, here's your one chance, here's the magnet and the state is the sponsor and we've heard it said head off or off the top of 15% cut off the pools before any redistribution is made. Everybody potentially is a loser. Where's the job opportunity? The people who can least afford to stay with it long enough and in sufficient financial depth to come out even in the long run are the ones that are being lured into this. I say it's a seduction. I say it's an enticement. I say it's wrong and I think that I'm not being a moralist when I say it. It's no easy way. There never was easy money and this is the last of the ways. Now I listened to the recital about lottery. It was first proposed, if we're going to go back, with a little bit of sugarcoating. It was supposed to be a \$25 million kitty for education. That was the lure that time and it went down. Then it was supposed to be palatable because it would be on a referendum.

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

151

We wouldn't face the issue here and it went down. Well maybe today would have been the day on lottery because the things that I've said about the poor don't really appertain to the risks inherent in the lottery.

And what about off track betting? What about it? Are we going to put up Master Charge Cards or CAP or any of the other credit cards and say, Connecticut extends credit. And what about the interest rates you charged on them? Who's kidding who? Who's going to compete with the gambler, the syndicate? The State of Connecticut? You know what it is, when they don't pay that debt, they have enforcers. You know that this isn't the answer to Connecticut's problems and neither is the racetrack. Now I am, I think it would be real cool if this were a bit of entertainment but I don't see a bit of entertainment in it at all. We bypassed so many monumental pieces of social legislation and have ascended to this one that it's incredible. Why a little one like grits and flour and enrichment of it, it's sitting up there, a consumer protection bill that ought to be out here. And that's just one of many that we've ignored. And I think it's a disaster and a discredit to us to have to have to face this one as a package. A package, we're left with no choice. And I for one am not going to vote today to support that type of indirect taxation as a means of so-called supporting funding of the general government of the State of Connecticut nor am I going to be, enter into any illusions that this is a job opportunity and that it's therapy. For that matter, maybe the horses, when this is established, ought to be named the first ones, ought to be Revenue, Therapy, Job Opportunity and Moral Snob.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. CARROZZELLA (81st):

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

152

Mr. Speaker, with due respect to the distinguished gentleman from 13th, I'd like to support this bill. Obviously there is a great deal of controversy concerning legalized gambling here in the State of Connecticut but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the people of this state want legalized gambling. Just last night at home, I received five calls from people in my district asking me to stand here today and support this bill and I'm doing just that. And I think it's obvious that with the close cooperation we've had with the people on the other side of the aisle, that everyone here, almost to a man, wants this bill. And I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that not only will this prove to be a source of revenue to the people of the State of Connecticut but I firmly believe and I think the statistics will show that, that this will help in our fight against organized crime. I have one problem with the bill, Mr. Speaker. I submit it doesn't go far enough. Part of this bill is a direct part of the bill that I myself submitted at the beginning of the session, H.B. No. 7761, that's the off betting part of the bill, off track betting part of the bill. It was my hope at the time I submitted this that not only would we approve off track betting, but we would be the first state to approve taking bets on sports events because that's where the real money is and that's how we can really go to combat organized crime. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was prepared today to offer an amendment to do just that, but in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation, I'm not offering this amendment, in the hopes that the thrill will pass and that it will eventually be signed into law by the Governor. It's a good bill. It's a giant step forward, Mr. Speaker. I urge its support.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill?

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

153

MR. LA GROTTA (170th):

djh

Mr. Speaker, for many years when I was a member of this House I always voted against any gambling bills of any kind. Of the last few years, I am supporting the bill, Mr. Speaker. The last few years I've been voting for it. Maybe in my mature years, I've begun to hope for more and I would answer those who say there's some immorality to this, to say that life without hope is almost nothing. It doesn't mean you have to attain what you hope for but you have to be hoping for it. And when you see the asthetic, happy feelings of these people who down, and I know people that don't have very much money but they buy a lottery ticket and it gives them hope. And I'm sure whether they buy a \$2.00 lottery ticket or they don't buy it, is not going to change their financial position. I think this is a good bill. I think it offers much hope to people whose lives are very mundane. I just noticed a short time ago that the girl, Virginia, who received a letter, Yes, Virginia, there is a Santa Claus, she just died. We believe. This is part of our American Heritage, I think, to hope that things are better. Some of us die before we ever attain them but the important thing is to have that hope. I support this bill. I think it will bring much joy to many people.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. PROVENZANO (127th):

Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I rise to support the bill as I have for the past five sessions and as Rep. Miscikoski has pointed to you, in those days it was fashionable to vote against the bill. It was fashionable to be on the side of morality and to vote for a state lottery and for horse racing was like voting against motherhood. It's interesting to note that in

Monday, June 7, 1971

154

1965, the forces of horseracing, coupled with the forces of the state lottery brought the closest vote ever when it came to a question of the referendum. And I've heard in this House the same arguments used that we were stooping to a new low in this manner to gather revenue for the state. And as we opposed the bill--

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman from the 127th hold? May the gentleman have your attention.

MR. PROVENZANO (127th):

And as we opposed the bill through session after session, the states around us have reaped the profits and have filled their coffers with money. The only one and the only state that has suffered is the State of Connecticut. I would hope that we would all support this measure and hope for the best.

MR. MORRIS (111th):

Mr. Speaker, briefly I rise to support the bill. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that they would include the numbers game in this particular bill but with the objections of off track betting, I feel that that particular provision would have failed. Now the gentleman from West Hartford alluded to the fact that the poor people of the state are going to be disillusioned, are going to get involved in gambling in this state and become even, become poorer because of it. I kind--

THE SPEAKER:

I'd remind again the members that we have this bill, the budget and over a hundred bills for consideration. It's extremely difficult to be heard. I'm sure you all want to hear our good friend from New Haven, Rep. Morris.

MR. MORRIS (111th):

Monday, June 7, 1971

155

I disagree with Rep. Lenge because the people who are poor, who can't afford the best, do not bet in the large amounts that we anticipate in this, in the area of horseracing anyway. We don't bet on horses. We can't afford it. We bet on the numbers.

THE SPEAKER:

Is that on or off the record, Bruce?

MR. MORRIS (111th):

That's on the record because I don't bet. I address myself to you, Mr. Speaker, because I'm not a gambler, I don't bet on horses, I don't bet on football, baseball or anything. I am a non-gambler. And a teetotler, so to speak, on gambling. But I like to support this particular bill because there's a vast amount of gambling in my community, in my representative district and I feel that those people who want to avail themselves of this activity, I think that they should have it available to them. I do not like the idea of seeing people gambling and being arrested because of this habit. I feel that we could probably use our policemen to better use than arresting people who are gambling on numbers or anything else of that nature. Thank you very much.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks before we vote?

MR. WEBBER (113th):

Mr. Speaker, personally I am less than enthusiastic about any and all gambling bills. However, our committee conducted a series of public hearings on the feasibility of legalizing gambling activities in our state and we covered the state very thoroughly and it would be, I think it's incumbent upon me to report to this Assembly that the majority of those who attended our hearings, and when I use the word majority, it's a gross understatement, anywhere from 90 to 95% of those people who attended our public hearings were all

Monday, June 7, 1971

156

for, strongly for the legalization of gambling. And, under the circumstances, I shall have to support this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. FABRIZIO (147th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I also support this bill as I submitted a bill for a lottery, a racetrack and offtrack betting. There's no question as to whether residents in Connecticut want a lottery, a racetrack and off track betting as all the polls taken have indicated this. The General Law Committee, as Mr. Webber has pointed out, had public hearings where numerous people, or 90 or 95% of the people were in favor of all types of gambling. We were on TV one evening for one solid hour and everybody that called in was in favor of almost all kinds of gambling, except three people. The lottery in New York raises \$2.5 million a month, while New Jersey's lottery raises \$3.5 a month and Connecticut could also raise a substantial amount of money by using a three numbered ticket, Mr. Morris, allowing the purchasers to chose the number he wishes, thus correlating the policy playing which is based on the numbers. This would help Rep. Morris' people in New Haven. There is strong support for a racetrack also. The state would not have to invest any money at all in the track. It has been reported that one organization has \$8 million to invest in a \$25 million track and stadium. By offering minimum purses of \$2500, they feel they will attract good stables and 12,000 people per day, thus the state would raise \$75,000 a day and based on 200 racing days, \$15 million a year. Racetracks will also create thousands of jobs which are so needed here in Connecticut and all over. We have racetracks in all the other states surrounding us, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

157

Island, Pennsylvania, New Jersey. There is no reason why Connecticut shouldn't djh
have a racetrack. The instinctive drive to win by people in all walks of
life, rich and poor--

THE SPEAKER:

I don't enjoy doing this any more than you do, ladies and gentlemen.
I think one of the reasons for the din is that we've been on this bill for
almost three hours. Further remarks on the bill? Rep. Fabrizio.

MR. FABRIZIO (147th):

The instinctive drive to win by people in all walks of life, rich
and poor, have made horseracing the king of sports. I've been in touch
with Howard Samuels' office in New York and he tells me that Connecticut
could rent their sophisticated computers which are capable of handling another
state or we could purchase our own manual computers, such as they used when
they started, for \$40,000. Connecticut could get into the off track betting
business with hardly no investment. As Connecticut earns the money, it could
invest in its own computers. We all know millions of people will gamble, law
or no law. You can place a bet on almost any streetcorner. Illegal gambling
corrupts law enforcement and politics while filling the coffers of organized
crime with money they then used for far more dangerous crimes, dangerous il-
legal operations, I should say, such as drugs. Off track betting, I predict,
will create a major source of revenue for the State of Connecticut in years to
come.

