

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 545	PA 339	1981
House	7230-7264	(35)
Senate	2797-2819	(23)
Government Administration and Elections	304, 330, 332	(3)
LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE		
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY		
total 61 p.		

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2013

H-297

CONNECTICUT

GEN.

ASSEMBLY

HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS

1981

VOL. 24

PART 22

7215-7431

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

359
kod

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Calendar No. 613, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 545,

AN ACT CONCERNING REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR LOBBYISTS.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Government Administration
and Elections.

REP. CREAN: (81st)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Gerald Crean.

REP. CREAN: (81st)

I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's
Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's
Favorable Report and passage of this bill. Will you remark,
sir?

REP. CREAN: (81st)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now this bill requires that a
lobbyist must register with the Ethics Commission if in lobbying
or in the furtherance of lobbying he receives, spends or agrees

to receive or spend \$500 or more, or if his receipts and expenditures total more than \$500.

The previous threshold which became effective in 1978 was \$300. The increase would raise the threshold in accordance with the inflation rate. This threshold would involve the above classifications of lobbyist as well as persons neither paid nor reimbursed to lobby spending no more than 5 hours lobbying if (1) the person spends \$50 or more to benefit a public official, staff or family member, (2) aside from his salary he spends or earns \$500 or a combination of both totals \$500.

This bill would also raise from \$25 to \$35, (1) the minimum advertising costs counted toward registration threshold, (2) minimum cost of one or more solicitations of other people to lobby to be counted toward the registration threshold, (3) minimum expended on behalf of a public official, staff member, or immediate family which must be reported to the State Ethics Commission for which verification must be preserved for three years, (4) maximum value of gift or gifts that anyone acting on his behalf may give to a state employee, public official, candidate, staff member or member of immediate family, (5) would raise from less than \$25 to \$35 per person

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

361
kod

the maximum value of food, beverage or both at a single occasion.

This would be exempted from definition of gift. It would not be included under gift.

I'd like to point out that this bill was presented on the recommendation of the Ethics Commission and it also received the unanimous support on both sides of the aisle at the GAE Committee meeting. I move passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further?

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 7051. I respectfully ask that the Clerk call the amendment and I be allowed to summarize it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk has an amendment, No. 7051, designated House Amendment Schedule "A". Would the Clerk please call the amendment.

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

362
kod

CLERK:

LCO No. 7051, designated House Amendment Schedule "A", offered by Rep. Shays of the 147th District and Rep. Mannix of the 142nd District.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. This amendment would provide that any state employee of the Executive Branch or the Judiciary Branch who lobbies in the General Assembly would register as a lobbyist solely for the purposes of wearing a badge and providing a knowledge to the General Assembly of who in the government is lobbying for particular state agencies.

I have summarized the amendment, Mr. Speaker. I move its adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

363
kod

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Members of the House, we have many state employees who work for both the Judiciary and the Executive Branch who spend their sole time during the legislative sessions lobbying on bills of concern to their state agencies, as they should.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide some identification so that we as legislators know who they're speaking for and who is paying the bill. And this would provide that they would register with the Ethics Commission, excuse me, would register for the purposes of noting that they were doing lobby work.

I was a supporter of the provision a few years ago that provided that lobbyists would wear badges. I remember at the time there were a lot of jokes among lobbyists because they somehow interpreted a badge as an indication that they were doing something wrong and that we were setting them apart with an "A". But the purpose and the benefit of that badge, I feel, has been tremendously helpful to me as a legislator. When a lobbyist comes before me he knows my name because I stand on the floor of the House or I sit there, I have my name. I

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

364
kod

know who he speaks for and I know what's motivating what he's saying.

We don't have that same luxury for the tens of state employees who are lobbying for state agencies. And we should. They should identify themselves and we should know who we're speaking with and who they're speaking for.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. WALKOVICH: (109th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Walkovich.

REP. WALKOVICH: (109th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment. I think Rep. Shays is correct that many of these people do spend a lot of time here at the State Capitol lobbying for different issues that affect their department. But I think what we have to realize is that's their job. They are part of the state government bureaucracy. They are there to help us to understand the workings of their individual departments. And if this amendment were passed, I think it would levy a great administrative burden on the Ethics Commission right now.

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

365
kod

There is a fiscal note that is attached to the amendment that indicates that several hundred individuals would have to register under this bill at a cost of at least \$3.00 per person. You take 500 state employees that would have register under this, it would be a fiscal impact to the Ethics Commission of some \$1,500. I don't think that the resources are in the budget right now.

I would wonder, if we're going to go this far, why also we wouldn't extend this same type of registration to individuals who show up before OPM to lobby for funds for their budget, or before other executive level type of agency.

I think, number one, if we're going to do this we should extend it to both, you know, in between each agency, in between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch. But as the amendment stands now and with the fiscal resources of the Commission, I think it's too much of an administrative burden and I would oppose the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. CASEY; (118th)

Mr. Speaker.

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

366
kod

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. T. J. Casey.

REP. CASEY: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment. I believe that legislative Commissioners and their staff have due course and opportunity as do any state lobbyists to address the Committee and the issues at the time, during the public hearing. But once that bill finally comes on to the floor of the House or into the Senate Chambers, they walk in and out and lobby that bill continually until it finally has the passage. I don't think that's right.

And I believe they should be registered. Thank you.

REP. SAVAGE: (50th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. John Savage.

