

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 546 PA 296 1981

House- 1572, 5276-5280, 5920-5956 (42)

Senate 966, 2384-2387, 2457 (6)

Government Administration and Elections 304-305,
330-331 (4)

~~LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE~~
~~DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY~~ total 52 p.

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2013

H-280

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1981

VOL. 24

PART 5

1418-1823

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 1, 1981 155
kpp

Standing Committee on Government Administration and Elections
on S. B. No. 536, AN ACT CONCERNING CONTROLS ON THE ADMINISTRATION
OF ELECTIONS AND PRIMARIES. The Committee recommends that this
bill be referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

CLERK:

Change of Reference. Favorable Report of the Joint
Standing Committee on Government Administration and Elections
on S. B. No. 546, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS
FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CODES OF ETHICS FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND
LOBBYISTS. The Committee recommends that this bill be referred
to the Committee on Judiciary.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

CLERK:

There is no further business on the Clerk's desk.

REP. GROPPA: (63rd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John Groppo.

REP. GROPPA: (63rd)

There being no further business on the Clerk's desk, I

H-291

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1981

VOL. 24

PART 16

5185-5492

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 14, 1981

92

klr

REP. JOHNSON: (51st)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Johnson.

REP. JOHNSTON: (51st)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place a few items on the Consent Calendar for action tomorrow. Starting at the top of page 13, Calendar No. 540, Substitute for Senate Bill 663, File No. 514; then over to page 16. Calendar No. 559. Substitute for House Bill No. 7152, File No. 743; on page 18. Calendar No. 570. Substitute for House Bill No. 1611, File No. 780. And on page 20, top of the page. Calendar No. 580, Substitute for House Bill No. 5810, File No. 777. Mr. Speaker, I move that these bills be placed on the Consent Calendar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The motion is to place Calendars numbered 540, 559, 570 and 580 on the Consent Calendar for action tomorrow. Is there objection to the placing of these items on the Consent Calendar? Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

CLERK:

Calendar No. 544, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 546, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CODES OF ETHICS FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND LOBBYISTS. Favorable report of the Committee on Judiciary.

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 14, 1981 93
khp

REP. WALKOVICH: (109th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Walkovich.

REP. WALKOVICH: (109th)

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate. Will you remark, sir?

REP. WALKOVICH: (109th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is a rather simple bill. It would establish a three year schedule limitation for the filing of a claim against the ethics law. Currently there is no time limit, thus allowing alledged violations to be carried out indefinitely. The Commission has requested the bill so that -- for purposes that as the alledged violations get older, the evidence becomes unclear. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further?

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 14, 1981

94
khp

REP. KEZER: (22nd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Kezer.

REP. KEZER: (22nd)

Yes, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 6697. Will he call and read and may I be allowed to summarize, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 6697, designated House Amendment Schedule "A". Will the Clerk please call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6697, designated House Amendment Schedule "A", offered by Rep. Kezer of the 22nd District.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Rep. seeks leave of this Chamber to summarize the amendment in lieu of Clerk's reading. Is there objection? Hearing none, you may proceed, Rep. Kezer.

REP. KEZER: (22nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are 14 names on this amendment and the gist of this amendment is to say that in a one year period of time after someone has served a term in this House of Representatives, that they should not be allowed to become a lobbyist within a one year period. I move adoption

of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark on its adoption?

REP. KEZER: (22nd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Kezer.

REP. KEZER: (22nd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The reason for this amendment is that the passage of this amendment would eliminate the possibility of being a legislator one day and a lobbyist the next. The purpose of it is a one year period of time, not a full session. Right now you can become -- be a legislator on December 31 of any given year, and a lobbyist on January 1st.

What happens, is after November elections, those of us who are incumbants who are not so fortunate to become elected again, become recruited, hustled, bombarded, by special interest groups and are asked to become lobbyists at the State Capitol. This amendment provides a cooling off period of time, not an unreasonable one by my standards, a year, and it really doesn't deny anyone from seeking employment for an unreasonable period of time. I urge adoption of this amendment by this body at this

time. I think it would be a healthy position for us to be in and one which we could all support. Thank you.

REP. GROppo: (63rd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Groppo.

REP. GROppo: (63rd)

May this item be passed temporarily, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

CLERK:

Calendar Pg. 15, Calendar No. 5553. Senate Bill No. 1452, AN ACT INCREASING THE REGISTRATION FEE FOR DEVICES EMITTING X-RAYS. Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue, and Bonding.

REP. COBLE: (129th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Coble.

REP. COBLE: (129th)

I move for acceptance of the Joint Committees Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committees

H-293

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1981

VOL. 24

PART 18

5907-6295

be aware of the fact that the rules do not allow the Speaker any discretion once the Speaker has asked the Clerk to announce the tally. We are getting late in this session and the Chair does not intend to leave the machine opened for any extended period of time so I would urge the members to stand by.

Will the Clerk please return to the Call of the Calendar.

CLERK:

Calendar Pg. 8, Calendar No. 544, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 546, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CODES OF ETHICS FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND LOBBYISTS. Favorable Report of the Committee on Judiciary.

REP. WALKOVICH: (109th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Joseph Walkovich.

REP. WALKOVICH: (109th)

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committees Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committees Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Will you remark, Sir?

REP. WALKOVICH: (109th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will. Mr. Speaker, this legislation

is very simple. It was proposed by the Ethics Commission. It would require the Ethics Commission to act on the complaint or a violation of part 1 or 2 of the Ethics Law within three years of the alledged violation.

Presently there is no limit, thus allowing an alledged violation to be carried out indefinitely before any action is taken. This makes it harder to prosecute successfully as the time passes and evidence becomes unclear.