A lottery, racetrack and off track betting will enable Connecticut
to reap the harvest of a tremendous income. I submitted these bills and I'm
strongly in favor of this bill. I urge the unanimous vote of yes on this
bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Monday, June 7, 1971

158

THE SPEAKER:

If all the people on their feet speak, it will be June 10th before we get to vote on this bill.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I rise in support of this bill. I have no hesitations or reservations whatsoever about the concept before us having my full vote and, of course, my support. There have been some statements made, and I think they've been made very thoroughly and in much detail regarding the support of this bill. There has been, up to this point, very little opposition but I would like to direct my remarks to a few of the items made in opposition to this bill.

There was a statement that the import of this bill has been suggested over many sessions as producing much revenue and in glowing terms. I don't think that any one of the supporters of this bill have any warped idea as to how much revenue a program such as this will raise. The Governor in his budget message estimated some \$2.5 million as a revenue estimate over the next fiscal year for the lottery. He made no estimates whatsoever on horseracing, pari-mutuel betting and did not mention off track betting. So, I don't think that any of us who are supporting this bill are the least bit swayed by the argument that it will not produce glowing revenue. It may not. That happens to be beside the point. There were also statements made that somehow the State of Connecticut might get involved in charging bets, charging credit cards, or the use of enforcers. I think those remarks don't belong in this debate, quite frankly, I think they're a smokescreen of people who have no valid reason for opposition to a bill of this nature and certainly do not have a place in sound debate on the merits or demerits of this particular

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

159

proposal.

djh

As for the General Assembly being somehow discredited or disastared taking up a subject of this nature while other bills are being killed in committee or lying in wait for action in another body of this General Assembly, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I do think that we are doing a credit to ourselves I think we are taking an action that the people of this state want, that the majority of the legislators want in this state. I do hope that it will produce revenue to the State of Connecticut which will ease our tax situation, however, I think the concepts in and of themselves beyond that point deserve merit and deserve strong support from all of us.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 16th. I'd observe before recognizing him that sixty-one different people have spoken on this bill so far.

MR. HANNON (16th):

Mr. Speaker, I concur with the distinguished Minority Leader. Had you called on me first, I would have said those very words. We have been in debate some three hours on this bill. That it is a giant step forward and a change in the tradition of the State of Connecticut, cannot be argued but none of us come here to seduce the people of the State of Connecticut, as has been inferred. We come here because the people of our districts want all or at least a major part of this package. That it is a sensitive area to raise income cannot be argued. And we, in structuring this bill, have made a sincere attempt to cover all of the loopholes, a sincere attempt to make sure that the fingerprints of everyone on both sides of the aisle is on it. And if we can't have a first class track, there's nothing in the bill that says we must mandate a racetrack in the State of Connecticut.

Monday, June 7, 1971

160

Well, we've talked about it for three hours and in the adoption and rejection of some eleven amendments, have thoroughly dialogued this bill ad nauseum and I would hope that now we could address ourselves to voting yes and get on with the other legislation before us.

djh

MR. HOGAN (177th):

Mr. Speaker, I'm not one of the sixty-one.

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. Hogan has the floor.

MR. HOGAN (177th):

If we have accomplished any good, perhaps its the fact that we've kept Rep. Hannon busy for three hours! Since I knew there was going to be a lot of great speeches and emotional problems here, I thought perhaps I'd better put my comments in writing so that I wouldn't make a mistake. So, if you'll bear with me very shortly.

It's a popular thing nowadays for everyone to have a bug even if he's going to a track and putting their money on a plug. It's a peculiar sort of a disease, it affects both young and old. You've got to play the ponies even if hungry and cold. When you read those racing forms, your thoughts go willy-nilly. If I had money to throw away, I'd spend it on a filly. Those horses have the funniest names, where they get them I don't know. But if I were to pick one, I'd bet on Miniskirt to show. I think those horses could run faster, but most of them are duds and you'll find you're short of cash, if you place it on the studs. The area that gets the track will have pains of depression when the town starts to fill up with what we have each legislative session. This idea is not new with me. It's something I have pilfered. I remember well the problem encountered by the good old Town of Milford. We

Monday, June 7, 1971

161

will make a lot of money, it says so in the text. But the bookies will want it all in unemployment checks. When people tell me how much they made I sometimes think I'll choke, but they never tell me when they go for broke. I must be quite old fashioned because it's not my bag, to waste my hardearned money of betting on a nag. So even though it will make a market for me to sell my hay, I think I'll make just like a horse and give out with a nay.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

Mr. Speaker, with all due respects to Mohammed Ali, with all due respects to the numbers game, with all due respect to the pictures we have of fiscal cornucopias and even with all due respect to Virginia's Santa Claus, I rise to express, not necessarily my opposition but my grave doubts about this bill. In doing so, I bear no delusions. I recognize that to speak in opposition to this bill is tilting with the foremost of windmills. Indeed when the leadership of both parties agrees, it's a formidable windmill. But I would like to express why I cannot vote for this bill, that is because it's been referred to as a great source of revenue for the state and the proponent of the bill even suggested it was a form of voluntary taxation. I was tempted at that time to ask about the progressive nature of that voluntary taxation because, of course, it's not progressive at all. It's the most regressive form of taxation we can impose upon the people of Connecticut. With all due regard to the popular clamor for this bill, I think in many ways what it is is a sock for what we should be doing in the form of taxation and what we all know and what they know in the Senate and what they know in the Governor's office we should be doing and that is putting together a decent, progressive fiscal package to raise revenue for the State of Connecticut. This is not going to do it. Those of you who think it will are deluding yourselves. We're going

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

162

to have to do it someday. This could have been the year. It still might be but probably not. It's too bad.

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, I don't really know whether I need to but I'd like to make it absolutely clear that those of us who have worked hard to put this bill together that could be agreed upon, those of us among the windmill fashion at least, do not offer it as a fiscal panacea nor as even a significant revenue raising measure. If it makes money, and I think that it will, fine. The State of Connecticut will be so much the better for it but I think our effort is directed more toward a reflection of what the people of the State of Connecticut have indicated to us, and certainly strongly in my area, they want the State of Connecticut to be and what they want its activities to consist of and as far as all of the other things that have been said in derogation of this kind of thing, I can only say that it's possible now for the quirks, unfortunately, to gamble as much as they desire to or will and the reason that many of them do is to hold out just a little hope in what's otherwise a dreary and hopeless existence. I don't know. I don't want to make a comment on whether that's good or bad, but it is a fact of life that we can recognize and those who would say that we're somehow further oppress those who are unfortunate and disadvantaged, I think are doing a disservice to the motives of all of us who feel that this is good legislation.

So, I support it wholeheartedly and hope that everyone will.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks before we vote?

MR. CRETELLA (99th):

Mr. Speaker, I'm anxious to get on with this vote for one reason,

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

163

because if we had passed this bill fast enough, you could have all taken advantage of what I consider to be the best bet of the day and that is, Some Shooter in the sixth at Lincoln Downs tonight. Let's get on with the bill.

djh

MR. KING (37th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. There is a Latin phrase written over two thousand years ago by the ancient Roman poet, Vergil, which I think is apt here today. Translated, or rather the Latin phrase is, *ne equo credite*, which means trust not in the horse. I believe, and seriously, that the horse which is symbolized in this gambling bill will bring to the State of Connecticut all the troubles that it brought to the City of Troy so long ago when the Trojians in spite of the warning, not to trust in the horse, nevertheless were persuaded to roll the large wooden horse into their walled city. The Greeks, the enemies, had left this horse at their gates and at first the Trojians were minded to destroy the horse.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 87th has the floor.

MR. PLATT (121st):

Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Please state your point of order.

MR. PLATT (121st):

I think a lesson in Greek history is somewhat out of order and not germane.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman is perfectly in order and may proceed. Rep. King.

MR. KING (37th):

Monday, June 7, 1971

164

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

However, I hope he'd get to Connecticut sooner or later.

MR. KING (37th):

I'll get there shortly, Mr. Speaker. Now, I have a comment about Greek history. Being persuaded finally to let the horse in, they began to celebrate with much joy and while so doing, a few Greek soldiers who had been carefully concealed inside of the horse, sneaked out, threw open the gates and admitted the enemy and the city was sacked. Now, if the logic of that story offends anyone, I can assure you that I am equally offended by the illogic of this gambling bill and its attempt to solve the great problems which face our state. If this gambling bill passes, the State of Connecticut will be trapped.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman has the floor. We've always respected the right of debate, we'll continue to do so today. Rep. King.

MR. KING (37th):

Mr. Speaker, it has been observed that when the rabble hists, it's time for good men to tremble. Continuing, with my history on this bill, I believe that if this gambling bill passes, it will put the State of Connecticut on the road to much trouble and that trouble, I believe, will cover a wide spectrum of matters. We've heard them all but briefly again. It will involve crime. This has always happened in the past in those jurisdictions where gambling has been permitted to operate under the aegis of the state. It will include embezzlement, larceny, loan sharks and all types of Mafia operations.

THE SPEAKER:

I suggest to those who want to vote, we're not going to get to it that

Monday, June 7, 1971

165

way. The gentleman from the 37th.

djh

MR. KING (37th):

The trouble, Mr. Speaker, to which this bill will lead will also include problems of the poor. We know again that the poor seem more prone to gamble than perhaps other groups. And when the poor suffer, we all suffer. And this is a problem all taxpayers, all of society, we know what this costs when crime is intensified and when problems of poverty are intensified. It will involve problems to the consumer because sooner or later if this bill passes, the State of Connecticut will embark upon an expensive advertising campaign as it has in other jurisdictions to persuade the taxpayer to do more gambling in order that the state may, in turn, reap more profits which by then it will need in order to put down the many problems which the prior gambling has created. Thus, an endless cycle of gambling and trouble and so on. This matter, Mr. Speaker,--

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 37th.

