

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 5357                      PA 294                      1972

House 2114-2140, 2812-2814, 2855-2858 (34)

Senate 2423-2428, 2599-2600 (8)

Judiciary 0

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE  
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

420

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate  
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2016

H-127

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1972

VOL. 15  
PART 5  
1842-2237

April 13, 1972

84  
djh

Table for the Calendar.

Is there any further business on the Clerk's desk?

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

May we proceed to page 8 of the Calendar, third item from the bottom. Cal. No. 442. Substitute for House Bill No. 5357. File No. 494.

THE CLERK:

Page 8. One star. Cal. 442. Substitute for House Bill 5357. An Act Making Certain Technical Corrections to the General Statutes. Judiciary. File 494.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on suspension for immediate consideration. Is there any objection. Hearing none, the rules are suspended. The Clerk has called the matter.

MR. SPIEGEL (126):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair will entertain a motion for acceptance and passage.

MR. SPIEGEL:

Move acceptance and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. The gentleman states the Clerk has an amendment. Will the gentleman summarize and waive the reading.

MR. SPIEGEL:

April 13, 1972

85  
djh

It would be easier to just summarize.

THE SPEAKER:

Is there any objection. Hearing none, the gentleman from the 126th for purposes of summarization.

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

I move adoption of the amendment, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this amendment refers to the code of ethics bill which was passed by this House at our last session. This particular amendment refers only to Sec. 1 subdivision d of that code of ethics bill. And all it does is eliminate the language which says that no person may be in partnership or association with any person or a member of a professional corporation which thereafter may receive employment or other things of value in appearing before the Claims Commission, the Banking Commission, the Liquor Control Commission, Motor Vehicles, State Insurance and Real Estate Commission. It does not eliminate the prohibition against the individual member. The individual member may not appear before those commissions. However, it eliminates the prohibition of membership or association with a firm that may do so.

I submit to you, Sir, that the language presently in the statute is indefinite and vague and unenforceable. And what this amendment does is make it more enforceable and more legal. For example, if we were to leave the language in the bill as it now stands, I believe it would successfully exclude the majority of the members of this House from coming back next session. It would apply to doctors, dentists, architects, engineers, real estate agents, insurance agents - even bankers, farmers, - farmers couldn't be members of co-ops or grangers - it would apply to senior citizens who couldn't be members of senior or golden members' clubs. It would even apply to show-producers, accountants,

April 13, 1972

86  
djh

florists - any member of a union - you couldn't come up here, etc. I don't want to oversimplify the matter, Mr. Speaker, but I think the bill as it is presently on the books is a little bit too far-encompassing and this amendment will point out the fact that it refers to a prohibition against members of this House. It has not been demonstrated that the legislation is necessary in the first place; however, this will make it better than it is now existing. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House A.

MR. DONNELLY (46th):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself most heartily and vigorously with the remarks of Representative Spiegel who has just gone before. There are those who remember, perhaps, a hand which I took in the closing moments of the session last June that resulted in the public act sought here to be amended.

There was no intention I believe on the part of any member in this Chamber to deprive members of all partnerships or other business or commercial enterprises - deprive those enterprises as such from engaging the normal course of business with agencies of the state. And I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Spiegel's remarks to the effect that the act as it now stands goes too far, much too far, the amendment makes it much, much better. I support it; I ask your vote for it.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House A.

MR. ARGAZZI (25th)

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse this amendment. It's an amendment

April 13, 1972

87  
djh

that I argued for very vigorously while we were discussing the ethics bill in the Judiciary Committee. I think without the amendment the present code of ethics makes it virtually impossible for any member of a medium size or larger law firm to serve in the House of Representatives or in the State Senate. I think the safeguards in the code of ethics will be adequately maintained even if this amendment is adopted and I would wholeheartedly support it.

MR. SULLIVAN (130th):

Mr. Speaker, as you will well remember through a series of events Mr. Smythe and I became associated with this bill during the last session. And I don't intend to go into the arguments that we've heard that evening. I don't think anyone has forgotten them. But I rise to oppose this amendment because what we are in effect saying is if an individual lawyer wants to come up here - and this is particularly the lawyers' amendment - if a particular individual lawyer wants to come up to this House, we say to him: You cannot go in to any one of these agencies and practice before them. But it's perfectly all right for you to go out and get a partner and send him in to do the same thing. I think I disagree wholeheartedly with the fact that this particular amendment strengthens the bill. I think it goes right to the heart of the bill. It destroys what is in it, what it was intended to do and what it was intended to prevent. This bill has not even been into effect; it does not go into effect until January of 1973. How anybody can stand here and say that they've experienced or we know that this is necessary to make it better, I don't understand. It hasn't been in effect. I oppose the amendment.

MS. CLARK (101st):

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the previous speaker and I oppose this amendment. I cannot understand why this presented in this form

April 13, 1972

88  
djh

without a bill being presented if this was such an important measure to bring up at this time. And why it had to wait until the closing day of this session, practically, and then be presented in amendment form.

I don't have the amendment before me but I certainly feel that it emasculates the code of ethics bill and I wholeheartedly oppose it.

MR. KING (48th):

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to think of this amendment as the point where- as the Madison Avenue boys say, the rubber meets the road. Either we want a stiff code of ethics bill or we don't. There are many who feel, and I personally feel, that the code of ethics bill which we passed last session goes too far because I have never seen the abuses the likes of which the bill seems to be aimed. But make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, when this amendment is passed the guts of that bill will be removed because we are talking about or at least the bill was aimed at some mythical abuse which the amendment would eliminate.