Under the general provisions of the criminal code, there is a statute of limitations on prosecutions by the State's Attorney, a willful violation of the two code of ethics. This would establish one for action by the commission as well. Mr. Speaker, I would move passage of the bill.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Chair will note that at a previous session, LCO No. 6697, which was designated House Amendment Schedule "A" was offered. It was moved for adoption but never adopted. The Chair at this time would have to recognize that what we have attached to this bill, therefore, is an amendment that actually must be taken on.

REP. KEZER: (22nd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Kezer.

REP. KEZER: (22nd)

Mr. Speaker, I was the one that proposed the amendment the other day. At the time when it was pass retained and keeping its place on the Calendar, and if -- it is before us now, right?

SPEAKER ABATE:

It is before us, Madame, it has been called and it has been offered and in fact we did move for adoption. Will you remark on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A"?

REP. KEZER: (22nd)

I would like to remind this Chamber because we're just about getting settled and I'm sure a lot of people haven't tuned in as to what's going on, that this was the amendment that would prohibit someone who sits in this body or in the Senate from becoming a lobbyist until one year after their term of office.

This was offered so that we would not have the situation where somebody would on December 31 of any given year be a legislator and on the next day, January 1, in fact be a lobbyist. It was offered by more than 14 people from both sides of the aisle and I think it's a good amendment and I won't go into the arguments that we had before because I think we're all aware of it and I urge you to vote on its passage, please.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A"?

REP. YACAVONE: (9th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Muriel Yacavone.

REP. YACAVONE: (9th)

Mr. Speaker, this is a bi-partisan amendment. In just a few minutes we have changed a number of signatures, legislators who were very interested in sponsoring this amendment. It seems like it's a very good idea for the legislature and legislators and it seems like it's a very good idea for the public that there be a period when legislators going out of office will have just take a short rest before maybe coming back to lobby. It seems like it would be good for everyone. We have close associations here, we can't really turn away from our former colleagues with whom we have worked on many issues. Maybe we can, but it's not human nature to do that, we tend to listen more to those we've worked closely with and be influenced I think.

And this is not to say that we're susceptible to corruption. Heavens, the issues may be healthy ones and we have the right to take whatever side we feel is the right side. In general, for our good, for the good of the General Assembly, and

for the good of the public --

SPEAKER ABATE:

-- Excuse me, Madame. Will the House of Representatives please come to order. Will the House please come to order.

I'm sorry, Rep. Yacavone, you have the floor.

REP. YACAVONE: (9th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a healthy amendment. I think it's good for the General Assembly, I think it's good for all of us individually and as a body that there be a prohibition on lobbying by former legislators immediately after they have left office. We would have to admit that there are times when we are influenced by our friends, we might not all admit that, but we've had close associations here and when issues are difficult, we tend to perhaps listen to those that we have worked with or in fact -- I think it just would be very, very good for all of us if this amendment were to pass today.

There were many who felt that one year probably wasn't such a good year, that it should be a longer period of time. But for your deliberations we do sponsor this amendment today. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The question before us is adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A" which bears LCO No. 6697. A question for adoption was put to this Chamber by Rep. Kezer. Will you remark further

on the adoption of House "A"?

REP. MOYNIHAN: (10th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Timothy Moynihan.

REP. MOYNIHAN: (10th)

Mr. Speaker, it's a rare opportunity to have the opportunity to debate my colleague from East Hartford. I think there's a broader question here really than the amendment that we have before us. And it's really the question of denying ones rights to perform as every other member of society may be allowed to perform. I would like to draw some, to show the difficulty of the problem, I'd like to give you some other examples of items that would not be covered by the amendment. What I think we ought to think about as we address this amendment, should, for example, staff members of the legislative process, who certainly do have a great deal of influence and have contacts, be denied the opportunity to lobby?

Should we deny the rights of members of the press to then seek employment in the private sector where they may have established contacts as a result of their service here as members of the Fourth Estate? Should lobbyists be allowed to run for a subsequent term as a member of the General Assembly? I think in

all the cases that I've cited, you'd probably say well probably not. Probably we should let members of the press go to work for private industry. Many times in the lobby capacity or public relations capacity, we would allow staff members I think in those cases to run for office or become lobbyists. We would probably suggest that the lobbyists should not be denied the right to run for a subsequent term in the General Assembly.

So I think in a way we're singling out elected officials for a very special denial of a right. And with that thought, and I hope you will be thoughtful about this, and think about these three examples that I've cited because they're not very different at all from the issue that we're addressing in the amendment, but the amendment is silent on those points, and I think they're very, very important before you vote for this amendment and deny rights to legislators. I would oppose the amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House "A"?

REP. SORENSEN: (82nd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Robert Sorensen.

REP. SORENSEN: (82nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Rep. Moynihan has indicated

he found it a rare experience to debate his colleague from East Hartford, and I find it just as rare an experience to agree with Mr. Moynihan.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who is in his third year in this House, my record as far as, if you want to call it liberalism, is quite well established and it seems like this might be a good liberal position to take to ban former legislators from becoming lobbyists if they leave in December and come in in January. Well, I'm gonna break my liberal mold and vote against this particular amendment for the basic reasons that Rep. Moynihan has just stated. And also for some personal experiences. In the three years that I have been in this House, I have known individuals who are former legislators who are now lobbyists that when they were in the legislature they could not influence me.

So they certainly are not going to influence me once they are out. I think it speaks very badly of individuals who feel that they have that lack of confidence within themselves to think that just because someone is a former legislator and they have worked with you side by side on certain issues, that you're gonna let that individual influence you in any certain way anymore than any other member of the public. I think that's a wrong attitude to have. I think you're penalizing, as the Assistant Majority Leader has said, individuals who have chosen to be legislators and then lobbyists. I would urge your rejection of this amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House "A"?