REP. SAVAGE: (50th)

Mr. Speaker, as one of the freshman in this General Assembly, I rise in support of this bill. I think one of the most confusing things that we have out there in the lobbyists' group is the group from the state agencies with no identification. And certainly they're very persuasive and they seem

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

367
kod

to speak authoritatively. But we have no way of identification. We wear our badges and I think it only fitting that they do also.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. MANNIX: (142nd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. John Mannix.

REP. MANNIX: (142nd)

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, it's a very simple concept. We're really after good government. And I think this idea, which has been proposed before and defeated, now its time has come. Incidentally, one previous proposal on this matter was to log in state employees. Hundreds and hundreds of hours are spent in this building by state employees. And if it's needed, fine. But at least we ought to know about it so that we can identify the people who are working for the state who are being paid by the state.

It's a very simple concept. It doesn't hurt anybody. It may help. It may help to prevent some of the abuses and may help for better government. I think we all ought to

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

368
kod

support it.

REP. LAROSA: (3rd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Paul LaRosa.

REP. LAROSA: (3rd)

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The reason is that I can recall when the other side of the aisle had control of the administration and I can also recall the intensive lobbying by the agencies, the heads of departments, in assisting the different people on the other side of the aisle, working to promote the influence of the Governor's office at that particular time.

I think as the Chairman of a committee, I think it's important that we receive some definite input from the agencies who are affected and who are asked to implement the legislation that is passed by this House.

I think that this is one impediment of government that would be put in as far as inhibiting legislation and actually to implement the legislation that we pass on the floor of this House.

I think it's just another way of obstructing government and I think in all honesty that we should be permitted for

state agencies to help develop legislation that's going to do the job for most of the people of this state.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Dorothy Goodwin.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Please state your question, madam.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Would these badges be the same as the commercial lobby badges or would they be, let's say, red instead of blue?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays, will you respond?

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If the Ethics Commission asked my preference for color, I would probably prefer red over the other color.

In all seriousness, I would hope it would be a different

color than the one that they use for lobbyists.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Goodwin, you have the floor.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was hoping that you would say that. Another question. We often have people from state government who come on a very ad hoc basis at the request of their Commissioners to represent a particular field in which they are an expert. Does each one of these people have to have a badge in his or her own name, or can the Commissioner have a little reservoir of badges so that he can hand out so that at least you would know it was a government representative? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It would be employees of the Executive Branch and the Judiciary, which would therefore exclude the judges and Commissioners and Deputy Commissioners.

The intent of the amendment is to get at those, get at is the wrong term, to identify those employees who on a regular basis are before the General Assembly.

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

371
kod

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. What happens to the employee who comes maybe once in two or three years?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays, will you respond?

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Very candidly, I'm not sure. I'm not sure if the Ethics Commission that would tell them or make recommendations that they should register or not, frankly.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Would these regulations require, apply even in cases where we requested the presence of the state officials?

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think the answer is no.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Goodwin.

REP. GOODINW: (54th)

Would these regulations apply to a member of the state bureaucracy who chose to appear at a hearing on his own

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

372
kod

behalf?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If he was not speaking for the Department but was solely on his own, speaking only on his own, he would not have to register, no.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. What about obtaining of information of this sort by telephone which we do at great length and very frequently from members of the state bureaucracy. What difference is there, through you, Mr. Speaker, between addressing somebody on the telephone and having him wander the halls of the Capitol? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

If the individual was calling the legislators up on the phone for the purpose of lobbying for particular bills, I think it would make sense for them to register as a lobbyist.

If you merely call a state agency to get information, I would not consider that lobbying work.

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

373
kod

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It strikes me that a great deal of what these people do is kind of borderline between responding to our needs and lobbying for their Commissioners.

How would we enforce this in the case when somebody came over to testify on his own behalf and one of us asked him a question that reflected, the answer to which reflected the Commissioner's viewpoint?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, if the lady would kindly ask the question again. There was too much talking around here.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Goodwin, would you be so kind?

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I can envisage a circumstance where somebody comes over to testify let's say because I know it the best, before the Education Committee from the State Department of Education, on an issue that affects his own child, and appears at a hearing to testify on that basis. And in the course of his time in the Capitol, he is approached

let's say by me, and requested to answer a number of questions and he's not got his badge on. Do I call him on it.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Rep. Goodwin, I think you're stretching the interpretation a mite. I would, for the purposes of the record and maybe to help you understand it, read you exactly the language that this amendment has, the new language. It states, "Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, each employee of the Executive or Judicial Branches of state government, other than a public official, who engages in lobby before the General Assembly on behalf of his employing agency or department, shall while so engaged in lobbying, wear a distinguishing badge of the type required for lobbyists. Such employee shall also be required to register with the state Ethics Commission by providing said Commission with their name and address and the name of their employing agency or department. Such employees shall not be charged any fee for registering or for the issuance of a badge."

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Goodwin, you have the floor, madam.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Mr. Speaker, I'm troubled. What I see is a series of

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

375
kod

ambiguities. The assumption here is that the state bureaucracy lobbies us. I think it's at least as true that we request information of them, and that the line between those two is not easy to draw, and that the flow of information should be as free as it possibly can be.

I can envisage a system where a badge would simply say "State Department of Education" on it and the Commissioner would, anytime he wanted to send somebody over here to answer questions on any subject, would provide that person with one of these general blanket badges.

• To tie it down to the names of individuals I find extraordinarily cumbersome. It seems to me that you might easily run into a situation where you had to wait for a couple of days before somebody could come over to tell you something because they haven't gotten a badge yet.

It seems to me it's an unnecessary intrusion and if we don't go to something like a blanket badge, then it seems to me, and it seems to me that a blanket badge might easily do the trick. You want to be able to know whether this person represents a government agency or not. You want to be able to do it on sight. You don't really need to know the name of that person. You don't really need to have that name

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

376
kod

in the record in any way. And I think this is unnecessarily cumbersome and contrary to the reasons why we have these exchanges of information between us and the bureaucracy.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. STEEVES: (116th)

Mr. Speaker,

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Borden Steeves.

REP. STEEVES: (116th)

A question, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Please state your question, sir.

REP. STEEVES: (116th)

These lobbyists that you are referring to in this amendment, are they people who are actively on the payroll of the state?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays, will you respond?

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

377
kod

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

People who lobby before the General Assembly who are employees of the Executive Branch or the Judiciary Branch would be paid employees of the State of Connecticut. They are the liaison people from the various departments who lobby before the General Assembly.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

DEP Rep. Steeves.

• REP. STEEVES: (116th)

REP Through you again, Mr. Speaker, another question to him. They are are actively then being paid by the state or the taxpayers of the state while they are actively lobbying? Is that true then?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays, will you respond?

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. There's no question that they receive their paycheck from the State of Connecticut. And I have no criticism of their communication with us. I just want some identification.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Steeves, you have the floor.

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

378
kod

REP. STEEVES: (116th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. BARNES: (21st)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Dorothy Barnes.

REP. BARNES: (21st)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment. I think it would be a very constructive act if we were to require that various departments, lobbyists really, were to wear badges, although I would have no objection to someone wearing a badge that said nothing more than "Education" in red, green, yellow or purple, whatever. I don't think that I'm particularly interested in the name. But I think it is important that we know how many people are working for what cause, are over here how often.

One of the things that I found most interesting about serving for the first time on the Public Health Committee this session, was the fact that at almost every meeting, the

lobbyists outnumbered the Committee members at least by two to one. At every single Committee meeting there was a member from the Department of Health Services, there was a member from the Department of Mental Health, there was a member from the Department of Mental Retardation, and there was a member from the Hospital Cost Commission. Every one of these people attended every one of the meetings that we held.

On various occasions we had numerous members from the Department of Consumer Protection if we were dealing with drugs, and on and on.

But to say that the people who are dealing in administrative programs, who are dealing with the courts, and I think most of it saw it recently as far as the Judiciary goes, was several members of the Judiciary working very hard on a particular program over here, that there are significant numbers of people who do nothing with their time but work to provide information or to influence in whatever way they can the actions of the General Assembly.

I am not saying that I think anything they do is wrong. I only think that for the sake of simplification of our system it would be easier for us to know if someone just wore the name of the agency for which he was working or she was working

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

380
kod

on his or her lapel, what business that person was dealing with that day.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further?

REP. THORP: (89th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. David Thorp.

REP. THORP: (89th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of badges. As a newcomer here, of course I can echo the remarks of my other freshman --

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Excuse me, sir. Would the House please come to order.
Excuse me, Rep. Thorp, you have the floor, sir.

REP. THORP: (89th)

As a newcomer here, I will just simply echo the comments that have already been made concerning the difficulties that newcomers have in knowing who the players are without a program.

But I think that there are actually two classes of individuals here that have a real need to know. And this has to do with freedom of information. We have passed all sorts of laws about freedom of information so that the public in general

knows what's going on.

Now when the public comes up here to visit our hallowed halls, they have no idea who is who without some sort of identification. Many of us as legislators continue to wear our little legislator badges and we at least have the option of living out our convictions by wearing our badges. But the regular state employees who are specifically over here as lobbyists, and I have no idea how many there are because I have no idea who they are in general, I just am suspicious that there are quite a few of them.

I think it would help our operation a great deal to be able to assess the magnitude of this situation if they were properly identified.

And now as far as badges in general are concerned, for you information, I hold before you a badge. This is a Prayy & Whitney badge, part of the United Technologies. As long as I am at Pratt & Whitney, I wear this badge. The company rules say that it will be displayed prominently over your heart at all times. And you'd better believe that that's where my badge is at Pratt & Whitney, that's where Mr. Hoffmeyer's badge is down there at Sikorsky. That's where Mr. Belden's badge is, etc., etc. And Mr. Belden is just showing me his

Sikorsky badge.

Badges are as American as apple pie. There's another badge over there. Mr. Helfgott has got one, too.

Now if private industry can go for badges and finds them useful in identifying who is on the premises, and of course it's a federal law because we're in the defense contracting business at Pratt, but if private industry and the government on the federal level finds them vital to keeping track of who's who, I see really no difficulty, particularly in the case of publicly paid lobbyists, to simply know who they are.

I suppose an alternative would be to have an employee yearbook but there's so darned many of them here in the state that we'd never be able to practically keep track of them as we do with a little CBIA booklet.

So I would highly recommend that we go with the badges. Again, they're as American as apple pie. So let's go do it.

REP. GROPPA: (63rd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. John Groppo.

REP. GROPPA: (63rd)

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are inclined to

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

383
kod

get a little punchy as the session goes on. And if there's anything that's punchy, I think it's this bill. Or this amendment to this bill.

And all we've heard on this particular issue is good government and identification. I think Rep. LaRosa stated what it was like here back in '71 or so when we had a Republican governor. My word, they had staff that attended every public hearing, morning noon and night. They sat down in the well like little Boy Scouts. In fact all they were lacking was the uniform of a Boy Scout.

Now we have a proposal here to have identifications on, be they Commissioners or employees of Commissioners, whether it's red, blue or green. Why don't we make it a neon sign or something that will really stand out to show who these people are. I don't see why anybody should get upset if they're over here.

You know when I see someone hanging around these Halls to long, I call the Commissioner up and ask if he really needs that person on his staff or not. And that's the best way of getting them out of here. I think if you did that once in a while, it would be fine.

But I'm sure that we have an individual here from the Office of Motor Vehicles that we'd never hear the end of the

criticism if that individual could no longer service your needs. And I think that there are other individuals that are here doing their job, representing their agencies to the members of the Legislature. And I am sure that many of you call on them many, many times to do favors for your constituents or to solve a problem for your constituents.

And now what you're saying is, you want to identify him, you want to put a badge on him so that they can be distinguished among the rest of the lobbyists that are walking around these halls. Isn't it too bad that every time there's a problem we have to spend legislative time to put into the statutes that we're going to resolve that problem.

And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minority side, if they say they're coming back here on the Majority in a few years, they would be the first to repeal this law.

Mr. Speaker, we've been here since 1:00 o'clock. We haven't done too bad. We haven't done too well either. And we've discussed this to the point that I think all the comments have been made that have to be made. And I urge that we go on and get on something that's more important than whether we should have state employees that work for us as Representatives, work for our constituents, to do a job that they have to do,

House

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

385
kod

whether we want to have them dogtagged or not.

I move that we move on with the bill, Mr. Speaker.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I only rise because there was some distortion by those who would oppose this amendment. And if you're going to vote no, I sure want you to know why you're going to vote no and not on the wrong reasons.

I have absolutely no motivations to criticize any state employee for speaking before this General Assembly and lobbying for those issues that are of interest to them. And I would be the first to admit that if I'm an effective legislator at all it's because of the help that I get from those very employees.

So there is no attempt to identify them as bad people. It's an attempt to identify them so I know if they are in fact state employees and who they speak for. There are occasions when some state employees lobby beyond what they probably should, and I think that's the time that Majority Leader Groppo will call up that Commissioner. He has one

advantage over me. He's been here twenty years and he knows who they are. I don't happen to know who they are, so I don't have the right or the ability, for that matter, to call those commissioners up. But for the most part, I welcome this to be here.

I would like to clear up one other point as well. Rep. Walkovich talked about hundreds of state employees would have to register. He misled the fiscal note. The fiscal note said that it is probable that several hundred registrations could be handled by the ethics commission and the additional cost covered by the current budget. The costs would be about two to three dollars at the most per employee.

I don't think we have hundreds of employees who are liason with this Legislative body. If we did, I'd sure like to know about it because then I might object. But I remember as ranking member of the Appropriations Committee when Rep. Groppo was the Chairman, he and I talked about this very issue and I think it dealt with Triage when they were attempting to hold on to the Triage bill.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to call for a roll call because this is not a Republican or Democratic issue, but what I do attempt and hope for is support for an issue and a solution to what I see is somewhat of a problem.

REP. CASEY; (118th)

Mr. Speaker,

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

387
klr

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. T.J. Casey.

REP. CASEY: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief. I think the question comes down to access. When you talk about the public interest and you have to have a political lobbyist, he is stuck behind that door. He can't come into this Chamber during debate while the session is arguing and in the midst of a bill. He can't. But a public lobbyist can. A state employee can. I think this bill is a good bill. I think those are the people that once the issue finally becomes to be debated on this floor, I think those people should not have access to this Chamber.

If they want us, they can send a little message. They can send a messenger in, grab us, like our paid lobbyists can. I urge everyone to support this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. David Lavine

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Please state your question, sir.

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

388
klr

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

DEPUTY Mr. Speaker, I have two questions. First, I would like to find out whether Rep. Casey's interpretation of this amendment is the correct one. Does this mean that a public employee would no longer have access to the lobby which is outside? Is that your understanding?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays, will you respond?

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Actually, no, it isn't and I'm happy to clarify the point. All they would have to do is register as a lobbyist for the purposes of identification. It's the Chamber decided that they did not want state employees to be in this Hall of the House, they would do that by their own rules.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Lavine, you have the floor, sir.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

It's my understanding that the ethics commission was going to make the determination as to what constituted and how the public lobbyists were to be treated, but I would like to ask a second question. And that is, would a commissioner or a deputy commissioner who came over to testify or a member of a board or

commission who came to testify have to be badged?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, he would not because the amendment says, other than a public official and a public official is defined -- a commissioner is defined as a public official as is a judge and a deputy commissioner and so on.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Lavine, you have the floor, sir.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Would a member of the Arts Commission be a public official?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays, will you respond?

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I believe, yes.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Lavine, you have the floor.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Just to conclude. I'm not sure the answer is yes, but certainly we have heard two interpretations of this from the other side, one that this bill should be passed to keep public employees who lobby out of this Chamber, and the other one, that

they would have access to this Chamber is we so desired. I think we -- this sort of an amendment needs some scrutiny and I think that what we've had are several interpretations of what this is about, and I don't think that we should be voting on this amendment without clear understanding of what it does or does not do to the people who many of us utilize for information.

I think that whatever the merit of this, there is certainly a lack of clarity and precision in this amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A"? Will you remark further on its adoption? If not, all those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

All those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Nay.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a roll call vote, please.

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

391
klr

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

In the opinion of the Chair, the requisite twenty percent has been met and a roll call will be ordered at this time. Staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members please take their seats. All staff and guests to the well of the House, please. The machine will be opened.

The House of Representatives is now voting by roll. Would the members please return to the Chamber. There is a roll call vote in progress in the Hall of the House. Would the members please return to the Chamber immediately.

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted and is your vote properly cast? If so, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

Would the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" to Senate Bill No. 545,

Total number voting	145
Necessary for Passage	73
Those voting Yea	69
Those voting Nay	76
Those absent and not Voting	6

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The amendment fails.

House Amendment Schedule "A"

After line 307, insert section 7 as follows and renumber the remaining section accordingly:

"Sec. 7. Section 1-101 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(a) Each individual who is a lobbyist, shall, while engaged in lobbying wear a distinguishing badge which shall identify him as a lobbyist. The size, color, material and other requirements of such badge shall be prescribed by regulation of the commission.

(b) NOTWITHSTANDING ANY OTHER PROVISION OF THIS PART, EACH EMPLOYEE OF THE EXECUTIVE OR JUDICIAL BRANCHES OF STATE GOVERNMENT, OTHER THAN A PUBLIC OFFICIAL, WHO ENGAGES IN LOBBYING BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON BEHALF OF HIS EMPLOYING AGENCY OR DEPARTMENT, SHALL WHILE SO ENGAGED IN LOBBYING, WEAR A DISTINGUISHING BADGE OF THE TYPE REQUIRED FOR LOBBYISTS. SUCH EMPLOYEES SHALL ALSO BE REQUIRED TO REGISTER WITH THE STATE ETHICS COMMISSION BY PROVIDING SAID COMMISSION WITH THEIR NAME AND ADDRESS AND THE NAME OF THEIR EMPLOYING AGENCY OR DEPARTMENT. SUCH EMPLOYEES SHALL NOT BE CHARGED ANY FEE FOR REGISTERING OR FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A BADGE."

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further on this bill? If not, would the staff and guests please come to the well of the House. The members please take their seats. The machine will be opened.

The House of Representatives is now voting by roll. Would the members please return to the Chamber. There is a roll call vote in progress in the Hall of the House. Would the members return

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1981

393
klr

to the Chamber immediately?

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted and is your vote properly recorded? If so, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

REP. KINER: (59th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Kiner.

REP. KINER: (59th)

Mr. Speaker, in the affirmative, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Would the Clerk please note that Rep. Kiner casts his vote in the affirmative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Would the Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 545.

Total number voting	145
---------------------	-----

Necessary for Passage	73
-----------------------	----

Those voting Yea	145
------------------	-----

Those voting Nay	0
------------------	---

Those absent and not Voting	6
-----------------------------	---

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Calendar page 2, Calendar No. 472. Substitute for House Bill No. 7266, AN ACT CONCERNING STATE PAYMENTS TO NEWINGTON CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL. Favorable report of the Committee on Appropriations.

REP. GIONFRIDDO: (33rd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Gionfriddo.

REP. GIONFRIDDO: (33rd)

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of this bill. Will you remark, sir?

REP. GIONFRIDDO: (33rd)

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Chamber recall that this bill was before us earlier in the day and was passed temporarily. At this point, I would yield to Rep. Gilligan for further explanation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Gilligan, do you accept the yield, sir?

REP. GILLIGAN; (28th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I do. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen

S-177

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1981

VOL. 24

PART 9

2762-3066

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

36
LFU

SENATOR OWENS:

Yes, Mr. President. This Bill originated in the Committee on the Environment so I'd be happy to bring it out, but Senator Skowronski is not here. May I ask, through you, Senator Schneller, whether or not it is the intention to bring that one out at this time?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Curry.

SENATOR CURRY:

Mr. President, having spoken with Senator Skowronski, I did note that he wants that item passed temporarily.

THE CHAIR:

It may be passed temporarily. Senator Schneller.

SENATOR SCHNELLER:

I believe Senator Baker has returned to the chamber if we could possibly go back to Calendar 356.

THE CLERK:

On page four of the Calendar, the bottom item, Calendar 356, an item that was passed temporarily and now a go, File 515, Substitute for Senate Bill 545, AN ACT CONCERNING

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

37
LFU

REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR LOBBYISTS, with a Favorable Report of the Committee on Government Administration and Elections and the Clerk has an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Baker.

SENATOR BAKER:

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

THE CHAIR:

Clerk will please call the Amendment.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has Senate Amendment, Schedule A, LCO 7004, offered by Senator Leonhardt. Copies have been distributed.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Leonhardt.

SENATOR LEONHARDT:

Mr. President, I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Do you wish to waive the reading also? Without objection, you may proceed.

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

38
LFU

SENATOR LEONHARDT:

I'd be delighted to waive the reading. Thank you, Mr. President. This Amendment would require a two year cooling off period, a decent interval, if you will Mr. President, before legislators go through the revolving door; that they go through the revolving door of being a legislator, acting in the public interest, to being a lobbyist who promotes a private interest.

I think that all of us know that lobbyists do provide valuable information to the State Legislature and I'd like to say at the outset of the debate on this Amendment that I am not myself personally aware of any improper methods or strong arm tactics or excessive pressure that has been used at the capitol this year. To the best of my knowledge, lobbyists have operated within the law in lobbying on some of the Bills that we have taken up this year.

However, this Amendment is aimed at a condition, I think a very negative condition, a condition that we have allowed to exist. The general condition of allowing former legislators

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

39
LFU

to immediately lobby former colleagues is one that is called into question the credibility of the General Assembly as an institution of whether we consider this weakening of our credibility to be fair or not or whether we like it or not, but based on the letters and telephone calls that I have received, I believe that this is a situation which exists.

This Amendment is not offered simply to respond to a matter of appearance or public perception alone. In adopting this Amendment today, we would be responding to three specific and concrete problems that cry out for correction. The first reason we should adopt this Amendment today is to guard against possible effects on the judgment of legislators during the end of the period that they're a legislator; during the end of their legislative service. If someone is looking toward the possibility of lobbying for a given interest, it might be possible, there would be a potential for them to have in mind that factor, as they

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

40
LFU

voted on Bills that affected that interest. Secondly, during the initial period of lobbying, a legislator lobbyist still really has the aura, I think, Mr. President, of a legislator and he would have--he or she has in my judgment, an unhealthy use of the governmental mantel. I think many of us feel very strongly about the friendships that we form in this Circle; the strong and positive feelings that we feel toward our colleagues and in many respects, we do have a sort of a club here of elected officials and we accord each other certain courtesies and we have special shared experiences and I think that if someone comes back to the legislature immediately, based on that kind of feeling, they have the opportunity for excessive advantage in the legislative process, based on their friendships.

Third, Mr. President, I think with the present law, allowing as it does former legislators to come back immediately as lobbyists, we allow governmental service to be used for immediate subsequent financial, private financial gain. I think this undermines the dignity of public service. The idea that people serve in the General Assembly so that

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

41
LFU

they can go out and immediately reap large private financial gain based on the value of what they learned and what they knew, based on their governmental experience I think is a very negative one.

I point out to the members of the Circle that this Amendment is limited to only lobbying of legislative action. It does not limit the ability of former legislators to lobby administrative action. I think in that category, the lobbying of administrative action is too indirect, too attenuating to apply a prohibition so this does not extend to that.

Neighboring States, such as New York and Rhode Island have taken this step as well as Pennsylvania and Florida. We here in the State of Connecticut, have taken this step, banning public officials from working for an interest that they regulate. In 1979, with the Gaming Policy Board, in 1980 with the DPUC so I think in 1981, it is time for us to take the step of applying these same rules that we have applied to others, to ourselves. We, who are after all, the most important policy making body of the State of Connecticut,

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

42
LFU

If we can apply these rules to executive agencies that only exercise authority that we delegate them, we should surely apply these rules to ourselves.

I think that this is really a very limited step towards freeing the legislative process from excessive influence by special interests. Public financing would be far more important, but we have to begin where we can, Mr. President, and I urge the members of the Circle to begin today with this important step.

THE CHAIR: (The President Pro Tempore in the Chair.)

Will you remark further? Senator Owens.

SENATOR OWENS:

Yes Mr. President. I rise to oppose the Amendment. I really want to say at the outset I know that Senator Leonhardt has given a long--has spent a lot of time working on this and that his motivations are the best and I know that he sincerely believes what he's asking the Circle to do here this afternoon. However, he draws an analogy between various other agencies and that we require the PUCA not to allow those who have served on the commission to come

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

43
LFU

before the Commission representing people or in some other capacity and restricting their appearance before the Commission, whether it be one year or two years. He also talks about the PUCA and how there are restrictions placed on those that were commissioners and those who come before the Commission at a subsequent date, either to represent or to plead a cause or to lobby or whatever it may be, any type of appearance and I think that those situations are easily distinguishable and laudatory from what he's asking us to do here this afternoon.

In each of the instances where the Federal government, whether it's Congress or whether they are any state legislatures, have restricted the appearance and the right to appear before an agency or the right to appear before a legislative body or anything of that sort it is usually because of the narrowness of the subject matter. When we're talking about the PUCA, we're talking about a very narrow field and it makes a lot of sense that if someone is setting rates with respect to various industries with respect to utilities, that that same person should not come six months

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

44
LFU

from then and appear either opposed to that type of action that the Committee had taken or in support of that type of action. Obviously we're talking about conflict of interest in those situations and that's what we try to avoid. We try to avoid either the actual conflict of interest or whether there be even an appearance of impropriety.

I'm not so sure what Senator Leonhardt is saying today about the concept of friends and so forth and I think that everyone who has been approached by a lobbyist and many of our former members of the Circle who come as lobbyists have appeared and come and asked us--I think the only benefit that they probably get is that if we see them, we would probably acknowledge their presence because we know who they are and someone who is just coming out of the cold, you wouldn't know, but after the introductions are made, I'm sure that they would try to get the same results.

I'd also point out that most of the issues that we're talking about in response to--and a lot of this is response to media and as Senator Leonhardt says, there's been a lot of people who have been communicated with this type of thing,

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

45
LFU

all of this, it seems to me, has been on issues that were certainly in the media for a long time. They were very controversial measures and they still are controversial measures and they're still going to be lobbied for a long period of time. But don't forget, there are also issues that require a lobbyist's expertise. This is something that hasn't been in the media and I'm sure that I would be remiss--I'd be misrepresenting if I didn't say that every Bill that I've ever seen that came through the legislature that I've analyzed or I know what's in the parcel and what's in each Amendment so sometimes we can have help from the lobbyists to explain these because they do have this technical expertise.