I personally would feel, Mr. Speaker, that if the bill remains intact that I as a member of a partnership, continue to serve in this general assembly. But if that is the price, if that is the price which the bill is going to exact I think everyone here ought to be willing to pay it. If we are saying in effect we don't really want a code of ethics bill which I think this amendment says, then by all means we should pass it. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, we should not hide behind a lot of soft-spoken words and say that the amendment doesn't do anything of any major importance to the bill we passed last year at the dramatic 12th hour. Certainly it does, certainly it changes the bill, certainly reduces it from a very strong ethic bill to no ethic bill whatsoever.

MR. BRUNO (132nd):

April 13, 1972

89  
djh

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment. It is nothing but watering down the code of ethics bill that we fought hard to put through last year. I hope the House will consider every angle of this bill again - this amendment.

MR. RITTER (6th):

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee last year, I worked very hard with the two chief authors. And when the Judiciary Committee finished its work on that bill, we felt that it was one of the best proposals that was available in the country at that time. And when it was brought to the floor of this House it was almost torpedoed on three different occasions. And Mr. Speaker, I represent<sup>to</sup> the members of this House that if this amendment goes through we are weakening this law tremendously. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, one of my great dismays in serving in this House is the tremendous conflict of interest that I observe daily. And I have been waiting impatiently for the bill which we enacted into law to go into force next January. And I'm waiting for that day. And I hope Mr. Speaker that members of this legislature will recognize that this is perhaps the most important single amendment that will come before this legislature this term. This act that we passed last year will change the nature of this general assembly and God knows it needs to be changed.

Mr. Speaker and members of this House, I hope that all of you - all of you - will oppose this amendment and make sure that we keep inviolate the act which we passed last year and which we have yet to enjoy any benefit from.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on House Amendment Schedule A. All those in favor of adoption of House Amendment A indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. It is the opinion of the Chair that House A passed. Will you remark on the bill as

April 13, 1972

90  
djh

amended. The Chair rules it's technical.

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

Mr. Speaker, this is a housekeeping bill which has been seen fit to be prepared for the purpose of clearing up some technical defects in the general statutes as existing. It's a rather lazy bill but I think it's a non-controversial bill. The amendments are for the benefit of the people of the state and I move - urge it's passage.

MR. RYAN (84th):

The Clerk has another amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk please call House Amendment Schedule B.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule B offered by Mr. Ryan of the 84th consisting of two pages.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the gentleman from the 84th care to make a summarization.

MR. RYAN (84th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll summarize. The amendment simply corrects an error made by the legislative commissioner's office some weeks ago in drafting the noise bill, ladies and gentlemen, which we passed on Monday.

In the bill vehicle is defined - or motor vehicle is defined as vehicle in subsection (56). Inadvertently in section (b) of the bill - pardon me, section (c) of the bill in one instance vehicle was called motor vehicle and if the bill is made law with motor vehicle it would not cover noise levels of motorcycles and snowmobiles, and it was pointed out to me by the legislative commissioners and recommended that we offer this amendment to remove the word

April 13, 1972

91  
djh

"motor" in one instance in section (c) in order to provide that the bill is really what it is intended to be.

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman from the 84th move adoption of B.

MR. RYAN (84th):

I move adoption of House Amendment B.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House B. The question is on adoption. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. House Amendment B is adopted. The Chair rules that it is technical. Any further remarks on the bill as amended by House A and B.

MR. METTLER (96th):

Mr. Speaker, I concur with the comments of those who recently spoke in their opposition to Amendment Schedule A which has been adopted by this House. If we are going to emasculate the code of ethics in this House I believe we should be on record and I move, Mr. Speaker, that when a vote be taken, it be taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

The motion is for a roll call vote. All those in favor of the vote being taken by roll call indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The Chair is in doubt. I'll impose the question again. Question on a roll call vote. All those in favor of the vote being taken by roll call indicate by saying Aye. In the opinion of the Chair there are more than enough to support a roll call vote, a roll call will be ordered in the Hall of the House.

THE CLERK:

There will be an immediate roll call vote in the Hall of the House.

2122

April 13, 1972

92  
djh

The House of Representatives will vote by roll call immediately.

Is there Business on the Clerk's desk while we're waiting for the members to return? If not, the House will stand at ease while we await the return of the members.

Will the House please come to order. Will the members take their seats, please. Will the members please be seated. Mr. Ajello.

An announcement for the benefit of members who may be wondering about our schedule, even as we wonder about it sometimes, it is our intention at this time to do some business until approximately 6 P.M. - to recess at 6 for the purpose of each party having a caucus in its respective room which will be announced by that time, I hope. And following the caucus there will be time for the members to have something to eat and we hope to return about 8 or 8:30 and complete Calendar business this evening.

I might add that we have been working industriously - the leaders on both sides have - on some items that we hope we can move either off the Calendar or around it and dispose of rather quickly; so we may not be here as late as you expect if we can have everybody's cooperation. In a few moments we intend to take up some of these items and move them along.

THE SPEAKER:

Are there further announcements? If not then for the benefit of members who have returned to the Chamber your attention is directed to Page 8 of today's Calendar, Calendar No. 442, Substitute for House Bill No. 5357, File 494, as amended by House Amendment Schedule A offered by Mr. Spiegel and House Amendment Schedule B offered by Representative Ryan. A roll call vote was requested and ordered on the bill as amended by House Amendments Schedule A and B. Will you remark on the bill as amended.

April 13, 1972

93  
djh

MR. CAMP (163rd):

Mr. Speaker, Might I add as a parliamentary procedure that perhaps for some of those who are just returning and not familiar with what we're on—we're on a technical bill generally with one exception. The exception is a rather drastic change in the code of ethics bill the last time. It seems to me we adopted the amendment. If we adopt the bill now as amended or rather the bill fails because of the code of ethics provision we're going to lose the benefits of the technical amendments.