REP. PATTON: (119th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Gerard Patton.

REP. PATTON: (119th)

Mr. Speaker, I really don't have a problem with the bill but there is another angle that I really wish everybody would pay attention to. And without hurting anybody's feelings I'm even going to spell out by name to make my point.

I'm talking for example of a person like John Groppo, and to be non-partisian, I can even say Jack Tiffany. What I'm talking about are people who have been here for many, many years and who use their physical bodies in their work. And what I'm really talking about is this amendment has overlooked the incapacitation of somebody through illness or sickness.

For example, someone could get hurt. God forbid, but they could hurt a leg, could hurt an eye, could hurt a lot of things. And their ability to earn their living in their normal occupation could be impaired, again, like Jack Tiffany. He can't go out and be a farmer if he had a serious disability. And so what we're talking about is prohibiting somebody like that with

all of these many years of experience from being able to capitalize on their wealth of knowledge and experience and yet they would not be able to conduct their normal occupation.

Mr. So what I think we have done is we have looked at this question from the point of view of those who would resign or finish for the sole purpose of going into lobbying versus those who might be forced to resign from public office and be in need of another way to earn a living and I think that if we were going to take this step towards prohibition, we should include in it an exemption for those persons who might be forced to resign due to health or other reasons such as health. Because the way this amendment is drafted right now, somebody could get elected in November, take office in January, and not be able to be a lobbyist for almost three years and so what you're really talking about is disenfranchising someone from a good, legitimate pursuit for more than two years, almost three years. And I think that if we would rearrange the wording on this thing, if we would make an accomodation for those who were incapacitated, who resigned due to health, and you know we've seen that already up here in just the last few years since Rep. Sorensen was here, we've seen people be incapacitated and I think there's none of us who would find fault with that person taking a job up here as a lobbyist where his expertise and his experience would be put to very good

use so I just offer that as a suggestion that we -- if we move forward, that we adjust our thinking to make an exception for those who are forced to resign due to bad help. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. David Lavine.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise as one who has seen this amendment come to us since 1970. In 1970 my seatmate offered the amendment. It was considered by the General Assembly at that time and was voted down and I believe I've seen the amendment offered in every session since then.

I'm an individual who has on occasion had some negative words to say about lobbyists and even lobbyists who may have been past legislators. Nevertheless, I think this is a bad amendment. I believe that lobbyists and legislators who have been lobbyists make contributions for both good and bad. And that we should have that opportunity at all times to have access to that information. I think we should be able not to have to limit all the members of this House. I've never

understood why indeed we can't at some point make our own minds up. Indeed there are times when it may not work out. But I think that there is an overriding question and that is the question of how we address ourselves in this Chamber.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have served in this Chamber and seen us constantly diminish and demean our own efforts. I have seen us take statutory whacks at ourselves in ethics. I've seen our attempts at getting an effective salary defeated frequently and I would say to you that that does not benefit the General Assembly.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is a time to try and say to everybody seeking office that this is a worthy office to hold and we should not diminish it and we should not demean it and we should not pass this amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House "A"?

REP. KEZER: (22nd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Pauline Kezer.

REP. KEZER: (22nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment is not intended to penalize anyone, it's not a slur, or any of the comments I've

been hearing in the last few speakers, they say in some way we're trying to get back at someone who's become a lobbyist and it certainly has nothing to do with a lack of confidence as expressed by Rep. Sorensen.

What it does have to do with is the pressure that some of us get put under in this Chamber, not by lobbyists, but by special interest groups that want to hire someone to in fact lobby their interests. What better person to hire than somebody who is presently sitting in the House or will be leaving at the end of a term. Because they have an edge, of course. If I were the head of a special interest group, I'd look for that kind of person. But, I'll tell you, as far as prohibiting, one year is not an unreasonable period of time because what happens is those of us who sit in this body may be actively recruited and who otherwise may not have been interested in one of these jobs when actively recruited may change their mind.

I just don't think it's healthy, I don't think that we in this Chamber are in the process of training lobbyists. I don't think that's a responsibility of being a State Representative. We're not training lobbyists in this body here. We are doing the legislative business of this state. So I take exception to the remarks about a lack of confidence and penalizing methods -- measures. It's not, it's just good government and a way to keep government a little bit more above board and as far as

denying, we do this in other areas to certain of our agencies that we do not allow people to go right in to their regular field right afterwards. It's not unprecedented at all.

Last year we passed one in the Chamber saying that somebody could not resign in the middle of the term to be a lobbyist. It's the same principle applied here. What difference in the middle of the term or December 31 or January 1 of the term? The same reasons apply. It's not terribly punitive, one year is not an unreasonable amount of time and I ask this body to think about it seriously and vote affirmatively.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"?

REP. DE MERELL: (35th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John DeMerill.

REP. DE MERILL: (35th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would join with those who oppose this amendment. I truly believe that it is a very degrading inference and I'd like to make it perfectly clear to this Chamber on my behalf and I believe on the behalf of the vast majority of this Chamber, that my vote is not up for grabs regardless of whether any lobbyist is a former colleague. I

truly think this amendment is a slur on this House and I urge its rejection.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A"?

REP. MISCIKOSKI: (65th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John A. Miscikoski.

REP. MISCIKOSKI: (65th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, number one we have to remember that we're all lobbyists in this building, lobbying for one thing or another. And anyone that's a lobbyist is performing a service because there's two sides to every story and we don't know it all here. And I'm sure that the taxpayers out there will agree with this statement. The thing is to let these people present their views, they're entitled to their views, they represent companies, they create jobs in Connecticut. And they should be heard. I just want you to strongly reject this amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further? Rep. Muriel Yacavone.