I for one, am going to oppose the Amendment. I feel that there's--I know where Senator Leonhardt is coming from on this. I know he's serious about this and he's sincere about it, but I do say that to draw an analogy between what other agencies have done and what other congressional bodies or whatever legislative bodies have done on imposing sanctions, restrictions on the type of appearances before various agencies

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

46
LFU

it is always being done because of the possible conflict of interest and also because it could create an appearance of impropriety and I think that to paint a brush and say that a former legislator can't come back for a period of two years and lobby here does a disservice to this body as well. Thank you Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Beck.

SENATOR BECK:

Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the Amendment, I have been contacted by no constituents on this issue and in fact I think that many people still remain unaware of the enormous power which an effective lobbyist can wield. I feel very strongly that the power of lawmaking is one in which many things interact, your knowledge, your perceptions, even the flow of time and I think to me the powers that a lobbyist can wield who have been in the General Assembly and come back immediately thereupon to his colleagues is very importantly a matter of time and time is one of the most

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

47
LFU

precious aspects in protecting the public interest. So I think that any former legislator who comes back to the General Assembly immediately after his term is inherently starting with a tremendous edge on any other citizen in the State of Connecticut.

Secondly, there is no question that there is a tremendous knowledge of the internal workings of the General Assembly, of even the way legislators think and act and behave and with the kinds of turnovers that we have in the General Assembly, given a period of two years or more, this kind of knowledge tends to diminish in its immediacy and even in its ability to catch the ear of staff who are sometimes even more important than the legislators themselves.

Finally Mr. President, I feel very strongly that so long as a citizen is aware of the fact that when he is elected or she is elected to public office, he understands the terms of that election and that responsibility, that by our imposing that upon any legislator in terms of future activities we not only protect ourselves, but just as importantly, we

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

48
LFU

protect her or him and I think we do this office no good by permitting ourselves to have this enormous power and turn around and wield it for private interests, sometimes very limited interests and I think that this is a misuse of the former role of a legislator.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on Senate Amendment, Schedule A? Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Mr. President, I stand in opposition to the Amendment. Mr. President, I, in my eleven years in the legislature, as Senator Beck pointed out, have not received one letter or one telephone call indicating to me that we should restrict ex-legislators from lobbying. Mr. President, I feel that a legislator goes before his constituency once every two years, to be elected. He goes before it because he feels he can come to the capitol and do whatever good he may be able to do for his constituency and for the people of the State of Connecticut through his votes. He doesn't

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

49
LFU

get a lot of money in the process. He takes a tremendous amount of abuse. He learns the process. He works hard at it. At least every legislator I've ever been familiar with and worked with worked very hard to learn the process. He gives up an awful lot of his time and then, at the end of this time, this Amendment would say to him, you've picked up some expertise in the field and if you happen to chose that you want to work for some industry, whether it be insurance, banks or whatever industry it is, because you choose to do that, we in this legislature, today, are going to refuse you that opportunity.

Number one, Mr. President, I don't think we have that right to refuse anybody his right to work. We have committee clerks, researchers, legislative commissioners office, fiscal analysis, many of these people go on to other industries and use the expertise they have learned here.

Mr. President, this particular Amendment, as I pointed out the other day every time we bring one of these forward, this particular Amendment for me to vote yes on it, would

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

50
LFU

be me saying again as I said the other day, in some way, shape or form, I'm going to be dishonest so therefore I need laws to guide me. I'm saying that if one of my fellow legislators go out and becomes a lobbyist, I won't be able to say no to him so therefore you better pass a law to protect me against them.

Our camaraderie was pointed out Mr. President. We have camaraderie and we suffer many, many causes together in the caucus room and on this floor and there's usually a divergence of vote, whether it's along party line or whether it's along issues. Our friendship amongst each other does not cause us to go with one or the other on a particular issue. We look at it. We listen to what lobbyists have told us about the issue, at least I think we all examine it very carefully and we vote, according to what we think is going to be the best for our constituents and for the State of Connecticut.

And Mr. President, for us to be suffering under the delusion that by us passing laws to protect us and protect us and protect us from committing wrongs, is just what it

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

51
LFU

is, it's a delusion because, Mr. President, if we're going to do wrong, no law is going to stop us from doing wrong and Mr. President, in all my time in the Capitol, I have been not overly pressured by any lobbyist group. So Mr. President, I don't feel that we should single out people who have gone through the election process and gone through years in this legislature and single them out and say now that you've left us, we've got to be protected against you, so you can't come up here until we think you've lost all your old friends and in two years, you've lost them all so now you can come up and pressure us. That's assanine and so Mr. President, I am going to vote against this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator O'Leary.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Mr. President, I too rise to oppose this Amendment. This Amendment is easily placed in the guise of a good government piece of legislation and I think that I supported,

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

52
LFU

on many occasions, legislation which I would characterize as good government legislation but not this one. We're told that some ex-legislators who may be out in those halls today, have an undue influence on this body because we once knew them. Nevermind the fact that when they sat in these chambers oftentimes they couldn't get a Bill passed. Now their power must be greatly magnified because they're up here as lobbyists and I just took today, in the past hour, and opened the envelopes that were placed on my desk from lobbyists and those three or four ex-legislators are the ones who are supposed to be having a tremendously undue influence upon us and yet here on my desk is material all directly related to Bills, lobbying us today from the University of Connecticut Law School, from the Secretary of State, from United Technologies Corporation, from the Commission of the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority, from the Executive Director of the Commission on the Status of Women, from the American Institute of Architects, the Connecticut Conference of

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

53
LFU

Municipalities, the Connecticut Coalition on Aging, the Connecticut Right to Life Corporation, the Connecticut Education Association; that's been placed on my desk in the last hour. They're all out in those halls as well. They've been out there a lot longer than I've been in this General Assembly. They know the process every bit as well as any ex-legislator knows the process.

Mr. President, I would put to any member of the Senate if you were a group of citizens, not organized on a permanent basis, and you wanted to oppose this letter from United Technologies Corporation or you wanted to oppose a particular issue that the Law School of the University of Connecticut was endorsing, how would you go about doing it? Would you not want to be able to hire or to find the strongest or the most articulate advocate for your particular position? If you have a child in need of some special education treatment, and that Bill is being opposed by the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council, which has been in these halls a lot longer than special education has been on the books, would

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

54
LFU

you not want to perhaps hire an ex-legislator who knew something about education laws to give your child a hand? I think that I've just raised enough issues here to cloud the purpose of this Bill. And when a Bill is in as much doubt as this Bill, and it seeks to deprive us of a First Amendment right, I think we must vote no.

I only vote to remove First Amendment rights from people, the right to petition their government for a redress of grievance when I am absolutely convinced that that's got to be done. I have no problem with prohibiting somebody from yelling fire in a crowded movie theater. That deprives them of a right. I have no problem with that. But to deprive them of the First Amendment right in an issue such as this I think is wrong. This is a big country. This is a pretty good sized state. There's a lot of hurly burly, rough and tumble out there and I think that in the end, when these forces clash, maybe out of it all, we get a little bit of truth and I don't want to exclude any branch or any group in that fight from having their voice heard and I oppose this legislation.

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

55
LFU

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, the Clerk will make the appropriate announcement of a Roll Call.

THE CLERK:

An immediate Roll Call has been called for in the Senate. Will all Senators please take their seats. An immediate Roll Call has been called for in the Senate. Will all Senators please be seated.

THE CHAIR:

The issue before us is Senate Amendment, Schedule A, to Senate Bill 545. The machine is open. The machine will be closed and locked.

TOTAL VOTING	36
NECESSARY FOR PASSAGE	19
THOSE VOTING YEA	10
THOSE VOTING NAY	26

The Amendment is defeated.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk is in possession of Senate Amendment, Schedule B, Senate Amendment, Schedule B, LCO 6819, offered by

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

56
LFU

Senator Leonhardt. That's LCO 6819. Copies have been distributed.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Leonhardt.

SENATOR LEONHARDT:

Thank you Mr. President. Several members of the Circle indicated to me that they would look with greater favor on a one year restriction than a two year restriction and that's the reason I have this Amendment prepared, but in view of the vote that we just had, I'd like to request that this Amendment be withdrawn.

THE CHAIR:

The Amendment has been withdrawn by its sponsor. Does the Clerk have any further Amendments?

THE CLERK:

No further Amendments, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Baker.

SENATOR BAKER:

Mr. President, the Bill itself comes to us from--as a

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

57
LFU

proposal from the Ethics Commission. It would raise the threshold requirement from which a lobbyist has to register from \$300.00 to \$500.00 the amount that he can receive or spend. As I said, the previous threshold was \$300.00 set up in '78.

In addition, it would also raise from \$25.00 to \$35.00 the minimum advertising cost counted towards this registration threshold from 25 to 35, the minimum cost of one or more solicitations of other people to be lobbied to be counted towards this threshold; from 25 to 35 the minimum expended on behalf of a public official, staff member of immediate family which must be reported to the State Ethics Commission for which verification must be preserved for three years and also the maximum value of gifts that anyone acting on his behalf may give to a State employee, public official, candidate, staff member or member of an immediate family and would raise from less than \$25.00 to less than \$35.00 the maximum value of food, beverage on a single occasion that would be exempted from the definition of a gift. As I said,

1981 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

THURSDAY
MAY 7, 1981

58
LFU

this Bill came to us from the Ethics Commission and it's justification is based on the inflation factor. If there is no objection, I would move this to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Any objection to placing the matter on Consent? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Moving to page five of the Calendar, page five, Calendar 377, File 574, Senate Bill 1302, AN ACT CONCERNING RAISING THE BONDING LIMIT OF CONNECTICUT RESOURCES RECOVERY AUTHORITY with a Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Beck.

SENATOR BECK:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and favorable action on the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark Senator?

SENATOR BECK:

Mr. President, this is a very important piece of legislation.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATIONS
& ELECTIONS

PART 1

1-343

1981

INDEX

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. 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

332

STATEMENT BY
ANITA L. LOALBO, ATTORNEY
CONNECTICUT BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION
BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1981
7:00 P.M., DANBURY CITY HALL

Good evening. I am Anita Loalbo, staff attorney for the Connecticut Business and Industry Association (CBIA). CBIA represents approximately 3,300 firms which employ well over 600,000 men and women in Connecticut. Our membership ranges from small businesses to large commercial and industrial corporations.

CBIA would encourage support of Proposed Bill No. 545-
An Act Concerning Registration Requirements for Lobbyists.
This bill proposes amendments in the general statutes that would raise the income-expenditure threshold for registration as a lobbyist from three hundred to five hundred dollars annually. Our Association believes that changes made in the statutes should affect all provisions dealing with specific dollar amounts as they concern lobbyists in light of current inflation.

For this reason CBIA would urge support of S.B. 545.

Thank you for your time.