It would seem to me therefore preferable if perhaps the person calling the roll call might reconsider the roll call, we can have a motion to reconsider on House Amendment Schedule A with the full benefit of the membership here and have a roll call on that question. In that regard, we either have our voice or not our voice on the amendment and then we could go on to the bill itself.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, might I ask for the person who called the roll call vote to withdraw his motion and I would then make a motion to reconsider House Amendment Schedule A.

MR. METTLER (96th):

I would withdraw my motion for a roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

Motion for a roll call has been withdrawn.

MR. CAMP (163rd):

Mr. Speaker, might I now ask that we have reconsideration of House Amendment Schedule A and on that may I move that we have a roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

Was the gentleman from the 163rd in the prevailing vote on House A?

April 13, 1972

94  
djh

MR. CAMP (163rd):

No, I wasn't, Mr. Speaker. I'll have to ask somebody else to make the motion.

THE SPEAKER:

Under our rules, Sir, I cannot accept your motion. Will you remark further on the bill as amended.

MR. MORRIS (32nd):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the bill as amended. And in doing so I may add that I realize that I'll be the one member of the law profession that the ethical bill will affect - if I'm re-elected next year, that is.

I disagreed with the ethics bill as it pertained to lawyers last year. I disagree with it as it currently stands in the statutes on the law books. But I am for the amendment which at least releases some of the power of some of the people who serve, the people who need it most. I believe the amendment is a good one in that it would allow people to serve in this assembly and have their partners or a partner or a member of their firm carry on the business back home.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, in ethics. And I don't believe there is an attorney in the state of Connecticut that has any more ethics than I - or morals either for that matter except perhaps when it comes to some limited subjects. It doesn't matter - which is not bad in my opinion. We have a duty as serving as a legislator, Mr. Speaker, or serving in the capacity of a legal beagle, I believe that there are other ways and methods of coping and dealing with the people who are unethical. I believe that we should exhaust those avenues before we limit or curtail the activities of somebody arbitrary. I'm for the bill as amended and I hope it passes.

2125

April 13, 1972

95  
djh

MR. KABLIK (22nd):

Mr. Speaker, under either the ethics bill as passed last year or under this amendment, Schedule A, I will not be practicing before any of the bodies involved. I am also a sole practitioner and therefore I can at least state that personally - this bill or this amendment, the amendment anyway, will not affect me personally whatsoever.

However, I think that as a sole practitioner and I'm a young individual, some point / in the future probably past the time I'm serving here, I will be in partnership but I think the sole practitioners, as attorneys, as a continuing basis are a vanishing breed. I think that the effect of the ethics bill as it passed in the last hour, in very heated emotion, will be effectively to remove attorneys from the general assembly. You can dispute that but it will at least limit them to a very, very small number.

Now in your mind answer a question: Is this desirable. If you feel yes then voting against this amendment makes good sense. If you feel no that attorneys as a profession - exceptions eliminated - do serve a valuable service in the assembly, I think you should support this amendment. Now, there are some problems with eliminating the partners of members of the general assembly. I can't say otherwise, but I point to the fact that I think this ethics bill did single out the legal profession and I wonder to what degree we should - maybe we should but why we shouldn't impose a greater, higher standard than is imposed for the United States Senate and why we should request that not only the attorneys but everyone that is connected with him cannot practice before the various commissions - and I'm not so sure that that applies to real estate people before the real estate commission, and a lot of other people. This specifically might have asked if they were included under the bill.

April 13, 1972

76  
djh

So I think that this is unfair and there will remain ethical questions, I'm sure. I don't feel, for instance, that it's fair or ethical if I were in partnership to accept the remuneration as my partnership share for my partner who had a case before the Liquor Control Commission. I grant that. But I think that's my personal problem. If you want to address a statute to that specific problem, I'd say fine. But the effect of the existing law which hasn't gone into effect yet will be by and large with the exception of few in terms of sole practice, etc. - by and large eliminate the legal profession. If that is what you want to do - fine. But I think you have to bear these points in mind as well.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

Mr. Speaker, on parliamentary inquiry. Are there precedents in the House for a ruling on germaneness of an amendment after an amendment has been passed?

THE SPEAKER:

Frankly, Sir, I have to check the precedents.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

Well in that case, Mr. Speaker, I would question the germaneness of-

THE SPEAKER:

Excuse me, Sir. Are you pressing your point of inquiry at this time?  
Your first point of inquiry?

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

Yes, please.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the Chair ask your indulgence, the member's indulgence to consult with precedents.

April 13, 1972

97  
djh

For the benefit of the membership and in reply to the parliamentary inquiry from the gentleman from the 112th, when the question was posed the Chair could not recall any precedent on this point. Having checked the House rulings, I find that there is no precedent.

MR. STOLBERG: (112th)

Rather than establish precedent that might be dangerous at this time because although I feel the amendment moved through the House when the House members were largely unaware of it, and that indeed the amendment was not germane. But I feel the ruling on germaneness once it passes being appropriate, I think the matter can be solved by moving for a division on the vote. I would like the vote taken on this bill, on Amendment B, A and the bill divided, please.

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

Mr. Speaker, point of order. I submit the gentleman is out of order here. The vote has already been announced.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

Mr. Speaker, speaking - -

THE SPEAKER:

Excuse me, Sir.

The Chair has not as yet had its say on the point of order, Sir.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

Excuse me, Sir.

April 13, 1972

98

djh

THE SPEAKER:

In the opinion of the Chair, the point of order as raised by the gentleman from the 126th is well taken. The Chair would observe this, that reconsideration on the part of a member who was on the prevailing side is an appropriate motion. Representative Camp, as we know, made this motion but did not sustain the motion. I think that the point of order is well taken. The Chair does not invite debate.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

Mr. Speaker, on parliamentary inquiry, has the vote been taken on the bill as amended?