REP. YACAVONE: (9th)

Mr. Speaker, just some brief comments. Rep. Patton,

whom I respect working with him on the Human Services Committee, has talked about possible serious conditions that would require someone to resign from the Assembly and then seek employment, and the only thing that comes to mind as a reaction to those remarks is that is the General Assembly an employer of last resort?

I think this is a serious problem for a lot of us having our friends lobby and we did pass the prohibition on resigning in mid-term. I don't know whether it was overwhelming as far as the vote, but it did go through and it's on the books.

I think I'm thoughtful in this matter and I think I'm very concerned about infringement of rights. I think it's a little sacrifice perhaps, it could be for some individuals to have to not seek this particular type of employment for two years, or even one year. But we do have to give up rights for the good of all and in this case it's the good of the General Assembly and the operation here.

I myself might be in the position where I could make a lot more money than I'm making here but I'll find something to do if I'm not working here at the Assembly, I'm sure of that.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

REP. ROSSO: (30th)

Mr. Speaker.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 20, 1981

30
kod

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Peter Rosso.

REP. ROSSO: (30th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't take the Assembly's time to rehash what speakers before me have said. I just find it interesting that Rep. DeMerrell and Rep. Sorensen and Rep. Patton and I agree.

But what we're saying with this amendment, ladies and gentlemen, is that, no, you're a second class citizen. You're denied the rights that we give to everyone else in the state. Because you happened to have been a Representative last year, you're second class. You can't be hired by a firm who will probably do good work for the State of Connecticut.

Now Mr. Speaker, I sat here quietly for half an hour. I'm prepared to vote. I think the House is.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

REP. BARNES: (21st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Dorothy Barnes.

REP. BARNES: (21st)

Mr. Speaker, I think that serving in the House of Representatives of the State of Connecticut does not cause one to be a second class citizen. To the contrary, I think that being a member of this body or the Senate places one in a position of highest trust of people in this state. I think it requires a higher level of concern for the integrity of our own conduct as well as that of the integrity of others. I think there is a cost in maintaining the public trust. I think that we do make sacrifices of numerous kinds when we come here. We talk considerably. I've listened to debates over the years about the monetary sacrifices that are made here. There is no question that that is true.

One of the other sacrifices that might well be made and which I favor is prohibition from returning to this body a year later to impose whatever will some lobbying group feels that some particular ex legislator can best impose on the system.

I would like to think that all of us were so above human feelings that a lobbyist who is a former leader within this body, either in the upper or lower Chamber, had the same influence as someone who came in as a lobbyist without knowing a soul here. I do not believe that is so.

RE: I believe that by passing this kind of legislation, we protect the integrity of the General Assembly in a way that is highly desirable not only to the people who serve here, but to the people of the State of Connecticut.

RE: I think one of the things that concerns commentators on government at all levels, but particularly elective bodies, in the last decade has been the rise of the special interest. Many of you have probably read in numerous journals lately that the rise of the entity, influence of the special interest is such that the decline of party solidarity has diminished. And I think possibly on various issues in our own Chambers over the last few years we have seen this. And I think we have to ask when we are talking about how democratic government should work, whether we believe that party solidarity and continuity is more important than the power of special interests to split and fragment various groups within this body to the detriment of party policy.

I come down on the side of the unity of the party system in the state and in the integrity of the people who serve in this body.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

REP. SMITH: (149th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Everett Smith.

REP. SMITH: (149th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Based upon my experience in three years in this Chamber, I think there is nothing wrong with the present system. I've never been put under any undue influence. I've never had any problems with lobbyists. They usually ignore me, as a matter of fact.

But I do think that it's very important that we have an appearance that there be nothing wrong. And I think to the public the appearance would be improved and our image would be improved by this amendment. And therefore, I am going to support this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. CASEY: (118th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Casey.

REP. CASEY: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I don't think that we have anything to be ashamed of. I think if

there's one thing that business will always look at is expertise. We are political communicators. That is our background. That is our knowledge. Some are lawyers, some are bricklayers, some are farmers. But one expertise we have over most people out there is communications skills in the political arenas.

And I don't believe that we should be here passing legislation to prohibit a member of this General Assembly who is elected to this astute body by his constituency, now we're saying that you can't go out and work for that constituency because you no longer have the best interests of the state in mind.

I think it's wrong. I think this is a bad amendment and I urge its defeat.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Robert Jaekle.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this amendment. And I would like initially to address some of the comments of Rep. Moynihan who felt we legislators were being singled out, apparently wrongfully in his opinion, by virtue

of a prohibition of our serving some special interest after our state service ends. Well that is not quite correct.

Rep. Kezer indicated there already is a prohibition on our resigning from office to become a lobbyist, but there is something else. We passed a law last year indicating that Commissioners of DPUC would be prohibited when they leave DPUC to seek employment or accept employment for any public service company for a period of one year following the termination of their service as a Commissioner. Additionally, if they are an attorney working for DPUC, they cannot represent public service companies before the DPUC for a year after they discontinue their state service.

So indeed we are not being singled out. I think we are continuing what we started last year. And that is that generally when people serve the State of Connecticut in elected or a powerful appointed position, that they should not use what they have learned on that job to their own financial gain when they leave state service.

Hearing some of the comments, I'd just like generally to indicate that I am proud to be a legislator. I think all of us should be proud that we are indeed participating in public service of probably the highest order.

What I do not like, however, is for some people to feel that we are not merely serving the public, and as I said, public service of the higher order. This job should not be considered a training ground for some lucrative position when we leave. When we serve in this Assembly, we serve the public. I don't like anybody thinking, or any implications, that our service here is not just for the public, but it's to serve ourselves financially when we leave. I think that impression of the Legislature is a bad impression and one that we can put an end to. And indeed Rep. Smith indicated he would support this because he thought it would help our image. It's not just our image. It's partly our credibility when we serve as legislators. It's part of our prestige. And I think it reinforces that when we serve here, we are serving the public, not ourselves.