MR. KING (37th):

This gambling bill, Mr. Speaker, also involves the trouble of permissiveness. We all have decried during this legislative session of much permissiveness which we believe is bringing ills upon our society. It's a gradual type of thing but I ask you, if we pass this bill and it becomes law, will this not be an act of permissiveness? I think it will. I ask you to take as a contrast some of the things which perhaps are out of fashion nowadays for surely there are things which you all will agree represent those which have made the state so great. I think of church people, of stone fences built by those who cleared the land, of our institutions, of the mighty Charter

Monday, June 7, 1971

166

Oak, of our schools, of our trades and our skills. These things did not come by mere chance. We have worked in these halls for five months and on many occasions--

THE SPEAKER:

Gentlemen, please. Perhaps it has escaped some of you, but the budget is still pending before us for debate this evening and while I'm reluctant to do so, we may be headed toward an all night session at the rate we're going. The gentleman from the 37th.

MR. KING (37th):

Mr. Speaker, I've heard a lot of comments during this legislative session about our high ideals, our determination, the fact that we would seek equity and fairness and I say that it seems to me that those words would ring shallow if now in this last hour, we turn to the horse or to the lottery ticket in an attempt to solve these problems. I ask you let's reject this abomination to fairness and equity. Let's reject this aversion to the principle that is meritorious, to face one's problems headon. Let's refuse, as lawmakers of all people, to be stricken by the illness of permissiveness that we've all been speaking about. I ask you champions of the poor and of the consumer and on this side of the aisle in particular, I ask you champions of the taxpayer and all of you who are quick to proclaim justice, your belief in justice, and to voice your abhorance to crime, to increased state spending and bureaucracy and to permissiveness. I ask you to reject this bill and thereby refuse to take another road to a brand new problem which can only bring more problems to the State of Connecticut.

MR. PLATT (121st):

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise after all of this debate but I do

Monday, June 7, 1971

167

represent a silent minority who are opposed to the State of Connecticut going into a gambling proposition to try to solve its financial difficulties. I subscribe to the statements made by Rep. Lenge and I will not repeat them. Gambling does encourage organized crime. I've heard statements made here today regarding the States of New York, New Jersey, New Hampshire and Rhode Island and I don't think any of us want to follow in their footsteps. I'm sure we don't want to follow in their tax programs to solve our problems. This is not a fund raiser. It will create jobs but are they the type of jobs that we really want and need in this state? This is not a way to escape a heavy tax responsibility which we owe in Connecticut is wrong and it's immoral and I will oppose this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks before we vote?

MR. BIGOS (45th):

My contribution to this long debate is simply going to be a word of admonishment. It's admonishment to my friend, Tony Miscikoski and those who might be running this ... racing when it comes to be and I say this on a basis of what happened in France. It was there that the lottery was very successful until the... Henchmen began to win the big top prizes regularly. So my advice to the people here is to be sure that the top people don't win regularly.

MR. GENOVESE (18th):

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to take a few minutes on this item but I think it's of great importance. I rise to oppose this bill, Mr. Speaker. I cannot believe that this General Assembly is ready to overturn almost two hundred years of tradition and history and open our state to this questionable form of raising revenue. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the introduction

Monday, June 7, 1971

168

of horseracing and off track betting will adversely change the character of our state. Let's not fool ourselves into thinking if our state allows horse-racing and off track betting, we will be able to keep the mobsters out. William Highland, former Chairman of the New Jersey State Investigation Committee testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that he had heard that organized crime was planning to infiltrate gambling casinos in Atlantic City if they became legal. He testified further that he had seen federal intelligence reports that mobsters from as far west as Chicago were already talking and arguing about how it was going to be blacked up. Does anyone in this Assembly think that for a minute, if horseracing is allowed, we will be able to avert the charges of race fixing which racetracks in other New England states have had levied against them? Bill Lee, sports editor of the Hartford Courant, reported that a study by New England organized crime system had turned over to Attorney General Robert Quinn of Massachusetts evidence of horse fixing in New England. Mr. Quinn stated, it is frightening that on a cursory study, they have found so much evidence of horse fixing in New England. Speaking personally, Mr. Quinn went on, I am not satisfied that any racetrack in New England is above suspicion. Mr. Speaker, proponents of this bill argue that legalized gambling device drives out the underworld but there is little evidence of that.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the members please be seated? Will the gentleman please hold until his fellow members are in their seats? Friends in the back of the House, would you please join us so that we can conduct this debate in an orderly fashion? The gentleman from the 18th.

MR. GENOVESE (18th):

Mr. Rufus King, Washington lawyer and former Congressional

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

169

investigator states in his book, Gambling and Organized Crime, that Nevada is almost completely enslaved to to gambler gangster forces. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, am not ready to start our state down such a road.

MR. BROWN (148th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill and I shall be very brief but I do think that we ought to balance the complexion of the argument and so, therefore, I am standing to support this bill. This is the opportunity that I have to join favorably with a colleague from Norwalk, Rep. Fabrizio, in support of this bill and I haven't been able to do that in the last few days, with water and some other things that we've disagreed on. So, I would like to be able to go back to Norwalk arm in arm at least on this issue. I might also say that I, as Chairman of the Welfare Committee, I would like to be thought of as a champion of the poor and we've tried to do a very good job this year but I understand that in the last few hours, several welfare bills have been vetoed so the poor has got poorer and so, therefore, I think in spite of that, in spite of that, is that I'm in support of this bill because I believe that the people of my district and I also believe that the poor in this state is not prepared for this body to regulate morals and its options but that it should get on with the business about, in the event of those being poor to get them off the rolls of being poor. Finally, I would like to say that I think that it is in the best interests of the state that we go forward with this bill. I must say that the, again, that the poor seems to be getting larger because with the 10% unemployment rate in many parts of our state, I think that there are a lot of people that will have a chance to exercise their options, even though they are poor. I support the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

If the members will be seated, we'll proceed with the vote.

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

170

Will the members please be seated? The machine will be open. Has every member voted? Is your vote recorded in the fashion that you wish? Would you please check the board. The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. djh

Does the gentleman from the 18th wish to make a caucus announcement with the gentleman from the 151st while the result is being tallied?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out two things. One is that the distinguished representative from the Appropriations Committee has a very brief list of bills he wishes to take up before we recess for the purpose of a caucus. We will recess for one hour and the members on this side of the aisle will caucus in the Judiciary Room.

MR. MORANO (151st):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the members on this side that there will be a caucus following recess in 409a, immediately.

MR. GILLIES (75th):

Mr. Speaker, I voted yes on that but it does not record.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 75th, Rep. Gillies, indicated that he was in his seat, voted and wishes to be recorded in the affirmative.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting	172
Necessary for Passage	87
Those voting Yea	141
Those voting Nay	31
Absent and Not Voting	5

THE SPEAKER:

The bill is PASSED.

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 27

House Bill 5168. An Act Concerning the Power of Lending of Future Advancement of Money and to Complete the Work Progress in the Event of Default.

Cal. 1255, File 1470, Sub House Bill 6723, An Act Concerning Technical Amendments to the Planning and Zoning Statutes with Respect to Hearing.

Cal. 1258, File 1490, House Bill 7321, An Act Concerning Payment for Preparation of Preliminary School Building Plans.

Cal. 1265, File 1472, House Bill 8612, An Act Permitting Constables in Small Towns to Make Arrests outside their jurisdiction and fresh pursuit cases.

Page 7, Cal. That is all I have for now.

Mr. President, at this time, I'd like to suggest that we proceed with the following two Calendars: Cal. 1358, commonly known as the Gambling Bill, File 1362, known as the Environmental Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator, do you not want to make to move on the Consent Motion?

Question is on the bill enumerated by the Majority Leader, is there any objection to their passage? Hearing none, said bills are declared passed.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, if any of them did not have double stars, I move that the rules be suspended.

THE CHAIR:

Motion has been made for suspension of the rules where necessary, concerning double or single starred items. Hearing no objection, suspension of the rules is ordered.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1358, File No. 1560. Favorable report of the joint committee on Appropriations. Substitute House Bill 7238. An Act Concerning A Commission

June 9, 1971

Page 28

On Special Revenue. As Amended by House Amendment Schedules, A, B, C, D, E, F, J.

The Clerk has two amendments and would ask if Senator Buckley and Senator Jackson, would give me a moment, I don't want to take them in the wrong order.

SENATOR ALFANO IN THE CHAIR

SENATOR STRADA:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. I believe there is an amendment and I yield to Senator Buckley.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, the Clerk has an amendment. I move adoption of the amendment and may we have the reading of the amendment?

THE CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT A, offered by Senator Buckley:

In line 195, delete the comma and insert in lieu thereof, the word and. and after the words racing division, delete the words, and a state off-track betting division.

In line 199, after the word lottery, delete the comma and insert in lieu thereof, the word and. And after the word racing, delete the comma and the words off-track betting. Delete Section 15 and re-number Section 16 to 29 15 to 28. Line 282, after the word lottery, delete the words, or on the results of races. In line 286, delete the word, betting and insert in lieu thereof, the word lottery. In line 292, after the words lottery, fund, delete the words and in the betting fund. In line 296, delete 16 and insert in lieu thereof, 15.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, rather than go through the process of waiving or moving

June 9, 1971

Page 29

to waive the reading of the amendment. I wanted to have the reading of the amendment had, here this evening. Because, as the indication was from the reading of it, basically this removes off-track betting from a package bill, which is a gaming bill. I stand here, ready to vote, if this amendment is passed, for the bill. Basically, this would leave lottery and horse racing in Connecticut. I am for that. I have been for it over a period of sessions.