THE SPEAKER:

It has not, sir. The question before us is acceptance and passage of the bill as amended by House A and House B. There was a request for a roll call vote by the gentleman from the 96th, subsequent to which, apparently pursuant to the remarks of the member from the 163rd, the request for a roll call was withdrawn. The main question is still before us, sir, acceptance and passage as amended by House A and House B.

MR. STOLBERG (112th)

On the main bill then, I move for a division on the main bill, the main bill is before us, I move to divide Amendment A from the bill on the vote.

THE SPEAKER:

The motion the gentleman has now made as a practical matter is substantially identical to the previous motion concerning which a point of order was raised.

MR. COATSWORTH (76th)

~~Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the gentleman from the 112th withdraw his~~

April 13, 1972

99

djh

motion in favor of a motion that I will make for reconsideration of the previous action and I indicate to the Chair that I was in the prevailing vote?

MR. STOLBERG (112):

I withdraw my motion.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 76th, the motion of the gentleman from the 112th is withdrawn without question of its orderliness. The gentleman from the 76th has moved for reconsideration, as I understand it, for House Amendment Schedule A only. Is that correct, sir?

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

That's correct, Mr. Speaker. May I ask, Mr. Speaker that when the vote is taken, it be taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

There is a further request that the motion for reconsideration be taken by roll call. The gentleman has indicated that he was on the prevailing side and the Journal will so indicate. The question I am about to put to you is the question for a roll call vote on the motion to reconsider. Is that clear, gentlemen and ladies? I will try your minds. Question is on a roll call vote. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. AYE. In the opinion of the Chair, more than a sufficient number supported the motion for a roll call. An immediate roll call vote will be ordered in the hall of the House on the motion to reconsider House Amendment Schedule A only. There will be an immediate roll call vote in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives will vote by roll call immediately.

April 13, 1972

100

djh

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

Mr. Speaker, speaking against the reconsideration, and very briefly, Mr. Speaker, for some reason we keep hitting the lawyers in this wonderful assembly, and I point out that this is not a lawyer's bill, that the effect of the prohibition will hit basically every occupation you can think of. When you look at the vague, indefinite language of the bill as it is now written, it says that no person shall be in partnership or association--now what does that mean? If you're a farmer and you join the grange, you're in an association with those people. If you have a co-op, you're in an association with those people. It goes on, in consideration of appearing or taking action, you shall receive nothing of value. Now, what does that mean? What is something of value? If you get an extra cent on a quart of milk because you're a farmer, that's something of value. If you're a member of a union and you're in the state labor council and you've got a big health and welfare fund that you want to invest, you have to go to the banking commission, maybe, for approval, maybe you want to start a bank or a credit union,--just where do you draw the line? My point, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not only the lawyers who have to fear this bill. It's the doctors, the architects, the real estate men, the insurancemen, and everybody, even undertakers, I'm reminded. Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat reconsideration. The amendment is a valid one. I think we must agree that the last code of ethics bill was taken up very late in the session under very questionable circumstances and the only reason it comes up at this late stage of the game is that we don't know that we might be frozen in here. And then what are we going to do? We might not even run for re-election. We may be brought back here against our wills and we've got this code of ethics bill.

April 13, 1972

101

djh

So think about it, and vote against reconsideration.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the motion to reconsider?

MR. ORCUTT (100th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion for reconsideration, and I do this with some reluctance because I have a great many friends here whom I admire a great deal, who are lawyers in this chamber, and who make a wonderful contribution to state government. However, we all know what the problems are in regard to this amendment. We do know that problems can arise with partnerships and profits can accrue to members of this general assembly because of their associations in partnerships and through their political influence. Let's face it. This can and does happen. We all know it happens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've been working to modernize the general assembly. This is our first annual session. We're trying to finish up early. We're trying to make a number of improvements. What are we doing here today? We're torpedoing the ethics bill. I say to you, sir, that this is doing a disservice to the general assembly. To tell the people that on the one hand we're doing such a good job, we're trying to do our business well and quickly, and on the other hand, when it comes to ethics in our own field--and I don't care, Mr. Speaker, whether it pertains to me as an engineer or to other non-lawyers, or whatever their occupation is in this house, let's have a good, strong bill. Let's try it out. If, in another year or two years, it does prove to be unworkable, I suggest that we try at that time to change it, but I really believe that now is the time to reconsider this motion and show the people of Connecticut that we want to keep our house in order.

April 13, 1972

102

djh

MRS. GRISWOLD (109th):

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Amendment A on which we are about to have a vote to reconsider isn't too long to be read. I haven't really ever heard the amendment. Is it a long amendment? It's not on my desk. Could the Clerk please read the amendment?

THE SPEAKER:

I will have to refer the lady to consult with the Clerk. I am sure the Clerk will be glad to show her a copy of the amendment. It would be inappropriate to have the amendment read at this time. We are on the motion for reconsideration. Will you remark further on the motion for reconsideration?

MR. EDWARDS (155th):

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what my vote might be on the reconsideration vote, I think it only fair to vote on reconsideration to support it. In the book, in our calendar, and perhaps this is the reason why there are so few people here, it says, An Act Making Certain Technical Corrections to the General Statutes. As you look at the act, it's a long one and these are technical corrections. There are things, many of which I'd have to go back to the files, look them over to understand, and I assume that that's exactly what they were. Possibly, someone should have questioned the amendment in the first place. To me, it seems a very substantive piece of legislation and changes pretty heavily what we did last year. Regardless of any other consideration, I think reconsideration is properly asked for because I do not think the amendment and what is on the calendar really held true and people should really have a chance to see it and think about it.

April 13, 1972

103  
djh

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the reconsideration and to oppose the amendment. I believe that the reconsideration is important at this time because if this amendment was passed through this vote, I believe it would actually kill the code of ethics bill. I've been involved myself actively in children's theater by producing and putting on two plays every summer for children and when I see a bad play, I know it. And this is a bad play. This is a phony group of self-interested legislators voting on their own conflict of interest.