And that's what this amendment will do. And hopefully the public will perceive us in that light. That's why I support the amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

REP. MANNIX: (142nd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John Mannix.

REP. MANNIX: (142nd)

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Lobbying is an honorable profession. Somehow or other it's gotten a tarnished image. And the reason it's gotten the tarnished image, in my opinion, there's several reasons, but one of the reasons is because hard-headed businessmen, people who control gambling in the state, people who control the liquor industry in the state, feel that if they want to affect how we vote, it would be wise, and the record will show this, to go out and hire exlegislators.

But to heap insult upon injury, in my opinion, they're not going to hire just the rank and file legislators because someone who had some leadership position would have more effect upon us. Now these people aren't stupid. Most of them are multimillionaires. They haven't gotten there by throwing their money away.

I know of one instance several years ago of an ex-leader he's not involved now, who was paid over \$20,000 to come back to lobby. He probably came up here less, I know he came up here less than a dozen times. Do you think they're paying that kind

of money just to explore the facts?

Let's be honest with ourselves. I think that's important. They're paying their hard money to have extra influence because we have the opportunity, which not every citizen has, and I think it's a unique situation to come down, to be elected, and to come up here and represent our community.

Our whole system of government goes back really to the Greek city-states. And in the Greek city-states, the politician was held in very high esteem. Unfortunately, today and you read the polls as I do, we're not. And there are many reasons for this. I think this is one of them. It's not going to solve the problem. It's a small step. It's only one year.

I think it's a worthwhile step and a worthwhile amendment and I hope you support it.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Farr.

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker, I think that there are two issues that the

amendment attempts to address. The first issue is the question of if you are hired as a lobbyist once you leave the Chamber, will that affect your decision while you're in the Chamber. I think in those areas where we have restricted and prohibited individuals who are state employees from going out and seeking employment with those companies for which they are currently regulating, we did so in part because we were concerned or the Legislature was concerned, that you would have your decision process affected while you were still in state employment.

In other words, if you're sitting on the DPUCA and a utility company comes in and asks for a rate increase, it's very tempting to go ahead and give them a rate increase and two weeks later be working for the utility company.

So in order to avoid that, you have a cooling off period which therefore avoids the possibility of being influenced.

The problem in this, if you look at the point of view of the legislator, the same thing can happen. We can go out as a legislator and seek employment a year afterwards for a company that we were successful in getting a bill through that helped that particular company. The problem is that it isn't simply employment as a lobbyist that we can do. You can sit as Chairman of the Insurance Commission, Chairman of the

Banking Commission, and retire as a legislator and work for the banks or work for the insurance industry.

This bill will not address that question. And I don't think there's any way you can address that question. We as legislators affect all areas of the state. And I don't think there is any way you can ban us as legislators from seeking employment from all those industries that we regulate.

So I don't think that we can effectively handle that problem. The other end of the problem is the argument that as an ex-legislator we're going to unduly influence those people we served with.

I think you address that problem by electing better legislators. I don't think you can solve that problem by simply saying we're somehow going to isolate our legislators from this influence, and the problem is our legislator is bad that they're going to be influenced by all these ex-legislators and not decide on behalf of their own constituency.

As a Representative from a district that happens to be very close to the Capitol, I find that most of the lobbyists that approach this body are residents of my district. And on almost every issue I'll have both lobbyists come up and tell me they live in West Hartford and they want me to vote pro or

against something. I think the most effective lobbyist is somebody who voted for you or who tells you he voted for you in the last election.

I think the reality is that the way in which you deal with lobbyists is the way in which you deal with every issue. You attempt to put the best interest of your constituents above the private interests of the lobbyist.

And I don't think this bill will change anything. I think it's more form than substance. And for those reasons, I would reluctantly have to oppose it.

REP. BRODER: (48th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Broder.

REP. BRODER: (48th)

This morning I was reading the Hartford Courant, and I assume that many members of this Chamber have seen it, and down at the lower right hand corner there's a very large article that says, "Rich Man, Poor Man, Among State's Delegation." It's about our Congressional delegation. And the man whose picture appears in that article is the man whose seat I now have, Samuel Gejdenson, whom many people who have been here for

several years knew personally. If you knew him, you know that he is kind of Eastern Connecticut's answer to Toby Moffet. And he generally espouses open government, a liberal point of view.

This morning he's quoted as saying he's having second thoughts. He likes the idea of financial disclosure, but he wonders, he's concerned over the fact that the requirements discourage "good people" from running for office.

That's why I rise on this amendment. It's nice to be on the side of the angels and apple pie and motherhood and all that, but there are times when I think we have a responsibility here to look into just what are we doing. And here, this amendment, while it sounds like we're trying to make the Legislature a more pristine, a more pure place to be, I don't think we're doing that. What we're doing is we're depriving the Legislature one more time of the opportunity to have good people serve here. We keep saying that we're bad guys. We keep saying that we need to place restrictions on ourselves so that we won't behave improperly.

And every time we do this we perhaps discourage some good person from running for this House. And isn't that the ultimate safeguard? To have 151 good people here, who will not be improperly influenced. And I think that this amendment

is just another nail in the coffin of those good people, keeping them away from this body. And therefore, I oppose it.

REP. VAN NORSTRAND: (141st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Van Norstrand.

REP. VAN NORSTRAND: (141st)

Mr. Speaker, I just parenthetically know and I'm encouraged to find that there's an answer to Toby Moffet in Eastern Connecticut. I thought you'd have to look in outer space.