I cannot say that in justice and in due conscience, to myself and to my constituents, I feel that making available to the people of the State of Connecticut, in the easy way, to dissipate their money, yes, to spend their money foolishly. We would be doing anything good for the members of the general public. We would be allowing people who have less will power than possibly some others who sit in this chamber, to go out and spend money that is best used in their savings accounts or to pay their bills or to educate their children or other many worthwhile purposes. To make off-track betting available similar to the way the branch bank is available, to people in this state, encourages people who would never get in their car and go to New York, or Massachusetts, or Rhode Island or the other places which have tracks. They would not do that during most days of the week. Yet, the mere availability of this facility, would encourage them. Would encourage them to spend money very foolishly. Hope springs eternal in the breast of most people in this world and I'm afraid that the instinct of gambling, made readily available would make poorer, much poorer, many families who cannot afford to have this element of hope, used as a lever or tool against the benefit and the advantages that they could gain by retaining their money.

Now the arguments will be made in opposition to this amendment, that, you can see your bookie, yet, O.K., there are bookies in Connecticut. There

June 9, 1971

Page 30

is adequate, in many areas there is adequate law enforcement against them. They are certainly kept in marginal areas. I do not know right now, where I could find a bookie, within a mile of the Capitol building, if I wanted one. If I were here and wanted to place a bet. And even if I did, if I were somebody who was a law abiding citizen, I would certainly think twice, about going to a bookie, because of the prohibitions now in our laws. And I might indeed be caught with him in his illegal activity.

So, the availability of bookies or illegal operations in Connecticut, so that a person might place a bet, is not the answer to allowing off-track betting. My basic point, Mr. President, and members of the circle, is, that the availability of off-track betting, would be a serious, social evil to the people of the State of Connecticut. Unfortunately, the amendment does not pass, I must vote against the bill, because of the strength of my convictions on this point.

SENATOR EDDY:

Mr. President, I rise to support this amendment. And I want to say, also that I'm pleased to be on Senator Buckley's side in this matter since I found myself opposing many of his other amendments, during this session on other bills. And Senator Buckley deserves a great deal of credit, for putting this amendment in. And I was also pleased to see that he has guts enough to talk morality, here, tonight. Almost everybody avoids it, saying you can't legislate morality. And there is some truth in that.

But, this does, in a way fringe on the matter of morality. I think that we have a right to consider ourselves here, deserving of at least discussing the matter of morality in all our

June 9, 1971

Page 31

Now, if you can believe those who favor turning Connecticut into what you might as well call a Casino State. They say that people want to gamble. And because they want to gamble, they should be allowed too, we should make it easy for them. But, Senator Buckley in the years that I've known him, has never hesitated to stand up for what he believes in. And what he believes is right for the State. And that's what he's doing here, tonight and I'm glad to join him.

Now, we've heard that to pass this amendment, will be to kill the bill. And this is probably true. And in some respects, unfortunate, because I, myself am on record favoring a lottery. I'm on record saying that I have no objection to horse racing. But, I think if this amendment does pass, and the bill does go down, due to the arrogance of those who brought it in here, in this form, this bill, should have been split in three parts. Furthermore, it should have been brought in earlier in the session. But, now it's here in one package. And those of us who oppose, this particular off-track aspect of it, will be forced, if we feel this way, to oppose this part of it and if we prevail, this bill will go down. I think this is unfortunante. And I think it was the wrong way of bringing it in.

Now, I want to say that, the reasons that I've heard for gambling, primarily boiled down to the State will make money on it and it will provide jobs. Now there's no question, the State will make money on it. There's big dough in gambling. We all know it. Organized crime has learned this and there are those who also say that, it will hurt crime because it will make that aspect of organized crime legal. But this is not proven to be true in other states. In fact, in many instances, not all, but in many instances organized crime has merely moved into the state apparatus and furthermore, it increases the

June 9, 1971

Page 32

action. More people get involved, more and more people and still there's plenty of room for organized crime to continue. It merely moves the State into what organized crime is now doing.

And as far as the people want it, and its taking money out of the state. They going to New York, you can say the same thing about abortions. That's losing money for the State of Connecticut, too. I don't consider it a valid argument.

Now, just in conclusion, I'll say that, I oppose this, I support the amendment but oppose this off-track betting aspect of it. Because, I, pardon me for saying so, of vision of this state that doesn't go along with this. For some reason or other, Connecticut has emerged as one of the best places in the nation to live. In fact, the recent poll showed there were two places most people would move to, if they had to move. One was San Francisco and the other was Connecticut. And we've done this without any natural resources. In fact, there are those who say if the State had been settled from West to East, Connecticut would be a natural area of national parks. But, we did it the other way and now, we're the most desired place in the nation to live.

We don't need it. We've done it without it. We've done it by working. And that's basically why I oppose this. And if is says that this is a moral aspect so be it. We've made it without it. I don't want it. I support the amendment and if the amendment fails, I'll vote against the bill.

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Mr. President, members of the circle, as one of the signers of the proposal to establish horse racing and lottery in the State of Connecticut, I rise, here, to support the amendment. I have never been in favor of the move to establish off-track betting. However, the people in my area, where

June 9, 1971

Page 33

I conducted a poll, through the news media, have indicated to me that they would like me to support horse racing, the establishment of a gaming commission and a horse racing track, together with lottery. I would ask the members of the circle, to support this amendment and send the bill back to the House, where it might be speedily passed and sent on to the Governor.

SENATOR STRADA:

Mr. President, I fully appreciate Senator Buckley's honesty and convictions. And I think he's using the proper vehicle to test this. It is offered in the package. He's testing it by an amendment. I commend him for that and I'm willing to leave it to the wishes of the Senate.

I also appreciate Senator Eddy's honesty and conviction. But, I must say that, with less than three hours to go, after six months, I really feel it's quite unfortunate that he chooses to call those members on the committee both Democrats and Republicans, whose honest judgement it was to offer a complete package to this General Assembly, arrogant. I really feel that's a very poor choice of words.

In any event, I would say that over the past several months, the General Law committee has conducted several hearings, all across the state. And it's my firm belief, and conviction that the vast overwhelming majority of people in this State, desire off-track betting. Now, there was some opposition in the House, the opponents of off-track betting said, that it shouldn't be mandated by the State. I would just like to point out to you, that the bill was amended in the House. It now provides for local option. So that, if, Senator Buckley's Town or Senator Eddy's town, does not wish to have off-track betting, it is certainly their privilege.

With respect to profitability, it has been found, Mr. President, after

e 9, 1971

Page 34

surveying off track betting systems abroad, that off track betting is a proven financial success. In France, last year, over 1 billion was handled off-track compared to 250 million dollars on the track. The pari-mutual take out is 25%, with 18% going to purses for horsemen, 6% to the race track and 1% to the Government.

In New South Wales, Australia, which legalized off-track betting in 1964, the pari-mutual tax is 13%, with 5.5% going to the Government and 7.5% to the totalization agency board, which is the non-profit organization which operates off-track betting.

I, really, there is so little time left and I won't go on, but, lest anyone believe that New York and I'm sure you're all familiar with New York, and the resounding success that they have had in a short period of time, that they have been operating, lest you believe that New York and maybe America, in America this is a novel approach or an novel idea, I would just point out to you that, off-track betting has been established and has been operating with success in such countries as, England, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, France, The Phillipines, Puerto Rico, Mexico, Venezuela, Peru, West Germany, Ireland, Sweden, Italy, Canada, Nevada and on and on one.

Mr. President, again I believe that the wishes of the people, the people have spoken across the State, and I oppose the amendment.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

Mr. President, as a member of the General Law Committee who joined with Senator Strada in so many of the hearings across the state about this matter, I would simply like to associate myself with his remarks.

Secondly, I would also like to address a question to SENator Eddy, it would seem that one would be splitting a very fine line to suggest, in fact,

June 9, 1971

Page 35

that it is moral to buy a lottery ticket because he's going to apparently vote for the bill if this is deleted and vote for buying a lottery ticket and immoral to bet on a horse on off-track betting. To me, that's very fine line splitting and moralizing of the worse sort. Thank you.

SENATOR CIARLONE:

Mr. President, members of the circle, I rise to support this bill and to congratulate the members of the General Law Committee for being so courageous in taking out this complete package. I think if they were to have done anything different, it would have been negligence on their part because we would certainly be facing this next year.

I might be narrow minded or near sighted, I don't envision the problems that have been presented to us by Senator Buckley and my good colleague Senator Eddy. It seems to me, in our society today, we are constantly changing and offering laws to make the individual achieve his own self determination. It appears to me, here, I certainly think the people in the State of Connecticut, if off-track betting is available to them, and they feel they want to avail themselves of this service, this sport, this recreation call it what you will, I think they're certainly intelligent enough to do so and not be causing any injury to themselves or their families. I certainly support this bill.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment. I would just like to add to the remarks of the Senator from the 20th. I don't believe Senator Eddy has to make any justification for drawing this line. He has made a valued judgement. I, myself, in complete opposition to this bill. If this amendment passes, I still intend to vote against the bill. And I also intend to support and introduce another amendment, which will be acted upon immedia-

June 9, 1971

Page 36

tely after this one.

So, I believe, you have to make a valued judgement on this issue and I myself, am going to make the valueed judgement completely against this entire bill. I think it is no wise for the State of Connecticut to venture forth at this late date, in this session, into an undertaking of this type. There is no need to try to solve our unemployment situation by this type of legislation. I will reserve my remarks on the main bill but, I do want to point out that, I think every member of this circle has to make a valued judgement, based upon what he feels is right for his constituents and the people of Connecticut and I intend to support this amendment and even if it is successful vote against the bill.

SENATOR MACAULEY:

Mr. President, members of the Senate, the concept of the gaming bill, has been under discussion, thoroughly discussed and gone around in this Senate and in this Assembly, since we began this session. The stand of some Senators is well known and that is, their purpose whatever their rhetoric is. And I think the purpose of this amendment is to defeat the bill.

We all know this here, that the passage of any of these amendments is going to defeat the bill. Regardless of my own morality, the people in my district, as I read the people, the will of the people of the State of Connecticut, they want this type of thing. And I'm not certainly going to stand in their way. I'm going to give the people what they want. I think they recognize the morality question is something that's been tossed around when we have church bingos and raffles and we can read about the success in New Jersey. The people just want this. And I think that these amendments I think we should recognize them for what they are, to kill the bill. I

June 9, 1971

Page 37

think we should vote against all the amendments.

SENATOR PETRONI:

Mr. President, members of the circle, most of us here have given great thought to this bill and the amendment that was introduced by Senator Buckley. We know that we have a few hours left and I think that this is the kind of a bill, that we've made up our minds on and therefore, Mr. President, when the vote is taken, I move that it be taken by roll-call, on this amendment.

SENATOR FINNEY:

Mr. President, I will be very brief, because I've said this before. I'm a little surprised to have one of the Senators, point to New York as the howling success of off-track betting. And yet, at the same time, we are hearing that New York State, is in one of its most dreadful, fiscal messes in all of its history.

It does seem to me, that making available to people, very often a small income, the false hope of windfall to a great many is being immoral thing here. I am opposed to this bill in its entirety. This amendment is better than nothing. But, I still say, that I do not think my function as a legislator, here, is to bring down the law of this State, and what we think of as reasonable behavior to the least common denominator.

SENATOR ROME:

Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of Senator Finney. I think that the entire bill is an unfortunate, unnecessary temptation to the poor of the State of Connecticut. And I find no redeeming value. I intend to vote with the amendment and against the bill.

SENATOR FAULISO:

Mr. President, I find nothing in the Bible which says that, thou shalt

June 9, 1971

Page 38

not gamble. And I do recall that there is a precept which says, people in glass houses shouldn't throw stones.

Tonight, we have a golden opportunity to articulate the Constitution. And there is that familiar concept that all men are ~~not~~ created equal. They are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And tonight, we are trying to articulate, the last few words, the pursuit of happiness. Tonight, we have an opportunity, to put an end to the hypocrisy, to the contradictions to the double standards that have prevailed so long in the State of Connecticut. Tonight, freedom reigns for all the people. Not just for the rich, and the affluent but for the black and the white, for everyone, for every race, color and creed. Because it gives them an opportunity to pursue happiness.

The argument that we shouldn't have off-track betting, seems to me, not very impressive. I have in my possession, the Wall Street Journal. Who, among us, wouldn't like to own or doesn't own a little stock? Now, the main office of the Wall Street Journal, is on wall street and in this great State of ours, there are numerous brokerage houses. What kind of purification or sanctification is there in this form of gambling, except that the law, the Legislature says, it's right. It's good. People do not like to gamble, they do not have to go to the races. They do not have to buy a pari-mutual ticket. They do not have to buy a raffle ticket. They do not have to buy or go to the bazaars. They don't have to buy an Irish sweepstake ticket. But, for years, I have seen, this practice of hypocrisy, that it is so nauseating, so abominable, that to hear people here, tonight, talk about morality to think that they themselves have a monopoly on morality.

June 9, 1971

Page 39

Mr. President, I know I am an imperfect human being. And I don't represent myself, as a paragon of virtue. But, I do know, that these things persist in our society. That to gamble, is like to breath. People drink. We know the errors of prohibition and we corrected that error. What we are saying, here, tonight, is give the people of America a right to be happy. The right to pursue happiness. Give them the right to have off-track betting. What do we see in our daily lives? Don't we see the local newspapers or the newspapers throughout the state, publishing on one side, the horse entries and then the next day, the results? And don't we see numbers published in some of the newspapers, so that this would edify and give information to those next to a lottery? Isn't all this gambling? And who among us, doesn't form some type of gambling or participate in gambling when they innocently put a little dollar in a little pool, during the World Series or during the Kentucky Derby? Who among us, doesn't buy a bazaar ticket? Who among us, doesn't buy an Irish Sweepstake ticket? Who among us, hasn't heard the history of our forefathers, when they raised money for public buildings, for churches, for schools? And God knows, that these men were God-fearing people. Let's put an end to this kind of hypocrisy. Let's put an end to these contradictions. To these double standards and give the people of our State, the right to pursue happiness.

I have other remarks, Mr. President, but, if this is designed merely to destroy this bill, because so many people have worked on this bill, if it's to destroy this bill, then I say that they are committing an injustice. If they truly mean that this is not correct and this is not just, are we so pure to think, that the people in New York, are less moral than we are?

Where, by what standard by what right, do we have to make that kind of judge-

June 9, 1971

Page 40

ment?

I know that the people of Connecticut, near the borders of our State, go to Grand Central and bet, off-track betting and they enjoy it. And there's nothing wrong with enjoyment. There's too much misery in this world. Give them the right to have what they should enjoy. This is good. This is just. This is right. And the people deserve it. And they have voted for it in the polls. They want this kind of action.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further?

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment. It's always with some prepartation that I rise after my distinguished and I might say, for myself, my beloved colleague, from the first District, that finished speaking. But, I rise to say a word or two. I want to say, that, I agree with his perhaps expanded notion of what the bill of rights entails. I think it does involve what he said. And this is a part of the pursuit of happiness. And I think that's why, the public is frankly, so strongly in support of off-track betting.

I appreciate the concern that has been manifested in this circle, tonight on this issue for the poor. I hope it's manifested here, tonight, and other occasions, as well. But, I must say that, I am not moved by the argument that we have an obligation to protect the poor or the middle income or the wealthy from anything that they do not choose to protect themselves from.

It seems to me that, hypocrisy, in regard to gambling, has closed an enormous amount of social ill, and dislocation. I think thathypocrisy in regard to gambling has lead to one thing, and that is, an enormous amount of illegal gambling.

June 9, 1971

Page 41

Our former Police Chief in the City of New Haven, Jim A'Hearn, nationally recognized as a law enforcement official, said often enough, in our City, that he supported the legalization of gambling, as a law enforcement device. And, that is, that if the State, could operate gambling and competitive terms with the underworld, in fact, we could put the underworld out of business, in this area. And today, as before, gambling is the major source of revenue, for underworld, for the criminal syndicate. The money that they use to go into all the other destructive evil forms of activities. So, I believe it's hypocrisy, to oppose off-track betting unrealistic and I will oppose the amendment.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, just a few words in comment on some of the remarks which have been made, here, subsequent to my opening remarks.

I strenuously object to the efforts of some people, some of the previous speakers, who have said that this amendment is a device to kill the bill. They are transferring a burden to those people who support this amendment, that is basically the obligation and the responsibility of the committee, which turned the bill out. We had no control over when this bill came to this floor. If it comes 2½ hours prior to the time this session adjourns, that is no reason, no justification, no crutch, no blackjack that anyone should use on the heads of the people, who are basically and sincerely, I believe, opposed to this concept.

Secondly, I think that if the bill came to us in three parts; one on lottery, one on horse-racing and one on off-track betting, we, who oppose off-track betting, would not be again blackjacked into having to vote as a package, for something that everybody knows, has wide disfavor among many

June 9, 1971

Page 42

members of this General Assembly, namely the off-track betting.

So that, I ask those people who may be swayed by the questions of the bill losing, to consider in their heart of hearts, that we who oppose off-track betting, are not responsible for the means or methods or time in which this bill reaches this floor.

Secondly, local options. Local option is a lot of nonsense. Local option would mean that maybe 50% of the hard-pressed communities, if there's some sharing in it, would take it. This means that the ready availability of track betting is still available to the people of the State of Connecticut, even though town X or Y or Z, does not accept the option of getting into the off-track betting.

The taxes and the money that might be generated from it, which is as I hear the many of the proponents, the only real reason for it, I really don't feel that the people of the State of Connecticut, can't support their taxes burdens through regular avenues, through regular means of revenue, rather than getting into something like this, that will take money from the pockets of people on a readily available basis like the corner bank or drug store, where they can't afford it. Where they really can't afford it. And if those people who are talking about making the pursuit of happiness available to everybody in this State, I would think that they would introduce bills on their own part to legalize prostitution or something like that, which would make at least a portion of our society, a little bit happier.

SENATOR ODEGARD:

Mr. President, very briefly, I rise to support the amendment, introduced by Senator Buckley. To my mind, very simply, this is the bill without the amendment allows the State of Connecticut to go too far, too fast. We do

June 9, 1971

Page 43

not have experience in this area. I'm perplexed by the idea that off-track betting is somehow included or eluded to by our bill of rights.

I further think that, in the near future, in the coming years, that the passage of this bill without this amendment, that is, allowing off-track betting, will have a tendency towards promoting the State of Connecticut, into a Las Vegas, East. And I don't believe that would be in the best interest of our State. I believe the bill should have been brought out in the three parts. The amendment would not have been necessary, under these circumstances, I believe it would have given us a better opportunity to pick and choose for better legislation. And I hope the amendment passes.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? Question is on the adoption of the amendment. A roll-call vote. A motion has been made for a roll-call vote. All those in favor of a roll call vote indicate by saying, "aye". Opposed, the ayes have it. More than 20% indicated a roll call vote. The clerk will announce a roll-call vote.

THE PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR:

THE FOLLOWING IS THE RESULT OF THE ROLL CALL VOTE:

Whole number voting	35
Necessary for passage	17
Those voting nay	23
Those voting yea	12
Those absent and not voting	0

The amendment is defeated.

SENATOR ALFANO IN THE CHAIR:

June 9, 1971

Page 44

THE CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT B, offered by Senator Jackson:

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment and I would ask the Clerk to please read the amendment?

THE CLERK:

In line 96, change the period to a semi-colon and insert the following words: except or be in partnership or association with any person or having any interest in a firm or corporation, or be in membership with any union or association, which partnership, association, firm, corporation or union, agree to accept any employment, fee or other thing of value from any person firm or corporation having any interest whatsoever and any activities or interest in or property of any gambling enterprise, directly or indirectly. Use their position to grant or obtain from any person, firm or corporation any privilege, exemption or preference treatment or to use their office or position for any purpose not authorized or intended by this act. Personally gain or benefit, directly or indirectly by any act of malfees, misfees, or nonfees. Senate Bill 548 of the current session shall apply to all commissioners, employees of the commission. No commissioner or employee shall make any wager or purchase any chance in any gaming activity authorized by this act. Any commissioner or employee who violates the provisions of this section shall be guilty of a Class D, felony.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment, I believe is self-explanatory. It places the members of the commission and any employees of the commission, under the ethics act, which we enacted here, just a few days ago,

June 9, 1971

Page 45

in this session, for members of the General Assembly, the Executive, Judicial and employees. I think history has shown that lotteries and other forms of legalized gambling, while they may have started out well, have soon degenerated into complete fiascos. And have developed outright scandals.

I think if we are going to rush pell mell into legalized gambling, as it appears we are going to be doing tonight, I think we have an obligation to the people of Connecticut, to insure that we have this strict code of ethics, billed into this law. So that, it is going to make it that much more difficult and will make the people who are involved in this operation, think twice about any underhanded dealings.

The Class D felony, that is involved, calls for a penalty of up to 5 years imprisonment or \$5,000 fine.

I think that this amendment will also be labeled as an amendment which would kill the bill. Well, I submit that this is not so. From the vote that was taken in the House, just on Monday, which was almost unanimously for this. I think there would be no problem at all in getting the House to reconsider this amendment. But, I think we're going to be derelict in our duty, if we enact this law without having teeth in it. And I for one, do not want to go back to my constituents and I would hope that every member of this circle, and those members of the House, would also think twice about enacting a bill which does not have the safeguards that are built into this amendment

And I sincerely urge every one to adopt this amendment.

SENATOR CIARLONE:

Mr. President, I rise to support this amendment. I spoke earlier and said I would support the bill. This bill with a code of ethics certainly makes known for the people of Connecticut, despite the fact that we are for

June 9, 1971

Page 46

racing, we certainly are not for form of chicanery that might go on with a commission of this nature. I think a code of ethics, would certainly make certain, that the people that would be serving here, would be beyond reproach and would be another protection and safeguard for our citizens. I think it is an excellent amendment and we should all support it.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, so that I do not assume the mantle or the role of a person who is opposed to the bill, I will say that I will support the amendment. I think it is a good addition to the bill and I think it makes some sense on the loosely worded provisions that are in the bill.

SENATOR FAULISO:

Mr. President, there is a presumption in the law that all people, people that presumed to be innocent. Even before this bill is enacted there s a presumption that people are bad. Under the bill, the Governor's going to make some appointments and I don't know where the power of appointment rests. But, it seems to me, that the Governor of the State of Connecticut is a man of integrity. And I think that I have a perfect right to presume that.

I think I have a right to presume that the appointees are people of, that are going to be qualified. Immediately to install or to operate with a code of ethics, is to presume we are not going to get started on the right foot.

Now, what Senator Jackson is preposing, perhaps at some date, if, this bill, becomes one which is not operating properly, which breeds corruption or which is one that is not fulfilling the high standards that we are now talking about. Perhaps a code of ethics might be appropriate. But, I question whether or not at this time, at this point, when we are dealing at the last

June 9, 1971

Page 47

hour, a bill that has been worked upon, where many individuals have employed many hours. It's my belief, Mr. President, that I don't think it's appropriate. I'm not going to impune the motives of Senator Jackson. I think that they are well-intentioned. But, it seems to me, that I would like to operate on the premise, first, that the people are presumed to be decent people, good people. We're talking about morals today. Everyone of us seems to think that we are better than the next person. And we think that our Country and our world cannot operate without imposing some sanction. I'd like to think that the ten commandments, in my life, are supreme. We make so many mistakes in implementing the golden rule, the ten comandments. We make so many mistakes that we fall flat on our face. God knows how many bills we passed in this session trying to approximate the golden rule.

It s best that we travel slowly, gradually and put this bill through now and wait for developments. I would oppose this amendment.

SENATOR STRADA:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose this amendment. I don't believe the amendment adds anything to the bill. In my judgement it's a mere surpluses. I will try to explain to you, why. The amendment attempts to bring the commission and its agents and employees within the purview of the ethics bill. Senate Bill 548 of the current session.

Mr. President, this bill has not yet passed the House, to my knowledge. And has not been signed by the Governor in any event. It is not now law, it may never be law. Therefore, this amendment is presumptuous and I submit does endanger the passage of a bill that is good for the people. Upon the hope and speculation that the ethics bill, will become law.

Mr. President, the ethics bill, even if it does become law, possible

June 9, 1971

Page 48

that that might be amended. To enact it in such a manner, that will be in-applicable or wholly inappropriate to the measure at hand. The bill creating a commission on special revenue, already makes adequate provisions for any fraud or misconduct on behalf of a commissioner or any agent or employee of the commission.

First of all, Section 2, provides that each commissioner must be bonded, in the amount of 25,000 dollars, with sufficient surety to be approved by the Governor. Section 4, provides that the commission itself, may require any employee to post a bond in any amount which said commission determines. Section 5, of this bill, prohibits all the commissioners and all employees of the commission from either directly or indirectly, individually or as a member of any partnership or a shareholder of a corporation, from having any interest whatsoever, in any of the legalized gambling activities. This provision, Mr. President. is very broad. And amply protects the protect. It covers all the situations referred to in the proposed amendment. Section 6 of this bill, gives the commission the power to make and enforce all regulations, necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the act, and to prevent fraud and dishonesty.

The commission is also authorized to call upon local police departments and prosecuting attorneys for information and assistance. The commission therefore, has more authority than that which is proposed even in the ethics bill.

Mr. President, a new comprehensive criminal code has been enacted and becomes effective on October 1, 1971. The criminal law obviously applies to all people in the State of Connecticut, including commisssioners, including agents, including employees of the commission on special revenue. Further

June 9, 1971

Page 49

criminal provisions in my estimation is not only unnecessary but redundant. The criminal law amply covers the areas of embezzlement, conspiracy and related criminal offenses and stiff penalties are provided.

Finally, Mr. President, and probably most significantly I think, the ethics bill to which this amendment refers, already by its own terms covers this commission, on special revenue, as well as, any other executive department. And I refer you to the relevant language of the ethics bill, is contained in Section 1a thereof and reads as follows: No member of the legislature, or employee thereof, nor any member of the Executive Department, or employee thereof, Mr. President, there are only three branches of government. The Legislative, The Executive and the Judicial. So I submit, that this commission must come under one of these classifications. The commission is certainly not a part of the Judicial or the Legislative, therefore, I submit it's part of the Executive Branch.

Section 6, of this bill, states it explicitly, that this commission is an administrative department and therefore, a part of the Executive Branch. This being the case, it is clear that the amendment in my judgement, is unnecessary, mere surpluses and I urge defeat of this amendment.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I take strong opposition to the words of my good friend from the 27th, on this matter. I would point out to him, he is correct. The ethics bill has not yet been passed in the House of Representatives. It is still to be voted upon. But, I would point out, that the provisions in this amendment Schedule B, would pick up some of the provisions in the ethics bill.

And, I believe it goes much further, if the ethics bill is enacted, this ~~Senate Amendment B, will go much further in protecting the public from any~~

June 9, 1971

Page 50

of the problems that I am sure are going to arise as a result of this enactment of this bill.

I don't want to belabor the point, because it is late. But, the fact that we are at almost 10 O'Clock, and we have our force to present amendments to this bill at 10 o'Clock, with only two hours to go, is not my fault. Is not the fault of any other member of this circle.

I would just like to quote to you, very briefly, from Virgil Peterson, the Chairman of the Chicago Crime Commission, who in his book, Gambling should it be legalized?, found that the experience in this country in lotteries and other legalized gambling, run by the State has not been good. Legalized lotteries, were common placed in the United States, in Colonial times, until they were abolished by various state legislatures beginning with Massachusetts and Pennsylvania in 1833, and New York in 1834. They were not abolished in Louisiana until 1892. Many of the lotteries authorized by various state legislatures, to raise funds for educational institutions, public development companies and civic improvements started on a modest scale. Eventually, however, the lottery business reached enormous proportions. It was largely taken over by unscrupulous promoters who were frauds and cheats of the most unsavory characters. They made fortunes at the expense of the poor and needy through every type of chicanery that could be concocted in their fertile brains. Bribery of legislatures in various states, was frequently resorted to by promoters. Political corruption was common place. It was not infrequent that promoters or agents sold the lottery tickets and then vanished with the money. As usual illegitimate offspring of the legalized lottery, sprang up and they further bled the poor people for whom they were principally designed.

June 9, 1971

Page 51

I would point out, to the good Senator from the First, who was quoting from the Bible, I would also point out to him, that the Bible says and I would quote, "money is the root of all evil".

There are going to be large amounts of money that are going to be handled by members of this commission and the employees of this commission. I repeat my statement, that I think we owe it to the people of Connecticut, to insure that every possible safeguard is built into this bill before we hastily enact it, tonight. I am also very sure, that if this amendment is passed, from the feeling in the House of Representatives, that they would have no hesitancy about taking up this amendment. Because everyone is just jumping over backwards to try to get this enacted into law. I think the reasons why, are very obvious. And some of the reasons that have been promoted here, in this circle, tonight, are not the real reasons. I will try to go into greater length on the main bill. But, I would urge, I honestly urge, adoption of this amendment. It is not meant for the purpose of trying to kill the bill, because I feel the bill will be enacted even after the amendment is passed.

Mr. President, I move that it be taken by roll-call vote.

SENATOR FAULISO:

Mr. President, I was here last session and I know the position of the Senator Jackson and I think he opposed measures similar to this, two years ago. And when he quotes about the Bible, that money is the root of all evil, I don't know how much money he surrenders, but, the Wall Street Journal seems to be indicative of people who like money. I'm not in any position to overlook or to probe or to investigate how many of us deal with stocks, but, again, I repeat, that this is a form of gambling except it has the blessing

June 9, 1971

Page 52

of the law.

And, again, to talk about historically what happened, many years ago, when there were corrupt people, as long as we have human beings, we ll have corruption, there's no question about it. We have knaves and fools in the legal profession. That doesn't mean that we indict the whole legal profession. We have knaves and fools in the Medical profession. That doesn't mean that all doctors are bad. We cannot draw a universal conclusion from a particular. That would be pure socrastry.

But, Mr. President, it seems to me, that when we talk about lottery. Although we have had for many years, a lottery law, a policy law and we have been prosecuting people for violation of policy law.

I have yet to see a person, who wins the sweepstake, the Irish Sweepstake or some other lottery, who is arrested. As a matter of fact, the very newspapers who condemn them, on the front page many times, they put the picture of the whole family. What a blessing that these people have won first prize in the Irish Sweepstaekes. Never have I heard an arrest of these fine people who are so fortunate. But, catch a person, with a wallet with an Irish Sweepstake, even if the race has expired, and he forgot to tear it up, because he forgot maybe, to show it to his wife and that he spent a dollar on the Irish Sweepstake and maybe he was going to show his wife an accounting, and he forgot to do it. But, the fact of the matter is, this is the time, tonight, to free the people from the straight jackets that they've been succumbed to and they've had to suffer for years. They've been handcuffed and the only people, that have been victimized by laws pertaining to gambling, are the poor people. I have yet to see a prosecution of people who gamble in private clubs, in the sanctity of these clubs where they pay a high ad-

June 9, 1971

Page 53

mission fee, high dues. I can't join that club. But, I'd like to go to Franklin Avenue, in my own district, and see these old people play a little pinocle. Or some other game and sure they play for money. You'd be naive to tell anyone that they didn't. But, once in a while, we see the police arrest these people, puerto ricans, blacks, poor ethnic groups of people who cannot afford to join the exclusive clubs. This is an opportunity for us, to say that all people are free. That this law that has been so discriminatory, so arbitrary that has victimized only one segment of our population, should forever be abolished.

I cannot buy this amendment because, I don't believe that this is the answer. We do have the safeguards as Senator Strada mentioned. Many, many, many, safeguards, many violations of the people, don't live up to the law. And they're still in the books. Many. Many laws, that cover our conduct, I think it was Calvin Coolidge, that said, we don't need new laws. What we need is, morality. And I claim, Mr. President, that this is a moral concept. This is morals throughout because, everyone has a chance. And nothing is wrong with this type of operation except the abuse. If a man gets drunk, of course, it's wrong. Because he has abused himself. But, liquor is sold permitted and we knew it was wrong, under prohibition and we corrected that wrong. And we have a chance here, tonight, to let freedom ring, I repeat. And give the people of our State, the right to stand aside with other people of our country. And I think that this amendment should be voted down and defeated.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? A motion has been made for a roll-call vote. All those in favor indicate by saying, "aye". Opposed? More than 20% having

June 9, 1971

Page 54

indicated for a roll call vote. The Clerk please announce a roll call vote will be taken in the Senate.

THE CLERK:

THE FOLLOWING IS THE ROLL CALL VOTE:

SENATOR FAULISO	NO
SENATOR SMITH	NO
SENATOR BURKE	NO
SENATOR ODEGARD	YES
SENATOR JACKSON	YES
SENATOR PAC	NO
SENATOR ALFANO	NO
SENATOR ROME	NO
SENATOR EDDY	YES
SENATOR CIARLONE	YES
SENATOR LIEBERMAN	NO
SENATOR HAMMER	NO
SENATOR ZAJAC	NO
SENATOR CUTILLO	NO
SENATOR SULLIVAN	NO
SENATOR BUCKLEY	YES
SENATOR CRAFTS	YES
SENATOR MURPHY	NO
SENATOR CASHMAN	NO
SENATOR GUNTHER	NO
SENATOR MACAULEY	NO
SENATOR CALDWELL	NO

June 9, 1971

Page 55

SENATOR PETRONI	NO	
SENATOR DOWD	NO	
SENATOR RIMER	NO	
SENATOR STRADA	NO	
SENATOR RUDOLF	NO	
SENATOR DUPONT	NO	
SENATOR POWER	NO	
SENATOR DINIELLI	NO	
SENATOR IVES	NO	
SENATOR MONDANI		YES
SENATOR DENARDIS	NO	
SENATOR HOULEY	NO	
SENATOR FINNEY		YES

THE PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR:

THE CHAIR:

RESULTS OF THE ROLL CALL VOTE ARE:

Whole number voting	35
Necessary for passage	18
Those voting yea	10
Those voting nay	25

The amendment is defeated.

SENATOR STRADA:

Mr. President, I now move adoption of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

WILL you remark?

June 9, 1971

Page 56

SENATOR STRADA:

Mr. President and fellow Senators, I now rise in support of this bill. The bill which I submit probably has more public support than any bill that has been before the General Assembly, this year. This bill has been developed over a period of many months. And has gone through many drafts. Having participated in numerous meetings of Democratic and Republican leadership, I commend both parties for their bi-partisan approach and their splendid cooperation, at arriving at a bill, which we feel is in the best interest of the people of this state.

Mr. President, this is not a political bill. It's a people's bill. Because it does what the people of our State want so very much. We have been privileged to have available to us excellent legal counsel, who have carefully scrutinized the gambling statutes of many other states. And have been in contact with the office of New York's gambling Commissioner Howard Samuels and many other people who have expertise in this area. Many studies and statistics were made available to us and were drawn upon in drafting this bill.

A short time ago, Mr. President, the General Law Committee, which considered all gambling bills, held an unprecedented public hearing. At which time we utilized television and took testimony from around the state, by telephone. The telephone lines were continuously busy. This first, for Connecticut, was a resounding success. In addition, Mr. President, the General Law Committee, held public hearings throughout this state over a period of many months, taking testimony from thousands of people. At all these hearings the people participation was resounding. And the opinions in favor of legalized gambling were overwhelming. Various newspapers,

June 9, 1971

Page 57

throughout the State, reports similar responses to public polls. And after calling upon all resources available to us, from within and without our State, we are proud to present Connecticut's first comprehensive legalized gambling bill, which I will attempt to outline very briefly.

The bill creates, a commission on special revenue, which consists of nine members, five of whom will be appointed by the Governor, 2 by the Speaker of the House, and 2 by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate. The Commission will have the over-all control and supervision of all gambling activities activated by this bill. Most decisions of the commission will be made by a vote of the majority of the members. However, Mr. President, all decisions with respect to licensing, including the location of race tracks, and betting parlors and decisions involving concessions, parking lots and related matters, must be made by the concurrence of at least 6 members.

The reason for this requirement, is that we consider licensing to be the most critical function of the commission. In that, for any legalized gambling operation to be successful, it is essential that only those of the highest calibre be permitted to hold positions of public trust. To accomplish this, we feel that participation of more than a bare majority of the commission, and members of both political parties, is required to protect the interest of the public.

The commission will employ an executive secretary, who shall subject to the rules and regulations of the commission, administer and coordinate the administrative functions and who shall have over-all supervisory authority and responsibility over each of the divisions.

Three divisions are proposed: A state lottery division, a state racing division, and a state off-track betting division.

June 9, 1971

Page 58

The commission shall employ an Executive Director to head each such division, who will administer and coordinate the operation of his division.

The commission will establish rules and regulations for the operation of each above named gaming activity. And will print them and make them available to the public. It will license agents to sell tickets and take bets and establish branch offices throughout the State. As well as license operators of race tracks and determine the number and location of such tracks.

The bill also changes existing laws to allow in addition to the possession of any number of Connecticut state lottery tickets, the possession of not more than five slips, tokens or paper evidencing any wager or bet placed in a lottery or contest conducted by any other state or country.

The State will run the lottery in the off-track betting and therefore all profits will go into the general fund. With respect to pari-mutual betting, the State will receive $8\frac{1}{2}\%$ of the total money wagered. And $\frac{1}{2}$ of the breakage to the dime resulting from such wagering.

It is hoped that this bill, in addition to giving the people what they want, will be profitable to the State and also have an adverse effect on organized crime.

Mr. President, with respect to the effect of legalized gambling on organized crime, estimates of the volume of gambling handled by organized crime varied. A survey recently conducted by U.S. News and World Report, estimates that, nationally 15 billion, in illegal gambling is handled by organized crime. In New York State alone, the New York State joint legislative committee on Crime, reports that organized crime income from all betting is about 1 billion dollars, or 130 dollars per person. In New York City's major slum areas, central Harlem, South Bronx and Bedford Stuyvesant revenue from narco-

June 9, 1971

Page 59

tics and gambling in 1968, was 343 million dollars. 70 million more than the state spent on welfare in the same areas.

And, while we realize, Mr. President, that legalized gambling is only a partial attack on the roots of organized crime's power, its profits, we do represent the first major effort in Connecticut, to begin to take away the millions of dollars that today, feed into the underworld beauocracy.

To enlarge the scope of our attack, this legislature may in the future, see fit to legalize bets on sporting events. To further strengthen our competition with organized crime, we encourage the Federal Government to change the IRS regulations. To give revenue from legalized gambling a tax exempt status. These changes are still in the future, but, we are only beginning tonight.

It is hoped that our Connecticut lottery will emulate and be as successful as the now exemplary New Jersey lottery, which sells lottery tickets at low cost. Has frequent drawings and gives back to the public large amounts of money, in the form of prizes. When that lottery started in New Jersey, last January, the rosiest predictions were that it would gross 30 million dollars a year. Mr. President, in five months, it has grossed nearly two times that amount, 59 million dollars. And Governor William Cahill said, so much money was being raised by the lottery, that he would not have to ask for new taxes this year.

It is further hoped that, our off-track betting system, will be as successful as the New York system appears to be after only a few trial months. And as successful as many other over-seas off-track betting systems and that our off-track betting system will be able to take advantage of the race-track in other states and other countries.

June 9, 1971

Page 60

Finally, it is hoped that our race tracks will exceed in success and public benefits, those of any of the other states in the United States. Even if we make a smaller profit, in order to obtain a higher social benefit.

Mr. President, I would be remiss not to mention that although we have every hope and expectation that this venture will be a financial success, we do not expect legalized gambling to answer all of our revenue and tax problems. Legalized gambling can never be a substitute for sound, fiscal management of State Government. As the name of the commission suggests, that is a commission on special revenue. We do expect this to be a profitable venture. And we do hope to keep Connecticut money in Connecticut. And to help divert funds from organized crime and to allow people to do legally what many have been doing illegally for so many years. You might call this a tolerable source of taxation. I urge support and passage of this landmark legislation, so that we can immediately send it to the Governor, who has advocated during his campaign, a lottery, a race track and off-track betting.

Mr. President, again I would be remiss before I close, if I did not specifically mention, for the record, the efforts of Representative Miscikoski who has championed the lottery for over 10 years in the House. I think he is to be commended for his perserverance, his bill is a part of this measure. I would also like to commend Senator Cutillo, the pari-mutual section of the bill. The bill that he submitted and the off-track betting bill was the bill submitted by Representative Carrozella in the House and many, many, other legislators.

SENATOR HAMMER:

June 9, 1971

Page 61

Mr. President, I rise to make a plea to the members of this circle. It is very unusual in this Chamber, but, I hope my colleagues will not think that it is out of order. I certainly do not want, would never suggest cutting off debate on any bill before us. But, I beg the members, to keep their remarks short. We all know how we're going to vote. For the benefit of the people of Connecticut, I really make a very sincere plea. There are dozens of bills coming up before us tonight. They will get lost because the time will run out.

Now, I'll just mention, in the field of education, the school lunch program, the drug education program, the occupational training act, the big school construction bill. We can't afford to let these things go by. If we could debate just as wholeheartedly but still not use up all the remaining time, on this gambling bill, I think it would be very much to the benefit of the people of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hammer, it is my intention as time allows, to have some of the Senators to preside, to have the honor on the closing night. Would you come up and preside, briefly?

SENATOR FAULISO:

I hope this is not a bad omen, she might cut me short.

SENATOR HAMMER IN THE CHAIR

SENATOR FAULISO:

This measure, would deal a death blow to illegal operators, gambling operators, in the State of Connecticut, that millions of dollars would be returned to the people and to the State of Connecticut.

I merely want to quote, I know that time is getting short, but, it seems

June 9, 1971

Page 62

to me, without quoting Ralph Salerno, who used to work for the City of New York, for the Central Intelligence Bureau, he posed this question, when he said, "what do you do, if you want to run a competitor out of business? You try to take away his customers, cut his profits and market a better product.

Now, Mr. President, one great feature of this bill, the great effect of this bill, is that we will release policemen from all the police department of the State of Connecticut. And also the Department of our State Police, who spend many, many hours in this area of gambling, following bookmakers, from early morning to the sun goes down. Wasting taxpayers money in an area that the people care less, because today, our society is besessed by a more serious crime. It would free the policemen to do more serious work, in the area of the more vicious crimes, robbery, burglary, rape, murder. So that's why I think that this bill would have a salutary effect besides all the other features that have been related by Senator Strada. I hail this bill, as being one of the landmark bills. One which will serve the best interests of the State. One which will drive the bookies out of business. One which will bring gambling out into the open and into the sunlight. No longer will people have to call up their bookie and taking the risk or chance that he might get caught. No longer will they buy an Irish Sweepstake ticket and conceal it under themattress. No longer will they have to buy Puerto Rican lottery tickets. Thank God, we have put an end to hypocrisy, contradiction, double standards and we will live free in America.

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Madam President, I rise to make a further appeal to the members of this circle. In this Calendar, of today's plan of action, we have what amounts to about 3 months work, to finish with in less than 2 hours time. There is

June 9, 1971

Page 63

no further debate that could possibly sway a vote on this issue. I ask you Madam President, to call for a roll call vote and let's get on with it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator, I hope the members will heed your remarks.

SENATOR CUTILLO:

Madam President, members of the circle, I want to take this opportunity to affiliate myself with this bill, this package. I want to commend the Chairman of the Committee, Senator Strada, for having the preception to come out with such a package. Certainly we had individuals who put in bills, it would have been a matter of pride to me, if my individual bill came out, but, I think, more important, the people of the State of Connecticut, are going to benefit, for the package that is coming out and I hope will be enacted by the Senate and signed in by the Governor.

I would like to make note of the presence of Representative Miscikoski, in our Chamber. I can recall only too well, two years ago, when the vote was taken on the lottery and defeated by a very narrow margin, this disheartened gentleman, from the House of Representatives, said he would try again. He has tried again, he is the father of the lottery and I think he should be commended for his efforts throughout the years in behalf of the people of the State of Connecticut. I am proud to be affiliated with this bill in conjunction with him.

We all realize, Madam President, members of the circle, what this would do for Connecticut. It would not only bring in the revenue, but, I believe it will create a tremendous tourist trade for our people. We passed a bill last night, in which we give the Development Commission more moneys to sell the State of Connecticut. I think this is a further evidence of the selling

June 9, 1971

Page 64

of the State of Connecticut, to the people of the United States.

I would like to note, also, of the efforts of people who are affiliated with racing, specifically the American Raceway, Madam President, and members of the circle, who have invested in Connecticut, millions of dollars with the anticipation that the people would reciprocate with their support. And, I believe those of us who are in the legislature and the Governor by signing this bill, will reciprocate the trust that these people have put in us. This is definitely a good measure and I move its passage.

SENATOR SMITH:

Madam President, originally I didn't have mixed emotions about gambling bill, hearing about it. I just didn't have any thoughts about it at all. Except that, I do know that illegal gambling, is paying off to the crime element. And people are going to gamble. Now, I represent a District, which runs from well-off financially state Democratic Party Chairman to some one not so financially well-off as myself. In so that runs the gamit of the economic strada. I want to say, that I don't think that there are any more poor people wanting to gamble than there are rich people, gambling already.

There's the esteemed Senator from the First, who's pointed out that there's gambling going on right now. The stock markets. This nation is gambling every day. In my opinion, now, by not taking gambling out of the hands of criminals, who use the proceeds to foster prostitution and drug-addiction and all other related crimes thereto.

Now, I do not gamble, Madam President, not because I can't afford it but because I do not want to. Simply because some other people do, is not enough evidence for me. I have more will power than they. And who am I or who are we, to assume that position? ~~Because I do not gamble is no reason why I~~

June 9, 1971

Page 65

should try to impose my will on someone else, solely because of that reason.

And I simply say to this circle, that if gambling is immoral, then let us legislate bingo out of our churches. If gambling is immoral, let's legislate it out of the stock market. And if gambling is immoral, let us expand our wiretapping law, and legislate it out of the homes and country clubs of the more financially well-to-do.

THE PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR:

SENATOR JACKSON:

I am sorry, Mr. President, while my good friend, Representative Miscikoski was sad two years ago, I am sad this evening. I believe that we are making a mistake this evening. I believe that what we are doing, tonight, will not do for the people of Connecticut, what the sponsors say it will do. I submit, that it will not solve our fiscal problems. I submit it will not drive out illegal gambling, illegal crime in Connecticut. I submit it will increase it.

I am sad as I've stated before, I realize the sentiment of the circle, I realize the sentiment of the General Assembly, perhaps the people do want it. But, I can only say that I will renew my efforts to have the amendment that failed tonight, with strict safeguards, on the commission and the employees, into law during the next session.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. A motion for a roll call vote. All those in favor of a roll call vote signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". More than 20% having voted, we will have an immediate roll call. Mr. Crary, will you announce it three times?

June 9, 1971

Page 66

Question is on passage of the bill. Proceed with the roll call:

SENATOR FAULISO	YES	
SENATOR SMITH	YES	
SENATOR BURKE	YES	
SENATOR ODEGARD		NO
SENATOR JACKSON		NO
SENATOR PAC	YES	
SENATOR ALFANO	YES	
SENATOR ROME		NO
SENATOR EDDY		NO
SENATOR CIARLONE	YES	
SENATOR LIEBERMAN	YES	
SENATOR HAMMER	YES	
SENATOR ZAJAC	YES	
SENATOR CUTILLO	YES	
SENATOR SULLIVAN	YES	
SENATOR BUCKLEY		NO
SENATOR CRAFTS	YES	
SENATOR MURPHY		NO
SENATOR CASHMAN	YES	
SENATOR GUNTHER	YES	
SENATOR MACAULEY	YES	
SENATOR CALDWELL	YES	
SENATOR PETRONI	YES	
SENATOR DOWD	YES	
SENATOR RIMER	YES	

June 9, 1971

Page 67

SENATOR STRADA	YES	
SENATOR RUDOLF	YES	
SENATOR DUPONT	YES	
SENATOR POWER	YES	
SENATOR DINIELLI	YES	
SENATOR IVES	YES	
SENATOR MONDANI	YES	
SENATOR DENARDIS	YES	
SENATOR HOULEY		NO
SENATOR FINNEY		NO

THE CHAIR:

The results of the roll call vote:

Whole number voting	35
Necessary for passage	18
Those voting Yea,	27
Those voting Nay	8

The bill is passed.

SENATOR STRADA:

I believe that when I originally moved adoption of the bill, I might have inadvertently neglected to move it as amended by House Amendments A,B, C,D,E,F and J as innumarated by the Clerk.

THE CHAIR:

The record will so note.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1362. File No. 1420. Favorable report of the joint committee on Appropriations. House Bill 9254. An Act Creating a Department of Environ=