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order in that I believe the speaker is becoming personal, I think it's uncalled for, unwarranted, and I would ask that you caution her not to indulge in personal attacks on the floor.

THE SPEAKER:

I would hope you would not press your point of order at this time.  
The lady from the 128th.

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, then, in that case, I won't say all of the things that I wanted to say. Then I will keep my remarks to the reconsideration and in so doing, say to the world, watch this vote, world. Connecticut citizens, watch this vote. Taxpayers, voters, everybody, watch this vote because I can't say anything else on it, but watch it.

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Mr. Speaker, insofar as I made the motion for reconsideration and I requested a roll call on this matter, I would like to explain very briefly what it was that caused me to make that motion and ask for reconsideration

April 13, 1972

104

djh

at this time because I think there has been placed upon this motion and upon the roll call motion considerable distortion as to what we are voting on and what the reason for reconsideration is. I think that last year when we passed a code of ethics bill, we did something that we could be proud of and the citizens of this state could be proud of, and I would only add, Mr. Speaker, that on this question we are voting on a question of gutting the code of ethics bill, and I moved for reconsideration, Mr. Speaker, because I believed that since we enacted a code of ethics bill last year that will take effect next year, if any changes in that code of ethics are to be made, it should be made by the entire House chamber, and not during a period of time when one-third or one-half of the members are on this floor and the other half think we are considering a bill that deals with technical amendments only. It is for that reason, and not because I have any axe to grind with any attorneys or not because I believe in this know nothingness that says that attorneys are all corrupt and everyone else is fine, but because the members of this body were not able to express their wishes on the code of ethics bill. I think all of us, all of us, should consider this motion seriously, should consider this amendment seriously, before any more action is taken. I support reconsideration.

THE SPEAKER:

Are you prepared to vote? The gentleman from the 25th.

MR. ARGAZZI (25th):

Mr. Speaker, based on that, and I think there is a misunderstanding as to what we're voting on, I'll support reconsideration and hope that the following vote on the actual amendment.

2135

April 13, 1972 105  
djh

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair will make one final announcement. There will be an immediate roll call vote in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives will vote by roll call immediately. Will members please be seated.

DR. COHEN (41st):

Will you please explain the vote?

THE SPEAKER:

Yes, I will. The motion is for reconsideration of House Amendment Schedule A only. Prior action was adoption of House Amendment Schedule A and subsequently adoption of House Amendment Schedule B. The main question was still pending, it is still pending, acceptance and passage. We have before us a motion for reconsideration of House A only. A YES vote will allow the chamber to again address itself to House A. A NO vote on reconsideration will terminate any further consideration of House Amendment A. Is that clear, gentlemen and ladies? Then the machine will be open.

Have all the members voted? Will the members who have voted please check the board and make sure that your vote is properly recorded? The machine will be closed. The Clerk will take a tally.

THE CLERK:

Total number voting - 168  
Necessary for reconsideration of House Amendment A - 85  
Those voting YEA - 127  
Those voting NAY - 41  
Absent and not voting - 9

THE SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk please note, Rep. Hilda Clarke votes YES

April 13, 1972

.106  
djh

THE CLERK:

The print out indicates that Mrs. Clarke, 158th, did vote YES.

THE SPEAKER:

The motion for reconsideration carries.

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th):

Mr. Speaker, I need not take the time of this House to review how I feel on the ethics bill. You all vividly recall the emotion and the fights we had on our last night. Neither, however, do I have to remind you of my position on expediting the business of this House; neither do I have to remind you that the hour is late. I don't think that we as a House can sit here deliberating on a bill which we had some very bitter deliberations about in the last session. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I move to table this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

There's a motion to table which is not debatable. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman from the 94th for the status of the record, is his motion to table limited to any further consideration of House Amendment Schedule A?

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's another reason for my motion. This bill is too important to risk the consequences even should this amendment pass at this late juncture. I move to table House Amendment Schedule A.

THE SPEAKER:

There is a motion to table, which is not debatable. Before putting the question, the Chair would inquire whether the gentleman who advanced the amendment would care to withdraw the amendment?

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

NO.

2137

April 13, 1972

107  
djh

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair will put the question to table. The question, let us clearly understand, is limited to House A. Is there a point of parliamentary inquiry?

MRS. CLARK (101st):

Point of inquiry, does the motion to table kill House Amendment A?

THE SPEAKER:

Yes. House Amendment A only.

MR. ORCUTT (100th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

There is a request for a roll call vote on the motion to table. I will try your mind. All those in favor of the motion to table being taken by a roll call vote will indicate by saying AYE. In the opinion of the Chair, a sufficient number has supported the motion for a roll call vote. An immediate roll call vote will be ordered in the Hall of the House. There will be an immediate roll call vote in the House of Representatives.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point is that the amendment is clearly not germane to the bill and should be ruled out of order. It is a substantial amendment to a technical bill.

THE SPEAKER:

I think that the motion at this time, with the motion to table before us, sir, is not in order. I would be pleased to address myself to your question of germaneness if the maker of the motion to table wants to withdraw

April 13, 1972

108

djh

his motion. The gentleman from the 94th indicates that he wants to press his motion to table. Will the members please be seated?

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry. If the motion to lay on the table is carried, does that then hold up debate on the balance of the bill, or do we then progress to a debate on the bill as amended by B?

THE SPEAKER:

In the opinion of the Chair, we would progress with further debate on acceptance and passage of the bill as amended by B.

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

And then, tomorrow could a motion to take off the table Amendment A be made?

THE SPEAKER:

That would depend upon whether the bill as amended was still within the position of the Chamber. That would depend on whether or not suspension had been granted for immediate transmittal. Failing immediate transmittal, the bill would still be in the possession of this Chamber under our rules in the hands of the Clerk's office, and if a motion to remove from the table were successful tomorrow, the matter, sir, in the opinion of this Chair, would still be before us. After tomorrow, assuming that the matter were to pass as amended and lay over for one day, the bill as amended would advance to the Senate and any motion to remove from the table would be a nullity. For the further information and benefit of the Chamber, if the motion to table that is now before us on a roll call vote does not prevail, and if any member chooses to question the germaneness of House Amendment Schedule A, the Chair after considerable reflection and examination of the amendment would like to indicate

April 13, 1972 109

that he would intend to rule this motion not germane. The question before us is on the motion to table. djh

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

Mr. Speaker, I just had a bolt of lightning strike me with wisdom. I would like to withdraw the amendment..

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th):

Mr. Speaker, presuming, and I do presume that I can rely on Mr. Spiegel's bolt of lightning, I would therefore remove my motion to table subject to his desire to withdraw his amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The motion for a roll call vote has been withdrawn.

MR. ORCUTT (100th):

Mr. Speaker, I was going to withdraw the motion for a roll call vote.

THE SPEAKER:

Thank you, sir. Now the motion for a roll call and the motion to table on the amendment, everything has been withdrawn. We have before us a motion, if you would believe it, for accepting the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule B. Will you remark?

MR. SPIEGEL (126th):

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and it should pass.

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

Mr. Speaker, the play is over.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, the question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of

April 13, 1972

110

the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule B. All those in favor will indicate by saying AYE. All those opposed? The bill as amended passed.

djh

I would like to digress from the procedure for a moment to say to you, Mr. Speaker, I've been here for fourteen years and I've never seen such an articulate display of parliamentary procedure and answers to questions as I've seen in the last forty-eight hours. I would like to congratulate both you, Speaker Kennelly, and you, Speaker Ratchford, for the excellent job you have done.

THE SPEAKER:

I understand the gentleman from the 118th has considerable business that can be moved at this point.

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, after having discussed the matters with committee chairman and with leaders on both sides of the aisle, for the purpose of expediting our business I'd like to at this time take up a number of items which we intend to address motion to which will expedite everybody's business and save everybody's time here, I think.

Commencing on page 2, Mr. Clerk, with Calendar 58.

THE CLERK:

Page 2, favorable report, calendar 58, HB 5034, An Act Creating A Fraudulent Claims Board.

MR. AJELLO(118th):

Mr. Speaker, I move that calendar 58, HB 5034, be recommitted to the

H-129

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1972

VOL. 15  
PART 7  
2495-2872

Tuesday, April 25, 1972

65.

item. Would the gentleman check with the Senate to see to it that the Senate members of the Committee also join him. roc

THE CLERK:

On Page 4 of the Calendar. Cal. 442, Sub. for H.B. 5357. AN ACT MAKING CERTAIN TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE GENERAL STATUTES, as amended by House Amendment Schedule B and Senate Amendments Schedules A and C. Committee on Judiciary. File 494.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair recognizes the Chairman of the Committee on Judiciary, Rep. Carrozzella of the 81st in Wallingford.

MR. CARROZZELLA: (81st)

Mr. Speaker, I would move for adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule A.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk please call Senate Amendment Schedule A. The House come to order.

MR. CARROZZELLA: (81st)

Mr. Speaker, I think I can summarize the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman can summarize it once the Clerk calls it.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule A was offered by Senator Jackson of the 5th, L Seal No. 1576.

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection to the gentleman outlining Senate A. Hearing none, the gentleman from the 81st.

Tuesday, April 25, 1972

56.

MR. CARROZZELLA: (81st)

roc

Mr. Speaker, the matter before us is the technical corrections bill that we passed some time ago. The amendment deletes section 39 and substitutes another section 39 which conforms to the intent of what which originally had done. The original section 39 referred to the driving under the influence bill which of course did not pass, therefore it had to be deleted. Insofar as the other part of the amendment, it changes medicine to osteopathy because that particular section deals with an osteopath and has no reference to medicine. It's a technical amendment and I move its adoption.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Senate A. If not all those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. SENATE A IS ADOPTED and ruled technical. The gentleman from the 81st.

MR. CARROZZELLA: (81st)

The Clerk has Senate Amendment C.

THE SPEAKER:

Call Senate C.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule C

MR. CARROZZELLA: (81st)

Offered by Senator Cashman, I believe.

THE SPEAKER:

The House will stand at ease momentarily. This item will have to be passed temporarily. Our computer is temporarily out and we can't verify the adoption of the amendment without

Tuesday, April 25, 1972

67.

obtaining a Senate Journal. If the gentleman from the 81st wishes to the Clerk's office to obtain a Senate Journal to verify adoption, we can proceed. This item will be passed temporarily and returned to once this is verified.

THE CLERK:

On Page 3, Disagreeing Action. Cal. 254, Sub. for H.B. 5198. AN ACT CONCERNING STATE EMPLOYEE RELATIONS ACT, as amended by House Amendment Schedule A and Senate Amendment Schedule B.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair recognizes rep. Motto of the 3rd district in Hartford.

MR. MOTTO: (3rd)

I move acceptance and passage in concurrence with the Senate. I understand there is an amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman wish to call the Senate Amendment first for consideration.

MR. MOTTO: (3rd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk now call Senate Amendment Schedule B, for H.B. 5198. File 312.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule B which was offered by Senator Petrone of the 24th. Delete line 26 through line 30 of House Amendment Schedule A.

Tuesday, April 25, 1972

107.

Chair the Ayes have it. THE RESOLUTION IS ADOPTED.

roc

(The Deputy Speaker now in the Chair)

MR. OLIVER: (104th)

Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege. Mr. Speaker, through you to the gentleman from the 52nd and the gentleman from the 122nd, I'd like to say as a matter of personal privilege, it occurs to me that if anything that I said discussing the past resolution in any way came out as a personal remark, I withdraw it and apologize. I have nothing but the highest respect for those two gentlemen. I disagreed with some of their ideas but not the personalities and I commend the gentleman from the 52nd, particularly for having initiated the thinking of this, although I disagree with the particular words that he had used and I wish my remarks to no way I hope against any personal reflection whatsoever on he or the other co-sponsors of that resolution.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 52nd.

MR. O'NEILL: (52nd)

Mr. Speaker, through you, a point of personal privilege. In no way did I take it as a personal insult whatsoever, sir, I consider the source from which it comes.

THE CLERK:

Turn to Page 4, the second Calendar item down, Cal.

442, Substitute for House Bill 5357, AN ACT MAKING CERTAIN TECH-

Tuesday, April 25, 1972

108.

NICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE GENERAL STATUTES, as amended by House Amendment Schedules B and Senate Amendments Schedules A and C, Senate A was already adopted. We are on Senate C. roc

THE SPEAKER:

In the recollection of the Chair, subsequent to adoption of Senate A, there was some question as to whether or not the Senate properly acted upon Senate C as is printed and appears on your Calendar. I believe that at the suggestion of the Chair the gentleman from the 81st requested the Clerk to check the Journal of the Senate to determine the appropriate action or status. Is the Clerk prepared to respond to the status of Senate Amendment Schedule C.

THE CLERK:

It was checked out and Senate C was adopted.

THE SPEAKER:

Is this pursuant to examination of the Senate Calendar, Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

True.

THE SPEAKER:

The question then is on adoption of Senate C, Rep. Stevens from the 122nd.

MR. STEVENS: (122nd)

Mr. Speaker, I would move that we adopt Senate Amendment C to Sub.stitute House Bill 5357. I ask permission to have the reading waived and I will summarize it.

Tuesday, April 25, 1972

109.

THE SPEAKER:

roc

Unless there is objection, and apparently none, the gentleman from the 122nd for the purpose of outlining Senate C.

MR. STEVENS: (122nd)

Senate Amendment C now before the House, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment to the technical changes to the Statutes Act which make those sections of the statute that have to do with financial assistance for higher education conform in their requirements for residency with the Residency Bill previously passed by the House. Adoption of Senate Amendment C also has a section 44 which adds a new appeal procedure that is not now in our statutes concerning students who apply and are denied financial assistance. For the information of the House, a subsequent amendment will be offered to delete that latter portion which puts an appeal into the statute that does not now exist. I would move adoption of Senate Amendment C, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the adoption of Senate C. If not the question is on its adoption. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. SENATE C IS ADOPTED and ruled technical and pursuant to the indication in the remarks of the gentleman of the 122nd, are there further amendments.

The lady from the 23rd.

MRS. TRUEX: (23rd)

I think the Clerk has an amendment to Senate Amendment C.

THE CLERK:

This is House Amendment Schedule C offered by Ruth Truex.

Tuesday, April 25, 1972

110.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the lady care to have the Clerk read House C.

MRS. TRUEX: (23rd)

Please, Mr. Speaker.

THE CLERK:

Strike out Section 44 of Senate Amendment Schedule C.

THE SPEAKER:

You have the reading. The lady from the 23rd.

MRS. TRUEX: (23rd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is just another purely cleanup amendment as Rep. Stevens indicated previously, speaking on amendment Senate C. This merely removes the section which was added by Senate Amendment C which previously amended a House bill which had previously had this appeal section removed, if you follow me. It is extremely, highly technical. This simply removes the appeal procedure which was never in the original House bill and I urge acceptance of this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House C. The question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule C. If not all those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. House C is ADOPTED.

The question now is on acceptance and passage as amended by House Amendments Schedules B and C and Senate Amendments Schedules A and C. Will you remark on the bill as amended. If not all those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed.

THE BILL AS AMENDED IS PASSED.

roc

S-89

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1972  
SPEC. SESS.  
MAY & JUNE

VOL. 15  
PART 6  
2393-2886

April 20, 1972

31.

none all those in favoe of passage of the bill as amended signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. Ayes have it and the bill is passed.

CLARK:

Cal. 432. File No. 494. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary. Sub. H.B. 5357. AN ACT MAKING CERYAIN TECHNICAL CORR\_ ECTIONS TO THE GENERAL STATUTES.

CHAIR:

Senator Jackson this is your annual bill of the session.

SENATOR JACKSON:

You're most kind. I would move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill and I would also point out that the Clerk has an amendment.

CHAIR:

Waive the reading?

CLARK:

Clark has two amendments.

SENATOR JACKSON:

May I inquire as to the -----

CLERK:

Senate A by Senator Jackson. Senate B by Senator Rimer.

SENATOR JACKSON:

I believe that Senator Rimer's has been incorporated into

CHAIR:

Senator Rimer.

April 20, 1972

32.

SENATOR RIMER:

May Senate Amendment B be withdrawn?

CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President I move that the reading be waived and I will explain.

CHAIR:

Have you moved the adoption of Senate Amendment A.

SENATOR JACKSON.

Yes I did.

CHAIR:

Would it be convenient then to explain the bill and the amendment together.

SENATOR JACKSON:

If that meets with your approval Mr. President.

CHAIR:

I think it is the most sensible procedure if it meets with your approval.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President I would also move adoption of the amendment. The amendment takes care of two problems it adds section 41 and 42 to the bill to take care of the problem to the bill to take care of the problem in the omnibus drug bill that was passed through inadvertance a problem arose as far as Osteopaths were concerned and their power to dispense drugs. This clears up any ambiguity and restores the it to its present

April 20, 1972

33.

status. In addition it adds a section 39 which spells out and makes very clear that a judge cannot have the power to suspend any mandatory sentence for anyone who is accused or arrested for selling drugs. Remember last year we had a policy decision that the non-addict drug pusher would have a mandatory jail sentence. This makes very clear that the judge does not have the right to suspend that which was the intent of the Legislature last year.

CHAIR:

Will you remark? Just a moment there is a question of another amendment. Would you care to remark while we are waiting?

SENATOR JACKSON:

I believe I have explained it. If you would like me to go on, if there are no questions on the amendment I would just point out that this is the Annual Bill prepared by the Legislative Commissioner's office.

CHAIR:

No I wouldn't particularly like you to go on.

SENATOR JACKSON:

I have a four page summary here Mr. President if you'd like me to go through it.

CHAIR:

I move we waive. We are looking for an amendment C which we can't find.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Is there another amendment? I wasn't aware of it.

April 20, 1972

31.

CHAIR:

Well that is what we are not sure of and you know there is an old Maine saying "Never speak unless it improves on silence"

SENATOR JACKSON:

Well if you just want me to keep on talking until you find it I would be more than happy to.

CHAIR:

No I would keep on talking until the T.V. man stops. That was meant kindly Senator.

Are you familiar with C or would you like us to be at ease for awhile while you look at it and see what it is all about? Senator Cashman.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

I was just wondering if perhaps we shouldn't act on this .

CHAIR:

First we must go ahead and have any discussion if necessary on Senate Amendment Schedule A. Hearing none all those in favor of the adoption of A. signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. Ayes have it Senate Amendment Schedule A is adopted.

SENATOR JACKSON:

I would defer to Senator Cashman.

CHAIR:

Thank you Senator. Senator Cashman.

CLERK:

Clark has in his possession Senate Amendment C as offered by Senator Cashman.

April 20, 1972

SENATOR CASHMAN:

Mr. President I move adoption of the amendment.

CHAIR:

Are you going to waive the reading here?

SENATOR CASHMAN:

You took the words out of my mouth. Mr. President this amendment has been distributed to the desks of all the Senators and what it does simply is to correct an oversight in the bill which we passed yesterday Sub. H.B. 5425 regarding the length of time one must be in Connecticut to be a resident in order to go to the to pay an in-state fee to our Colleges and State Universities.

In the subsequent bill which dealt with our scholarship program there was an oversight and they retained the 12 month requirement. All this does is to bring into line that second bill, H.B. 5425 into alignment with H.B. 5302 so that they read exactly the same. It is merely a technical correction. I have the agreement of Senator Murphy and Senator Hammer on it and I move passage of the amendment.

CHAIR:

The Chair recalls that discussion last night. The question is on passage. Remarks further? Hearing none all those in favor of Schedule C. signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. Amendment Schedule C and A are ruled technical. The bill as so amended is now ready for discussion. Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

April 20, 1972

36.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President if I haven't already done so I would move passage as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule A and C.

CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Hearing none all those in favor of passage of the bill as amended by Senate Schedule A and C signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it the bill is passed.

CLERK:

Cal. No. 433. File 487. Favorable Report Joint Standing Committee on Rules. H.B. 5474. AN ACT CONCERNING THE DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY OF THE LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

CHAIR:

Senator Burke;

SENATOR BURKE:

Mr. President this legislation authorizes the Rules Committee to dispose of used desks in the Senate and House for a price determined by the Committee. The proceeds of the sale are to be merged with the appropriation of the Legislative Department. I move its passage.

CHAIR:

Remarks further. Hearing none all in favor aye. Please do better. All in favor aye. Opposed nay. Ayes have it. Bill is passed.

CLERK:

Cal. 435. Favorable Report of the Standing Committee on Transportation. H.B. 5415. AN ACT CONCERNING REQUIRING TRANSPORTATION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN SCHOOL BUSES.

May 3, 1972

20

deserve. You are lucky that the Chair is moved so by sadness and emotion at the leave taking of Senator Ives that I will say only one sentence.

It's rarely pointed out, but he won the Silver Star in combat when he was eighteen years of age on the battlefields of Europe. He spent a lifetime career in the military as well as in civic and community service. He has depleted the community of Morris, which was small to begin with, by employing half of them in his office up here at the State Capitol. We enjoy having them all up here--it gives a rural atmosphere to our Legislature. He's a man in one sense, a man whose brilliance is marked only by his honesty.

All those in favor of the adoption of the resolution signify by saying Aye. Opposed? THE RESOLUTION IS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, may we go to our calendar on page 3, calendar 432, and take that matter up at this time.

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Page 3, Disagreeing Action, calendar 432, file 494, favorable report of Committee on Judiciary, Sub. HB 5357, An Act Making Certain Technical Corrections to the General Statutes, as amended by Senate amendments A and C and House amendments B and C.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by these House and Senate amendments. Mr. President, the disagreeing action was simply changing the procedure in

section 44 of the Senate Amendment Schedule C. I concur in the change. The general bill has already been passed by this House and it is the usual technical amendments.

THE CHAIR:

You move passage of the bill now in this form, is that correct?

SENATOR JACKSON:

That is correct, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed? The Ayes have it. THE BILL IS PASSED.

THE CLERK:

SR 39, Resolution Calling for National Congressional Action to Terminate Military Activities in Indochina and the Support of the Connecticut General Assembly in Such action.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, I move adoption of the resolution. Will the Clerk please read the resolution?

THE CLERK:

Resolved by the Senate: WHEREAS the Indochina war has killed over 56,000 Americans, over 165,000 South Vietnamese and other allied troops, and over 810,000 North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops--over 1,000,000 in all; has, from 1965 through 1971 killed 150,000 and wounded 350,000 Vietnamese civilians; has created over 6,000,000 refugees in all Indochina; and has devastated much of the countryside, rendering one-fifth of North and South Vietnamese land useless for the next twenty-five years; and WHEREAS, the area today is more divided and unstable politically than before the war