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the amendment, these have always been difficult amendments or bills for me. The one that Rep. Jaekle referred to I opposed when we passed it because I felt it was unconstitutional to limit the opportunities for employment for Commissioners and I believe it had a separate reservation for even being retained by private clients to appear before the DPUC.

I don't think lobbyists are second class citizens. I don't think what's before us necessarily demeans us. I've always felt quite different, however, about things that affected us versus affected others who in essence would be the

general public, because I've always felt that whether all this would become a law, I view it as a regulation of ourselves.

I think the essence of it is in part what Rep. Mannix was talking about. When people retain lobbyists and you're all familiar with a number of them, I think many of them have long backgrounds within their vocational expertise, and you see them routinely year after year. I think I saw an article on one who has like a roster of a dozen clients that he services. And they continue over the years and they earn, depending on the worth of the information they give us, our respect or not, if their information is unreliable.

But there is another class, and I think that's what this amendment is directed toward. Just along the lines that Rep. Mannix was talking about. We're not seeking out people who are great communicators, they're not getting hired because they've got Masters in journalism or they just came out of an advertising agency. They're getting hired because they just came out of this Assembly. I don't think that's wrong and I don't think they're wrong.

But I'll tell you what I do think sometimes. I don't know how you feel, but I think the reason they got chosen was because unlike some of those others in the first group I

mentioned, they will get entree, they will get your ear and to talk to you because they have been your colleagues. And I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but a couple of times, and again I don't know what the experience of the members is, but a couple of times in meeting some of these people I've had a couple of sad moments. I don't know whether you've had any sad moments.

Frankly, I'm going to support this just to minimize my sad moments.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

REP. GROppo: (63rd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John Groppo.

REP. GROppo: (63rd)

Mr. Speaker, we've had about 18 speakers on this issue and I had hoped that we wouldn't start the day off with a long debate on a bill that involves our conscience as far as lobbying goes in these Halls. I've had the experience over the years that, you know, I could take or I could leave a lobbyist. If I want to listen to him, I listen. If I don't, I just walk away.

And I don't see where we have to restrict anyone that serves this General Assembly, whether it be in this House or the Chamber on the third floor, to restrict them and to say, you know you're nice people, you can be elected by your constituents but don't feel that you have the right to go out and seek a job whether it be lobbying, public relations, or what have you, and lobby your fellow legislators on a particular issue.

I think we're going way beyond what we were elected to do when we start cluttering up the statutes with elected officials can't serve as a Commissioner, or work for a private industry. I think we're going way beyond the bounds that we were elected to do in this state. And that's to do what's fair and what's right for the majority of the people.

Lobbyists do not affect. In one way they do but they do not affect the decisions made by us unless we listen to them. And I have the greatest respect for the majority of the lobbyists and some of them I have no respect for at all. But that's me as an individual and how I take these people. But they're all honorable men and women. They do it, they have a job to do. And maybe some of us do not like that kind of a job that they do. But I don't think that we should spend much

more time in this Chamber arguing this issue because I think that the speakers that have already spoken have indicated whether they were for or against this and I don't think they're going to change anyone's mind, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that this would be the end of the debate because we have a long list and I don't want to hear any complaints later on about 6:00 o'clock or 7:00 that I've got a commitment.

Because we intend to stay here this evening to a late hour. So Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can get on with the business. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

REP. YACAVONE: (9th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Yacavone.

REP. YACAVONE: (9th)

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

SPEAKER ABATE:

The question is on a roll call vote. All those in favor please indicate by saying aye.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 20, 1981

48
kod

REPRESENTATIVES:

CLERK: Aye.

SPEAKER ABATE:

In the opinion of the Chair the requisite 20% hasn't been satisfied. When the vote is taken, it will be taken by roll.

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

If not, would all the members please be seated.

All staff and guests please come to the well of the House.

The machine will be opened.

The House of Representatives is voting by roll at this time. Would the members please return to the Chamber immediately.

The House of Representatives is voting by roll at this time. Would the members please return to the Chamber immediately.

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted?

Would the members please check the roll call machine to determine if their vote is properly recorded.

The machine will be locked.

The Clerk will take the tally.

Would the Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" to Senate Bill No. 546.

Total number voting	143
Necessary for adoption	72
Those voting yea	61
Those voting nay	82
Those absent and not voting	8

SPEAKER ABATE:

The amendment fails.

House Amendment Schedule "A".

After line 13, add a new section 3 as follows:

"Sec. 3. Section 2-16a of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

No state representative or state senator (who resigns from) WHOSE TENURE AS A MEMBER OF the general assembly TERMINATES OR IS TERMINATED shall engage in the profession of lobbyist, as that term is defined in subsection (1) of section 1-91, until ONE YEAR AFTER the expiration of the term for which he was elected."

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the bill? If not, would all the members please be seated. Staff and guests to the well of the House please. The machine will be opened.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 20, 1981

50
kod

The House of Representatives is voting by roll at this time. Would the members please return to the Chamber immediately. The House is voting by roll. Would the members please return to the Chamber immediately.

Have all the members voted? Would the members please check the roll call machine to determine if their vote is properly recorded. The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take the tally.

Would the Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 546.

Total number voting	142
---------------------	-----

Necessary for passage	73
-----------------------	----

Those voting yea	142
------------------	-----

Those voting nay	0
------------------	---

Those absent and not voting	9
-----------------------------	---

SPEAKER ABATE:

The bill passes.

CLERK:

Calendar page 9, Calendar No. 548, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1153, AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL TO IMPOSE CIVIL PENALTIES, LIMITING

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

JUDICIARY
PART 3
725-1118

1981

MS. KENNEDY: (continued)

I was expecting. And that it was a very difficult situation for them.

SEN. OWENS: Any other questions? Rep. Berman.

REP. BERMAN: I think there's a little misunderstanding of what this bill purports to do. It does not allow for the discontinuation of medical treatment and the keeping alive of those who are very, very ill and may be in pain, but it does provide for those who have indicated that they wish this when their brain ceases functioning, when they are determined to be brain dead.

MS. KENNEDY: Well since this time, since 1964, I have been very interested of course in cases of this type. And one that caught my eye was this Karen Ann Quinlan, who was removed from life support systems when they believed that she would die, and that the doctors were convinced that this girl was not able to continue on. And of course, they removed her from life support systems and she has continued not only to live, but as I understand it, she has eye/hand response now, which when she is said in a loud voice, Karen, can you look at me? Karen, can you hear me? She will look and respond.

So there is, what some doctors certified with her, some of the doctors certified that there was brain death, you see. And some of the doctors were not willing to this, but they agreed, the courts agreed to remove the life support system. So what I am saying, in my husband's case, there will be many cases with different gradations and the individual doctor, the individual family, and the patient really it should be a combination, as it is now, of medical expertise and of their knowledge of the patient at that moment. I would see a very great amount of court work for doctors who are needed in the hospitals now, trying to defend what they did at this moment, which is so difficult for the family, for the patient and for the doctor. And on an individual basis it really has to be protected there by the medical profession and the family as it is now.

Also, I have known families who could not wait to have someone die because they stood to inherit or it would make

S-175

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1981

VOL. 24

PART 7

2100-2459

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
APRIL 30, 1981

164
LFU

give notice and in some instances, there has been a question of interpretation in the courts as to whether or not the reason has to be set forth on the notice. This would, in fact, say that it has to be--it mandates that it be put on the notice to quit and it would require that it be put on for whether it's non-payment of rent, nuisance or whatever reason that the landlord might require or might feel necessary. I ask if there is no objection, that this matter be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing none, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 363, File 564, Substitute for Senate Bill 546, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR VIOLATIONS OF CODES OF ETHICS FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND LOBBYISTS, with a Favorable Report of the Committee on Judiciary.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Owens. Excuse me. Senator Baker.

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
APRIL 30, 1981

165
LFU

SENATOR BAKER:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR BAKER:

Yes, Mr. President, This Bill would impose a three year statute of limitations on complaints regarding alleged violations of the codes of ethics for public officials and lobbyists. It came to the Committee from the State Ethics Commission. Presently there is no limitation on actions by the Commission and it would seem to them and to me and I would hope to the body here, that it's basically unfair to allow possible action on a violation to hang over someone's head indefinitely. If there is no objection, I would move this to the Consent Calendar. The effective date on this is October 1st.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objection, so ordered. Senator
Gunther.

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
APRIL 30, 1981

166
LFU

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, through you, a question to Senator Baker. Senator Baker, if a person were to go let's say four years, and it was not discovered during that period of time, could the legislature itself be waived from any prosecution or any censorship of that particular party if this were to pass?

SENATOR BAKER:

Mr. President, through you, I'd ask the Senator to repeat his question. I didn't hear.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

In other words, after three years, if the legislature--I know this takes care of the court approach and that sort of thing, but how about the legislature itself. Could they conceivably be excluded from censoring or taking any action on--or any action that was taken after a three year period?

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
APRIL 30, 1981

167
LFU

THE CHAIR:

Senator Baker.

SENATOR BAKER:

Mr. President, this Bill does not deal in any way with the legislature and its action, censorship or dealing with disciplining its members.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gunther. Hearing no objection, it may be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 365, File 555, Senate Bill 671, AN ACT CONCERNING BONDS IN CRIMINAL CASES, with a Favorable Report of the Committee on Judiciary.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Owens.

SENATOR OWENS:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of this Bill.

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
APRIL 30, 1981

237
LFU

three, Calendar 228 and 256; On page four, Calendar SB1002, HB7267,
288. On Page five, Calendar 305, 306, 307 and 308. SB1449, HB6063, 5988,
On page six, Calendar 310, 311, 312 and 313. On page 5756, 7248,
seven, Calendar 315, 318, 319. On page eight, Calendar 6269, 7221, 7234,
320, 321, 322, 323, and 324. On page nine, Calendar 6675
6199, 7368, 7307
326, 327, 329, and 330. On page ten, Calendar 331, 332, 6979, 6986, 7034,
333, 334 and 335. On page eleven, Calendar 337, 338 7313, 5911, 6662
5928, 5727, 7244, 7245,
and 339. On page twelve, Calendar 346, 348 and 349. On 7090,
page thirteen, Calendar 352, 353 and 354. Page fourteen, 6027, SB376, 373,
905,
Calendar 357, 359 and 360. Page fifteen, Calendar 362, 1178, 1219, 1342,
363, 365, 366 and 367. 546, 671, 894, 932,

On page sixteen, Calendar 368, 369, 370 and 1089, 1153, 1206,
372. On page seventeen, Calendar 374 and 376 and 379. 1343, 1435, 587, 1453,
Page eighteen, Calendars 380, 382, 383, 384. Page 1454, HB7284, 7328, 7363,
nineteen, Calendar 385, 387 and 389. On page thirty one, 5811, 6875, 6877,
Calendar 46 and that concludes today's Consent Calendar. SB54

THE CHAIR:

Does any member of the chamber have any ques-
tion in reference to the Consent Calendar? The Clerk
will make the appropriate announcement of a Roll Call.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATIONS
& ELECTIONS

PART 1

1-343

1981

INDEX

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS

February 26, 1981

MR. NEURATH: (continued)

experience in regard to this. For the last two years I've become -- I had become progressively frustrated by the state of the world and the State of Connecticut in the country, and with the actions of government. And I think many citizens share this frustration. But recently, I became aware of a political party who held many of the same views that I had, and how to solve its problems. It happens to be the Citizens Party, but I'm sure there are other people who found other minor parties which fit closely to their views of the world.

Since then, I've taken part in the political process to an extent that I never dreamed would be possible, where I never dreamed I would have, when I felt faith to a choice of only two parties. And my appearance here tonight I think is evidence of that. In a democracy, all citizens should be able to join a viable party. Bill 533 could virtually eliminate this choice of parties by severely restricting the ability of minor parties to remain viable. And finally, I'd like to mention this button which I'm wearing, 27 percent button. It refers to the fact that the winner of the last presidential election received votes from only 27 percent of those registered to vote. If a landslide winner could only get 27 percent of the votes, then surely it's unfair and totally against the principles of democracy to require a minor party to get 10 percent of the vote to stay on the ballot. Thank you.

REP. WALKOVICH: Thank you, Chris. Any questions from the Committee? If not, David Eaton to be followed by Sarah Morehouse.

MR. DAVID EATON: Senator Baker, Representative Walkovich, Members of the Committee. My name is J. D. Easton. I'm Executive Director and General Counsel of the State Ethics Commission, and I'm here to express the --

REP. WALKOVICH: Would you move the microphone closer.

MR. DAVID EATON: -- Express the Commission's support of three bills which have been introduced by your Chairman. First is S -- Senate Bill 545, which would increase the threshold for registration as a lobbyist from \$300 to \$500. The second is S -- Senate Bill 546, which would require the Ethics Commission to commence action on a violation of another code which administers within three years of the time the violation is

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS

February 26, 1981

MR. EATON: (continued)

alleged to have occurred. The third is Senate Bill 547, which would increase the per diem of the Commissioners from \$25 to \$50. I have given your staff a written statement, which gives briefly, and in some detail, the position of the Commission on these three bills. Because of the lateness of the hour, I invite your attention to the written statement.

REP. WALKOVICH: Thank you very much, David. Are there any questions from the Committee? If none, Sarah Morehouse. I will also indicate that we've received a written statement from the Connecticut Business and Industry Association on this very same issue, David.

MS. SARAH MOREHOUSE: I'm Sarah Morehouse from Fairfield, and I'm speaking for the Connecticut Committee for Party Renewal. On Proposed Bill 533, Section 3, 534 Section 6 and 534 Section 12. First I want to thank the Committee for listening to testimony from the public. Before I address myself specifically to several of the issues before you, I want to say a word about the Connecticut Committee for Party Renewal and a general orientation so that you understand why we advocate the positions we do.

Founded two years ago and patterned after a similar group on a national level, the Committee is composed of citizens from various backgrounds. Most notably, the political and academic communities, and our honorary co-chairers are the State Democratic and Republican Parties. What unites us is a strong belief that the citizens of Connecticut are best served by a system of various political parties. Strong parties, we believe, can organize politics and make a comprehensive to the average citizen, enable office holders to be held accountable as a team for their collective actions, allow voters to have a say in how issues are resolved when the parties stand on meaningful platforms, serve as watch dogs against each others, stimulate citizen participation in politics, and serve as a vehicle for the mass of people who lack great wealth or power.

When parties weaken, interests groups, single issue pressure groups and sour media campaigns come to dominate politics. Therefore, we are here to examine proposed changes in the election laws to determine what effect they will have on the vitality of our political parties. I address three of the proposals of the Secretary of State Kennelly. The

MR. INSOGNA: (continued)

I'm asking this Commission for its support for Bills number 556, to reduce the number of voters required for continued ballot status; Bill 558 to reduce the number of signatures required to eliminate a petition for ballot of parties; and of course, I want to in opposition to 533, which would -- Bill 533 which would raise from 1 percent to 10 percent votes required for continued ballot status. The last bill, of course, I think would tend to increase the alienation of those people from the electoral process, which I think Bill 556 and 558 would do the opposite. I think in both instances, perhaps one-fourth of the current number of voters and signatures required would help minority parties to get on the ballot, present their program to the people. Not only would it present new ideas, new programs for , it also has the beneficial effect of having political parties look upon themselves consider the extent of which they have alienated the large percentage of the market of electoral process would act as a upon them to improve the performances and consider more concretely the interests of the people of the State of Connecticut and the nation. Thank you very much.

REP. WALKOVICH: Thank you. Any questions? Next speaker is Robert Godfrey.

MR. ROBERT GODFREY: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. I'm Robert Godfrey, Vice Chairman of the Greater Danbury Chamber of Commerce. I want to address myself briefly to the subject of three bills that you have before you tonight, Senate Bill 545 and 546, 547 Attorney General's Statutes. Two of them deal with raising attorney expenditure threshold and to do the Members of the State Ethics Commission. I would favor -- a comprehensive look at Chapter 10 items in regard to all of the threshold amounts triggering or triggering the definitions of gifts and so forth, and have them brought into line change since 1977 when these were first passed and suggested. 546 deals with the creation of a statute of limitations and suggests three years. I would suggest that as a reasonable time matching the requirement that is currently in the statute for retaining the documentation on the reports that go under Chapter 10 for three year period. I've got to apologize to the Committee. One of the items, as you know, in

75
gmc

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS

February 26, 1981

MR. GODFREY: (continued)

our communications to you previously has been -- expressing our support for the American system of laws -- law created by democratic re-elected representatives of the people, and I didn't see in the bill some of the constitutional amendments that I heard the testimony on tonight. I just want to briefly reiterate the chamber's strong stand in favor of that and opposition to any bills to the constitutional amendments that would weaken -- weaken that strength that's built into the American constitutional system at this time.

And it's late, and good night, and thank you.

REP. WALKOVICH: Thank you. That's the end of the participants on the sign-up sheet. Hope there is no one who wishes to give any further testimony. This hearing will convene until tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock.