

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB5489	<PA82-68>	<u>1982</u>
General Law	10-12, 21-24, 28, 57-60	12
Senate	840-884	45
House	747-849, 1938-1982	148

**LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY**

205 p.

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

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2012

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GENERAL
LAW
PART 1
1-216**

**1982
INDEX**

10
gat

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE

February 26, 1982

REP. CAPPELLETTI: (continued)

Now I know there are many arguments; I realize the arguments for driving across the border is a very valid argument but I still say that when Massachusetts raised its drinking age, the legislators there did something that they felt was good for Massachusetts and I think that's the attitude that we have to take.

Also, I have heard many arguments saying that with the age of majority a youngster can go into the service at 18, then why not have them be able to buy a drink. Well, I would offer to this Committee that that argument to me is illogical. If we can take youngsters at 18 years of age who are at the height of their physical prowess and teach them skills and teach them to hone their reflexes so that they can better defend themselves and defend the country, what makes it -- how does it follow that we can provide the access to alcohol which is, in spite of what most people believe -- most people believe that it is a stimulant; it is not, it is a central nervous system depressant and by being a central nervous system depressant, it dulls the reflexes and it also removes inhibitions; inhibitions that people put voluntarily on their own action so that they can -- their actions can conform to what we expect in a well functioning society.

Therefore, as a -- I would like you to look at this legislation and I hope everyone would look at it as not an infringement of 18 year old rights, but rather as the protection for their lives.

I thank you.

REP. CARRAGHER: Thank you Representative Cappelletti. Are there any questions? Thank you Representative. Glenn Duhl, speaking for Representative David Lavine.

MR. GLENN DUHL: Senator Mustone, Representative Carragher and Members of the General Law Committee, my name is Glenn Duhl. I'm Representative David Lavine's Legislative Intern and I'm here to speak for him concerning House Bill 5489, An Act Concerning Raising the Drinking Age to Twenty.

Representative Lavine has long supported Bills favoring an increase in the minimum age of purchase and consumption of

11
gat

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE

February 26, 1982

MR. DUHL: (continued)

alcoholic beverages in the State of Connecticut. Representative asks all those who oppose this Bill to spend a Friday or Saturday night at a hospital emergency room. Here that person will be able to see all the young people who are brought in. It is inexperience with alcohol and an inability to drink and drive that is the cause of the carnage that an opponent to this measure will exert.

Let me recall the number of alcohol related accidents which I have personally known victims. In high school there were few weekends without some type of alcohol related traffic accident. How about graduation? One graduating senior decapitated and numerous others severely injured. The list is endless. What worries me and must surely worry others is the fact that those youths who have had one too many and they're not merely endangering themselves, but you and me, every one of us.

Personally, I would rather not be known in the books as a statistic and further hearing deciding whether the age of majority should be raised. I believe, as does Representative Lavine, that the time for passage of such a Bill is known. Data from recent studies has shown that raising the legal age from 18 to 20 has led to a significant decrease in alcohol related traffic accidents.

I shall summarize, rather than reiterate, the facts which Senator Smith previously gave in her testimony. Research from both the University of Michigan and the University of Maine shows that following an increase in the age of majority in their respective States, there was a marked decrease in alcohol related accidents and, in particular, deaths associated with teenage alcohol usage. The University of Michigan's Highway Safety Research Institute has found out in the twelve months following the age hike in Michigan in 1978, non-injurious road accidents involving drivers aged 18 to 20, declined by 17 percent. Dr. Alexander Ragenau, the prominent researcher at the Institute, has also noticed that the accident resulting in death or injury decreased by 28 percent among 18 to 20 year olds in the State and single car crashes by males in the Bedford age group declined by 23 percent.

12
gat

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE

February 26, 1982

MR. DUHL: (continued)

The University of Maine showed similar conclusive statistics. A drop of nearly 17 percent in non-injurious crashes and a drop of 21.5 percent in single vehicle nighttime crashes. It is very risky to drive in this State. Citing an array of statistics, currently up to ten percent of the people driving on the roads on weekend evenings are legally impaired by alcohol. Would you want your children, let alone yourself, traveling with such terror loose on the highways?

We cannot sit back and disillusion ourselves by saying that something is being done. That's very misleading and often a cop-out. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety in Washington, D. C. expects on an average a 28 percent reduction in nighttime fatal crash involvement for young drivers in each and every State where the minimum age is raised. Should not Connecticut be one of these?

I thank you for your time and I will be happy to answer any questions the Committee may have in regards to this testimony.

REP. CARRAGHER: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? Thank you. Paula-Ray June.

(HB 5489)

MS. PAULA-RAY JUNE: Thank you. I'd like to introduce myself. I am the new coordinator for the Town of Guilford. First I would like to address Representatives Sorensen and Atkin. Working on a daily basis with teenagers between the ages of 18 -- 11 and 18 and to Senator -- Representative Atkin, being a native resident of Norwalk, and living there until I was 26, I choose to disagree very strongly with both of your statements.

I do believe that, and from what I see on a regular basis, that if the rules were changed, that alcohol wasn't as available to the young people, that it would make a difference on a high school level. Simply because it's not as available. The liquor store -- they could not walk five miles from the school to the nearest liquor store and keep it in their lockers. That's a given fact.

Number two, Norwalk, I think that there is a problem there because New York does have a lower drinking age. Guaranteed you all might have gone to the same bars in Port Chester

21
gat

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE

February 26, 1982

MR. MIERZWINSKI: (continued)

advocacy organization that provides students with opportunities to investigate consumer, environmental and social problems. I'm here today to oppose raised Committee Bill 5489 which would raise the drinking age to twenty.

For the last four legislative sessions, my organization has opposed such proposals. I want to assure you that our opposition is not based on the simple premise that because raising the drinking age would remove a right or perhaps even a privilege of our constituency that it should be opposed.

Problems of teen alcohol abuse and concomitant motor vehicle fatalities are too serious to base policy positions on such self interest motives. We continue to oppose this Bill because we do not believe that raising the drinking age will solve the problems of teen drinking and motor vehicle fatalities allegedly caused by lowering the drinking age.

In our four years of testimony we have yet to see anyone that testifies before this Committee provide it with primary source data basis from Connecticut demonstrating that raising the drinking age will solve the problems that it is supposed to. I do not doubt that raising the drinking age might lower youthful motor vehicle fatalities in Connecticut. Data I have examined from Michigan suggests that raising the drinking age has had some statistic measurable effect. However, raising the drinking age will likely cause deaths too. I have no crystal ball so I cannot say how many young people will head to Port Chester or Brewster but I'm willing to bet that (1) New York won't raise its drinking age; and (2) The costs of an 18/20 New York border will outweigh the benefits of lower fatalities in Connecticut.

Connecticut young people will still be involved in crashes, only our statistics will look good because they died in New York. While I haven't carried out an analysis of population, I am sure that the exposure on the New York border is greater than the combined Massachusetts and Rhode Island exposure. So, I'm opposed to raising the drinking age because I think that decreases in local fatalities will be outweighed by increases in intra-State crashes.

Data from Michigan are not comparable to date from Connecticut, not only because of this border with New York but also

MR. MIERZWINSKI: (continued)

because every police department and every health department has its own data base with its own descriptive variables, both dependent and independent, and I would not try to draw conclusions based on a comparison of apples and oranges.

I have a second major reason for opposing this increase and I've looked and I've never been shown testimony or data from alcoholic abuse professionals, supporting an increase in the drinking age. I would ask this Committee, instead of raising the drinking age, to consider a friendly amendment to this legislation. It is friendly because I believe it has great potential for addressing this broad problem you are taking a pot-shot at. However, I feel it is perhaps unfriendly because it will cost money. I urge, however, that you consider it. Amend the proposal, in order to establish a research team in the CADAC, Connecticut Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council, which would evaluate the problems of teen drinking and alcohol motor vehicle fatalities, in order to propose a broad-based action plan to approach the problem.

Give this team money and resources sufficient to carry out primary source research. I'm not talking about a literature review of what's being done by people in Michigan. I'm talking about doing that work in Connecticut, going out and interviewing alcohol professionals, going out and interviewing school systems. Some of the points that I think you could cover would be a performance audit of alcohol education programs in the schools evaluating compliance with CTS 1019. An evaluation of all policy measures to curb teen auto fatalities including a study of other options that may have more impact than raising the drinking age. Raise the driving age is one proposal that should be looked at. Another is to establish provisional licenses, such as they have in New York, where people under eighteen cannot drive at night. People under eighteen have the least driving experience. They also have a great deal of driving exposure.

In addition, there is one study done in Connecticut that suggests that elimination of driver education cuts down the number of young drivers, therefore, cutting down fatalities. There are a number of different ways that you can look at the problem.

MR. MIERZWINSKI: (continued)

In addition I believe that you should develop a broad-based multi-media program that addresses the alcohol abuse problem that this entire State has, not only its teenagers.

I would be happy to offer the Committee more suggestions as to the study's scope. Because I've not been convinced that raising the drinking age will do all that it is supposed to do and, because its bad effects may outweigh the good, I am convinced that such a report will be worthwhile.

Charge the group with a strong mandate to report back to you in December, so broad-based legislative proposals can be devised for next year. I assure you that no State agency has done such work and that it would take time and money to do it right. Perhaps that study will recommend raising the drinking age; but if it does, it will be a recommendation based on a serious evaluation of numerous other policy factors.

As a secondary, but important, issue, I must add that an additional echo of raising the drinking age would be I think the attenuation of any interest on this legislature's behalf and really going after the alcohol abuse problem. You will have raised the drinking age but you will have failed to solve the entire problem of teen alcohol abuse. People will assume you will have solved the problem and no further steps will be taken. Everyone will think you have taken those steps, unfortunately and, to me, that's the real problem that raising the drinking age would mask the rest of the problem.

For four years I've urged the development of a broad-base program to curb alcohol abuses. Instead I've seen endless debate on the drinking age which is a part of the problem but, in no sense, all of it. I urge you to face the fact that Connecticut teenagers and adults have an alcohol abuse problem. Why not make a constructive attack on that problem, rather than taking potshots at it.

I have one additional comment. I had a number of pieces of literature here, as well, which I would make available to the Committee. I think it's largely very similar to what everyone else has, although there is data that contradicts

24
gat

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE

February 26, 1982

MR. MIERZWINSKI: (continued)

some of the work done in Michigan. I also have a study from the Michigan Department of Public Health which states that their position is that the drinking age is not the crucial issue. When Michigan raised their drinking age they had recommended that it stay at nineteen although the public referendum did vote it up to 21.

Thank you.

SENATOR AMELIA MUSTONE: I -- as co-chairman of this Committee, I would request that there be no applauding nor any criticism aired at any of the testifiers and I thank you for your cooperation. Are there any questions for this gentleman? Representative Sorensen.

REP. SORENSEN: Not so much a question but I don't know if you're aware of the study and recommendation of the Task Force on Youthful Drinking of the Connecticut Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council. They did conduct what I consider to be quite an extensive study and did offer several recommendations, and their major recommendation was, and I'm quoting right from the report, that the recommendation on drinking age, the legal drinking age should remain at eighteen in Connecticut and then they went further on down the line and cited specifics for educational programs, including media campaigns, alcohol information and drug education in school driver ed., driver home training and so forth. So, we have done studies by a State agency and a subcommittee or task force of that State agency has recommended, to the State of Connecticut, that they feel, in their opinion, with the research that they have done that the drinking age in Connecticut should remain at eighteen. So, the study has been done.

MR. MIERZWINSKI: I should clarify. I do have a copy of that study and I guess what I'm implying is that it would be necessary to do a study that recommends policy proposals that includes implementation of those proposals and includes recommendations that the Legislature invest some funds in order to make sure it's not just a paper proposal. I have copies for the Committee.

SEN. MUSTONE: The next person to testify is Elva Vocatura.

28
gat

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE

February 26, 1982

MS. VOCATURA: (continued)

when alcohol is not available. Aside from inescapable social ramifications that I previously stated, are we not unjustly depriving a small segment of our adult population of basic rights. If the age were raised, would we not in effect be making eighteen and nineteen year olds second-class citizens, free to enjoy all the other responsibilities and the rights of our State's adult citizenry except the right to drink. The vast majority of young adults uses alcohol maturely. Should they be penalized for the small percentage who don't.

Should these same responsible young adults be penalized in an attempt to keep alcohol out of high schools? I do not believe we can legislate morality or proper social behavior. And, for all the reasons I mentioned, I urge this Committee to keep the drinking age at 18.

Thank you.

SEN. MUSTONE: Are there any questions. Thank you. Having joined us since the beginning of the hearing, I believe, is Representative Benvenuto and Representative Walter Joyner. The next person is Al Antoch.

MR. AL ANTOCH: Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. My name is Alvin Antoch. I'm a member of the Board of Directors of the Connecticut Cafe and Liquor Council. I would like to voice my opposition to Bill 5489. I've owned and operated a cafe for approximately twenty years and I have been dealing with you, so to speak, eighteen, nineteen and twenty year olds for the past five or six years, whatever it's been since they changed the law and I don't see any real problem at all. They are well behaved, they're well mannered, they maintain themselves and they conduct themselves in an orderly manner in my establishment. I think it would be wrong to up the age. I have more problems with 21 to 30 year old age group than I do with the younger crowd.

I'm on the Connecticut/Rhode Island border and I have a lot of kids who come across the line, which we're saying we're going to drive them to New York if we do that and I have to agree with you, I think we will.

I don't know -- everything I had written down everybody has already said so I'm going to make it brief and I thank you very much.

57
gat

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE

February 26, 1982

MR. ATKIN: I haven't read the thing fully but the Dram Shop Act greatly probably effects the on-premise consumption rather than off because usually if someone was coming into a liquor store and they were drunk you wouldn't serve them. But, on the -- you know, on-premise, one, two drinks you might be okay but the third and fourth you could go over the rack.

And I might want to say that a great many of the alcoholics in the country today are not between the ages of sixteen to eighteen, they are from the ages of sixty to seventy.

REP. ZAJAC: They must driving real good then because they're not in the accident reports.

MR. ATKIN: Well they don't drive too often.

REP. SORENSEN: They're not out there to hurt you.

MR. ATKIN: Right. They're only up at five after nine when you open.

REP. ZAJAC: Bob, did you have a question?

MR. ATKIN: Thank you.

REP. ZAJAC: Frederick Oertty. Is a Frederick J. Oertty here? He must have left, okay. Carroll Hughes.

SEN. MUSTONE: Lynn Steinsifer.

MS. LYNN STEINSIFER: Senator Mustone, Members of the Committee, My name is Lynn Steinsifer and I'm here on behalf of SKM Restaurants.

REP. SCHMIDLE: We can't hear her.

REP. ZAJAC: Could you speak up.

MS. STEINSIFER: Okay. My name is Lynn Steinsifer and I'm here on behalf of SKM Restaurants, Inc. concerning HB5489. SKM is the owner of Toad's Place and Toad's Place of Waterbury at which we offer food, drink and -- excuse me, food, drink and live music ranging from jazz to country western and bluegrass. Many of the people who come to Toad's Place

MS. STEINSIFER: (continued)

are between the ages of eighteen and twenty. Contrary to the conception of many people we find these young people to be intelligent, responsible individuals.

SKM is in agreement with a lot of the testimony that's been presented today, particularly by Conn. PIRG and the Cafe Council, in opposition to raising the drinking age.

We'd like to add the following: If the main impetus for raising this Bill is to keep eighteen year old high school students from becoming a source of alcohol for their younger high school friends, we wonder whether the Committee would consider amending the law so that there is a limitation on package store purchases, rather than on-premises consumption. In this way, it will appear, anyway, that eighteen year olds -- allowing eighteen year olds to drink would not then condone the drinking of fourteen year olds.

SKM's opposition to the Bill is based on a firm belief, as is many of the opponents, that you -- you will not successfully discourage drinking by eighteen year olds if you raise the drinking age. Unfortunately you may only succeed in raising a challenge to people who will be underage. This challenge will be met by Connecticut teenagers driving to New York State whose drinking age will probably remain lower than Connecticut.

If they can't go to a club to drink they'll buy liquor themselves. They get a false I.D. and I see that somebody else is underlined that argument very clearly. They can get an older friend or an older brother or sister or even kindly strangers to buy them a six pack and where they drink that six pack is probably going to be while they're riding around in their car or at an unsupervised party.

Encouraging our young adults to commute to another State to drink or to drink procured liquor while cruising in their cars can and will have enormous costs in human life; theirs, as well as other drivers.

We would contend that it may be education and that would be education of philosophy of moderation, as well as the technicalities of vehicle safety begun early, at home and in

59
gat

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE

February 26, 1982

MS. STEINSIFER: (continued)

the schools which holds out the best hope of reducing the alcohol related accidents that many people have given statistics about today.

In addition, I'd like to point out the critical difference between unsupervised drinking by teenagers and buying drinks at a well run supervised club. For one thing, the expense alone may keep a reign on their intake. More importantly, bartenders and floor service personnel, as well as the people who stand at the door and check I.D.'s are alert to young people and they do not over-serve them. Toad's Place is a well run closely managed club as are the clubs who have testified here today. All I.D.'s are checked at the door. That's to the consternation of some of the older people who do come to Toad's Place but it keeps underage patrons out of the club.

Club owners such as Toad's Place are a responsible group. They are not insensitive to the alcohol related problems that have been listed today. They would, however, encourage you to continue to allow eighteen and nineteen year olds to drink legally.

We remain certain that they will drink, even if they have to go out-of-State to do it. Or, break laws to do it.

SEN. MUSTONE: I have one question of you. We asked Mr. De Fillipo the gentleman who presented us with these I.D. cards how he acquired them whereupon he said he just took them and told the kids to leave. At your establishment would you do that? Or would you call a policeman?

MS. STEINSIFER: I couldn't say what the policy is on that, I haven't asked about it and I don't work on those premises that we represent, SKM.

SEN. MUSTONE: Thank you. Any other questions?

REP. ZAJAC: For years, I think somebody said five years, we've been debating this issue ever since, since '71, '72, Age and Majority and the problem started when the age went up -- went down rather. Everybody has said, New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and it's interesting for me at least who has been on this Committee that length of time to hear

60
gat

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE

February 26, 1982

REP. ZAJAC: (continued)

now only New York -- same thrust saying we're going to go to New York but they can't go to Massachusetts because they raised it and they can't go to New -- can't go to Rhode Island on the other periphery border they can't do it and, as somebody testified, even Governor Carey, this year, of New York, is proposing it so perhaps we may be in Connecticut the last little island -- the last State, so they won't have to commute to -- that they will continue to drink and go to New York because New York may raise it this year too.

MS. STEINSIFER: We're aware of that possibility. I think that what you will see is even if Connecticut goes ahead and the other -- and follows the other States and raises the drinking age, you will find that teenagers will drink and we would mostly like to put before you the alternatives of teenagers drinking in unsupervised situations or teenagers drinking legitimately. And I think that the most important thing to look at is that it's an education problem to get teenagers to drink responsibly.

REP. ZAJAC: Thank you.

SEN. MUSTONE: I -- we didn't recognize Mr. Dan Duffy from Legislative Research and who I always invite to ask questions of the testimony as it appears before us.

The next person to be heard is Stephen Brady, followed by Liz Sullivan. Stephen Brady. He's not present. Liz Sullivan.

MS. LIZ SULLIVAN: Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen, my name (HB 5489) is Liz Sullivan. I'm a student at the University of Connecticut. You might see me around CAP but I'm a Legislative Intern. I am speaking on my own behalf.

I am speaking, I think, as a responsible 21 year old student who has been drinking since the age of 18. I thought maybe perhaps I could give you a view of what goes on at the University of Connecticut and some people that I deal with every day, deal in the field capacities of Social Chairman, Vice President of Communications, the University Board of Governors in charge of many of the events at U-Conn. I think that if you're aware of any of the University's

S-191

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1982

VOL. 25
PART 3
587-896

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 112
jgt

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:

Question before the Chamber is on Calendar No. 155, Senate Bill 143. Machine is open. Machine'll be closed and locked. Total voting is 35. Necessary for passage is 18, voting yea is 25, voting nay is 10. the measure is adopted.

THE CLERK:

Continuing with an item that was previously passed temporarily on page 14, calendar No. 171, File No. 82, 310, Substitute for House Bill No. 5489. An Act Raising the Drinking Age to Nineteen. (As amended by House Amendment Schedules "C" and "F", with a Favorable Report of the Committee on General Law and the Clerk has some amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes, Mr. President. I move acceptance and passage of the committee's joint favorable report as amended by House Schedules "C" and "F".

THE CHAIR:

Will you explain "C" and "F" before we start, Senator?

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes, Sir. Well, "C" was the ...

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 113
jgt

THE CHAIR:

Why don't we adopt them separately?

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Fine. "C" was ...

THE CHAIR:

In case there's a problem that they has to back down to the House, Senator.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Very well. "C" was the ...

THE CHAIR:

All right. We'll move adoption of House Amendment Schedule "C". Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes. "C" was the voice vote to raise the drinking age to twenty in the House.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "C"? Senator Skelley.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Mr. President, I ask that the vote on this amendment be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, the Clerk will make the appropriate announcement.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 114
jgt

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:

Senator Johnson.

SENATOR JOHNSON:

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President, could I just ask the amendment that we are voting on at this point is House Amendment "C" so we are voting up and down, up or down, on raising the drinking age to twenty. Correct?

THE CHAIR:

House Amendment Schedule "E" inserted twenty in lieu of the word nineteen, so the issue before us is whether or not we want to adopt twenty or prefer to leave it at nineteen the way it came out of committee. That's House Amendment Schedule "C".

SENATOR MORANO:

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Morano.

SENATOR MORANO:

Mr. President, I rise to speak against House Amendment "C" and I urge its rejection.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 115
jgt

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

As long as we're going to get into a debate, Mr. President, I think that the bill that stands before us to raise the age to twenty is a step in the right direction. I think that if we're going to listen to the constituencies throughout the State of Connecticut we find out that we probably we would be going to age twenty-one. The interesting thing to recognize here with the amendment with either nineteen or twenty is the fact that back when the laws first gave the right to vote back in '72 to the young people of our country, all states didn't rush out and actually reduce the drinking age to eighteen. I think it was some twenty four or twenty-five of them at that time that did. Since that time, you'll find out that not one state has reduced the drinking age but you have sixteen states that have raised the drinking age including our sister states up in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. I think that all of us have had the polls run almost three or four years now in all our districts throughout the State of Connecticut and I think one of the reasons that we're up here is we're up here to represent a constituency and I think that what's happened here with the amendment in the House has been the right step. Unfortunately, it should have gone to twenty-one, not twenty because most of the polls that were conducted would show that the people of the State of Connecticut overwhelmingly support a raise in the drinking age and some of 'em were nineteen, twenty and twenty-one but almost invariably they said lookit, raise

that age up to twenty-one, but they would be willing to compromise on the twenty. I think you'll find that the original bill at nineteen left such vulnerability in the young people of this State. This is the age, if you take a look at the charts, I think all of you have seen miniatures of it, but this is your chart, as to the fatalities and those mountains that are way up in the end there, that's from about nineteen and twenty years back to about sixteen and if you take a good look at those charts, you'll find out that back when we passed the drinking age you were not peaking up, the number of fatalities, were not peaking down in the sixteens and the seventeen years of age. You'll find out they were peaking in around nineteen and twenty, but since we passed this law, we constantly have this increase and some of those statistics when you take a look at it, in 1978 we had a banner year, ran up almost at sixteen where they stayed all the way up there until nineteen and then radically dropped down. All I can say is if we're up here listening to our constituency this year, we'll support this as a possible compromise on twenty because certainly, drinking isn't a privilege. It's a right, and when I hear all this dialogue that, you know, you're going to have to go to war, you're going to have to serve, you have the majority rights, the riding into New York to get their liquor and beer if you don't take and maintain it at eighteen. I think if you take a good look at the statistics back when it was twenty-one in the State of Connecticut and eighteen in New York, the young people weren't killed driving back and forth on limited highways. They were killed on the back roads in the State of Connecticut. Not only that, a very fine argument

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 117
jgt

against the business of the travelling back and forth in the states, they don't have to travel anywhere now. They can take and go around the block and pick up as much as they want in any liquor store in the State of Connecticut and not only that, they can take all their young friends with them. I think the movement that the House made in actually raising this to twenty is a good move. I think we ought to listen to our constituents. I think we ought to listen to the people of the State of Connecticut and I think what we ought to do is maintain and hold onto this amendment and discourage any attempt to take and reduce it back to nineteen or to stay where it is at eighteen now. We made a mistake. Let's correct it.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Regina Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would also urge support of the, of this proposal to age twenty. Besides some of the points that Senator Gunther has just made, I think it's important for us to also recognize that our neighboring States of Massachusetts and Rhode Island have raised the drinking age to twenty. Last year, Massachusetts, their statistics indicated a 20.7% decrease in alcohol related fatalities among teenagers in the age bracket of fifteen to nineteen. I also understand that Rhode Island's decrease last year was near 30% in that age bracket. I think that also, I think for the first time the State of New York considering raising the drinking age. For the first time, the Governor of New York has indicated he would support raising the drinking age to nineteen. There's also

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 118
jgt

a bill in New York to raise the drinking age to twenty-one. The information that's available not only in our neighboring States of Massachusetts and Rhode Island where the increase in the drinking age has shown a significant decrease in the teenage related fatalities in alcohol, we also have studies that have been made available to us for the first time by the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse in Alcoholism and the report shows, for example, the State of Michigan that had raised its drinking age from eighteen to twenty-one. In this age bracket there was an 11% daytime and 28% nighttime reduction in alcohol related injuries and fatalities which translates into 373 daytime individuals daytime, 1726 individuals nighttime. I also believe that nineteen is not good enough because of the figures that I have just seen recently showing that there are over 3,300 nineteen year olds still enrolled in our public high schools. I think the idea of raising the drinking age is to indeed try to also remove the availability of easy access to alcohol from the younger children in our school system. I believe from the work on the Public Health Committee that the statistics we're dealing with with our Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse are extremely alarming. The increase in our alcoholism problem among teenagers is becoming an overwhelming situation. It was pointed out to us by the commission that we simply don't have the rehabilitation facilities to deal with our alcoholic children in the age bracket of ten to fourteen years of age. Last year, there was during the year 1981, nearly 11,000 children who have an alcoholic problem and family members were treated by our KDAC (?) facilities. Nearly 11,000. We must, I believe, do whatever we possibly can

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 119
jgt

do to try to deal with this alcohol problem with our young people. This is, I believe, a very important step. We have not in the past experienced those problems with young people and alcohol as we have since we've decreased the drinking age, and I think when we look at our surrounding States and the statistics that we're seeing, it's the most compelling evidence we have to make this move and raise that drinking age to twenty where it will be a bit more certain that the twenty year olds are not as apt to mingle with the younger teenagers. I would also like to point out that I know I, I don't know about others, I had literally thousands of petitions sent to me from the shoreline town areas and some of the communities in my district. I agree wholeheartedly with Senator Gunther. I believe the majority of people out there if they had their way would see us raise the drinking age to twenty-one, not even considering nineteen and twenty, so I would urge each and every one of you for the betterment of our children to do what we can in their best interests and I believe it would be indeed in their best interests to raise the drinking age to twenty. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Owens.

SENATOR OWENS:

Yes. I rise, Mr. President, to reject House Amendment "C" which would increase the drinking age to age twenty and contrary to the experience that Senator Regina Smith has had, most of the calls and most of the correspondence that I have had have indicated opposition to raising the drinking age at all. However, I do come from an area of the State

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 120
jgt

that would be vitally affected by any type of increase and because of this I spoke to a Senator Patervan (?) from the New York State Senate as late as yesterday and he advised me that there is presently a bill that's in committee in the New York State General Assembly that was co-sponsored by thirty out of sixty state senators that would increase the drinking age from age eighteen to age nineteen. He said that there is a great deal of support for this in the State Senate in New York and in the House. It looks like there will be passage of the bill when it comes to the floor, that Senator Carey that used to oppose the bill I understand has withdrawn his opposition to an increase of nineteen. I say this because I think the history is very important in this situation particularly when we consider the slaughter on the highways and the danger of repetition with those who might leave the State of Connecticut and go to New York because they have a drinking age that is less. I have every reason to believe after speaking to Senator Patervan and others from New York that they will see fit to increase the drinking age to nineteen and it is my understanding that Senator Carey has agreed not to veto this bill if it comes to him, so if we were to increase the drinking age to twenty, this would cause a great deal of havoc and concern to those of us who come from the Fairfield County area. There would be an increase in driving and we would go back to what happened prior to 1972 when the newspaper headlines, every weekend, would show death on the highways, serious injuries and fatalities, coming as a result of the sojourns to places like Bisda (?), and Salem and Portchester and places like this where people were going because of the lower drinking age. Now

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 121
jgt

Senator Gunther raises the question of what happens to the various rights to vote. He says that - he talks about the right to fight for one's country and so forth and he kind of dismisses these as being non-important when we talk about the drinking age and he considers that the peril and the safety is far more important to the State (inaudible), so that's why when it comes to a vote, if we ever get there, that I would probably support an increase to age nineteen but it seems to me age twenty would be too far and too harsh and would be too drastic action to take in this General Assembly. I think it's very hard to do anything with increasing this, but I think when we consider the statistics that it's incumbent upon us to take some action to increase the drinking age, but certainly twenty would affect those of us who live in Fairfield County and those of us who have children or represent constituents who have children who would be vitally affected by this. For this reason, I would urge the Senate to reject House Amendment "C" that is the increase to age twenty. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator O'Leary to be followed by Senator Skelley, then Senator Martin.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Mr. President, a question through you to Senator Mustone.

THE CHAIR:

Proceed, Senator.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

850
Page 122
jgt

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Senator Mustone, can you tell us what the basis for the committee's rationale was in keeping the limit at nineteen rather than twenty?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone, if you care to respond?

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes, Mr. President, through you to Senator O'Leary, it was brought before the General Law Committee's attention that 67% of all the people that live in the State of Connecticut live one hour away from the New York State border. We realize that the Massachusetts drinking age and the Rhode Island is twenty, but underlining what Senator Owens said, we too were in touch with the New York General Assembly. The sentiment appears to be there to raise it to nineteen and we thought that if we stayed with the nineteen we would be more (inaudible). The committee heard testimony from the Association of Secondary Superintendents and also the Connecticut Package Store Association. The Connecticut Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission presented their position paper to us which also underlined the nineteen year old age so that in effect, Senator, was our rationale.

THE CHAIR:

Senator O'Leary, do you care to remark further?

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Thank you very much. I think that the committee adopted a wise compromise and I'm going to vote to reject the House Amendment.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 123
jgt

THE CHAIR:

Senator Skelley.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Mr. President, I'm sometimes rather amused how we pass legislation in this Chamber, and maybe I just come from a different world or something, but I can remember when the drinking age was twenty-one and I was in high school and graduated from Rockville High in 1964. I don't remember a lack of beer or booze at parties up there. It was illegal, and I don't think any of us if we answer that question honestly with ourselves hadn't been some place before we were twenty-one years of age. I can remember driving down to New York State. A friend of mine, my best friend, happened to be going to Fairfield University at the time. It was a stop-over before we went into New York City. I can also remember making the trip back from New York State, sometimes the same night. I can remember when in fact on a Sunday night the restaurants would close at nine o'clock and everybody would go up to Springfield and Chicopee because they closed at eleven o'clock. I can remember when the law was twenty-one in Rhode Island and those of us that are nineteen and twenty years old went down to the Blue Sands into Neptune. If you think that legislation is going to change anything and we can list our statistics and all of are mortified by them, if you really think it's going to change anything, you're wrong. A kid that wants to drink at seventeen years of age is going to drink and they've got all kinds of little ways in which to do that. One of the favorite tricks that used to be around when I was a kid was going to Park

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 124
jgt

Street in Hartford, find a poor disadvantaged gentleman on Park Street, buy him a half bottle of wine and he'll go into the package store. That's reality. That isn't what we write in the statutes. That's life. I have always voted against it because I felt that perhaps the age of majority was too young at eighteen and I'm still not convinced it isn't too young. I can speak for a young man, maybe not for a young lady. I have two daughters, one rapidly approaching thirteen that gets lots of phone calls from boys. It makes me very nervous, but I can speak for a young man that was between the age of seventeen and twenty-one and most young men think they know everything there is to know in the world. By the time they're twenty-two they come around to their senses. They're not as bright as they think they are, but we allow a lot of flexibility for an eighteen year old. Some of the statutes I'm most familiar with we allow them to work with machinery for the first time in his life. We allow him to work on construction for the first time in his life. We allow them to vote. We allow them to enter into marriage contracts and legal contracts. We allow them to, in fact, establish credit lines. Maybe that's wrong. Maybe that's wrong, and if the argument is, and I think it's a valid argument, the kids are drinking younger, they are going to drink younger, but in 1964 when I graduated from high school, you couldn't find any pot in high school. You couldn't find any pills. You found beer and you found booze. Four years later, it was a drug scene. We have laws against that if I'm not mistaken. I think it's illegal to do that. So now we're going to address this by changing the statutes. We're going to have a kid who's

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 125
jgt

eighteen years of age with beer in the back of his car coming back from a prom and the cops going to come out and he's going to run away from that cop. We don't want that and we're frustrated to the point where we're looking for a solution to the problem and we think that legislation will solve that problem. It really won't, because those kids, and I've heard it said by several of my colleagues, they don't vote anyway. You're right they don't vote because they're not thinking of the process up here because they're not going to think of it until they're twenty-two years of age or even older and they won't care what you pass either. They'll just say it's illegal for us now, we'll find another way to get it, and if they want it, they'll get it. Educators, I can remember the last election, they berated me on the fact that I was opposed to raising the drinking age. You've got to do something in the school systems, so we'll change the language in the statutes and that'll make it all gone. Nobody drinks any more. Ain't going to happen. Well eighteen years old, in fact, is an age which I personally question for the age of majority. I do, in fact, think nineteen may be a little bit more reasonable, not any more workable, but more reasonable. I happen to think that maybe we should take a little more, a little harder look at the problem rather than addressing the statutes. We don't have the staff to deal with the problem according to Senator Smith. We don't have the financing to deal with the problem. Mr. President, I have no doubt that she's right, but we have no intention of making a commitment to the problem either. We're just going to change the law in the statute. We're going to make it all gone. You know, sometimes the greatest

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 126
jgt

thing in the world for me to go back to work after the session is over 'cause this place can get rather heady. We have a tendency we talk about constituents and the people that call us. It's so refreshing to go back out to work and to find out that most of the people up here don't care what we do anyway, and we're so self-centered that we can change everything in the State of Connecticut, that we can deal with social problems by changing the statutes and we can ignore the problems that are out there because we don't want to deal with this one because it's politically sensitive, because we don't want to deal with the aspect that we should be shamed or mortified that some day our kid in high school comes home and you find a bag of pot on his bureau, and what's our reaction? Take him out to the woodshed and beat his brains in, or do we recognize that perhaps a segment of our society has already accepted that, but that's taboo to say up here, because people will draw different conclusions and different opinions of the individual that says it. If we feel this society in this State has a problem we ought to legitimately deal with it. We each ought to set a course for ourselves and say how are we going to change that attitude because we're not going to change their attitude by changing the statutes in our Blue Books. It's not going to work. They don't read them.

Mr. President, I would urge this circle to vote against this amendment. I happen to think that the Committee on General Law after researching the thing, the problem, and recognizing our financial limitations and our unwillingness to put forth a workable program with serious revenue behind it to deal with the problem, perhaps is the way that we should go. I would

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 127
jgt

hope that the circle recognizes the fact that statutes don't change people's lives because they're just not going to pay attention.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mary Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN:

Mr. President, those of us who are going to vote for the twenty year age are doing this in response to the parents, the educators, the police, the organizations who have pleaded with us for years to do this. We've avoided this for years. We did this in 1972 and the problem has steadily built up for all these years. We have avoided it, now we're facing it head-on and it's about time we faced it. One of the organizations, the Commissions (inaudible) which had opposed it and why I could never understand, has reversed its position to age nineteen. This was after the bill came out of committee before it went to the House. It supports age nineteen. However, more recent information indicates conclusively that nineteen is age of greatest incidents in alcohol related motor fatalities and they have sent facts to support this conclusion. Whenever they mention Fairfield County (inaudible - didn't come through on tape) coming into Connecticut. They're just as guilty, so I think that we should respond to these people and face up to our responsibility because it is our responsibility. We did this in the first place and it's time we reversed our decision and it's not something that we did quickly. It's taken ten years to build up. I think it's about time we voted for twenty.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 128
jgt

THE CHAIR:

Senator Johnson to be followed by Senator Knous.

SENATOR JOHNSON:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I rise in support of the amendment - retaining the amendment for twenty year drinking age and I disagree with Senator Skelley who proposes that by changing the law we cannot in this area change people's lives. I am convinced that we can change people's lives. We can impact this problem by adopting this amendment. Yesterday because of the snow and our cancellation, I was able to make a long overdue trip to the grocery store. It was very interesting that a number of my oldest daughter's colleagues that she had gone to public high school with, mostly male, happened to be two or three which for me I think is a large number in the grocery store, actually took the time to stop me and said, do it. Now they were really talking about nineteen rather than twenty, but they were describing the pressure they felt as nineteen year old high school students not to turn down the buddies that they played ball with, the kids in the music club, the kids in the band, the kids in their class, who were under age who wanted them to buy them a six pack. Very tough to say to your friend, I won't do it. Not tough at all once you get out of high school and you're associating with a different group. Not tough at all to tell your old high school associates that, no, you won't buy them a six pack. They need the support and the protection of illegality. It is absolutely true and there isn't one of us that believes that changing the law will mean that there won't be a kid under

the age who will not imbibe. We're not going to completely eradicate the problem, but we are going to impact it and that's what we have a responsibility to try to do. There are kids out there that need our help in saying no. The issue, I think, and in talking to the kids who have called me incidentally when I go through with them the driving statistics, the alcoholism among teenagers, the destruction in families, and I ask them don't you have friends that you think are abusing. Yes. After the discussion, they don't feel uncomfortable with raising that age. They give me a positive sense at the end of those discussions. I think we can do something and I think it's our responsibility to do something and I want us to raise it to twenty and the reason is twofold. First of all, there is psychologically a boundary between teens and twenties. It's a little easier - it's a little more difficult for a young person to pass for twenty than to pass for nineteen. Takes a little more gumption, a little more hoodspa. It's a little easier for enforcers to say are you really twenty than to say are you really nineteen and we know that it's that judgement all along that is going to be the way this is enforced, so raise it to twenty. It gives that little greater differential between sixteen and nineteen, sixteen and twenty. There is a greater gap, psychologically and in reality between sixteen and twenty. Secondly, I would say that twenty year olds also need a stronger statement from us that alcoholism and its use requires maturity. It isn't following (inaudible). It's becoming one's own boss, and I would remind you, especially the members of the Appropriations Committee, that at UConn in 1979, most of the 363 discipline cases in the dormitories were related to excessive drinking.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 130
jgt

In one dorm alone, the students were billed for \$15,000.00 worth of damage. I have a daughter in college who was billed for the damage in the dormitory that she wasn't a part of. What an injustice to allow the kids who weren't drunk, the kids who don't even drink, to be billed for the damage of the kids who cannot moderate their behavior. We know it's a problem and it's not a small problem. At Central when they had a, really a terrible episode, they banned for a month alcohol on the campus. Class attendance on Monday improved. Attention in those classes on Monday improved and vandalism dropped precipitously, dramatically. I believe that not only from the point of view conserving our resources but from the point of view of our obligation in terms of leadership to our young people, we ought to be saying, the use of such a substance requires maturity and it is not, in fact, something that you can do responsibly at a young age and there's too much evidence to show that and I would urge that you stay with twenty and pass this amendment. It's needed and it will make a difference.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Knous.

SENATOR KNOUS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I just had a couple of comments, then I do have a question, through you, to Senator Mustone. I have supported the raising of the drinking age to nineteen. However, when we look at the amendment which is before us, there are a few things that do trouble me and one is the timeliness of the amendment. I think, Mr. President, if we were to pass the bill with the amendment, what in effect we

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 131
jgt

would be doing would be to create a situation where there'd be a class of people who would have been drinking for a period of time, whether we agree or disagree, from six months to a year, who then would, according to the law, according to the amendment would then no longer be able to drink legally. What I think we'd be doing because of the timeliness of the amendment is creating a situation where some people would be, of course, going into a bar and drinking and would become familiar with the bartender, I can see all kinds of problems in terms of trying to enforce this particular provision during that period of time. I think that we'd be creating a situation that would be somewhat unenforceable and we would be creating a situation which would be encouraging the people to break the law, so that I bring that to the circle's attention and I would like to, through you, Mr. President, just ask Senator Mustone if that, in fact, would happen. Would we not, if we were to pass this particular amendment, in fact, be creating a situation where the people who were drinking for as long as a year would, in fact, under the law, no longer be allowed to drink if we were to pass this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone, if you care to respond.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes. Through you, Mr. President to Senator Knous. The effective date on House Amendment "C" would be October 1, 1982. There are two amendments before the Chamber this afternoon, one that would change it to July 1, one that would change it to September 1, and I believe Senator

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 132
jgt

Skelley has another amendment which would address the point that you've made here, Sir. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Knous.

SENATOR KNOUS:

Thank you. Also through you to Senator Mustone, will the amendments that address the issue of people who are working at eighteen and then, if we were to pass the legislation, would be, in fact in a position of jeopardy as far as being able to lose their job if they were working at eighteen and we changed the law to twenty. Are those people picked up with the future amendments?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes, Sir, through you, Mr. President, except those all depending on which age the Senate chooses to go, there is a further amendment which would allow bartenders at the age that the age of consumption is legal. In other words, if the Senate goes to nineteen an eighteen year old person would not be able to work in a place where liquor was sold, but bus boys, waitresses, all of the other staff people would be allowed to.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Knous.

SENATOR KNOUS:

Thank you. Just to summarize, Mr. President, I would, as I

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 133
jgt

stated before, I do support the raising of the drinking age to nineteen. I would oppose the amendment based on the facts that I just heard from the Senator. I think that when you create a situation where you take something away from a group of people that traditionally the Senate and the Members of the Circle have attempted to grandfather people in, I see us really creating some problems in terms of enforcement if we were to go to twenty. I even see some problems in enforcement to nineteen. I would prefer having something like phased in so that individuals who are currently legally entitled to that particular right would continue to do so and then new individuals as they would reach the age of eighteen, in other words, someone who is not yet able to drink legally, then fine, they should not be allowed that right at nineteen but I foresee some problems. I also think that in reference to raising it above nineteen that might be a good issue that would, should be brought before the people of the State in a referendum. I think that might be an appropriate way to do it if we're considering changing it higher than nineteen, I think maybe a referendum might be the way to do it, and then it would both sides to debate the issue thoroughly and the judgement of the referendum could be, would certainly be the judgement of the people of the State of Connecticut and I think we could then follow that recommendation, so in summary, I would oppose the amendment although I do support raising the drinking age to nineteen. Thank you. Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ciarlone.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 134
jgt

SENATOR CIARLONE:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Very quickly, I support the amendment as it's before us for all of the reasons that have been outlined here this afternoon. I merely want to make a couple of other observations that I don't think were made here this afternoon. There's no question that raising the age of drinking to twenty years old is not a panacea for some of the problems that Senator Skelley alluded to, but I say to Senator Skelley and the other members of the circle who may have some different thoughts, what is the alternative? To continue on the path that we're on now obviously is not the way to go. We all have the statistics that show that the fatalities and the injuries on the road are alarming, so something has to be done. Something has to be done in that maybe what Senator Gunther said early on this afternoon when we moved to move the age of majority from twenty-one to eighteen, many of us in the circle acted in haste. Maybe that is something for another day, we should take another look at that, maybe recognize the fact that maybe there are some folks that really should not be, should not have some of the liberties and the privileges that the age of majority brings. I think this drinking age is probably one of the problems that came with lowering the age of majority from twenty-one to eighteen. Another problem that I think has been alluded to but has not been really described at length is some of the problems that lead to alcoholism. The fact that you drink at eighteen or twenty-one, in my judgement is not the answer. What moves someone to that age to drink? In my judgement these are escape mechanisms that many adults have that prob-

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7 1982

Page 135
jgt

lem. The youngster is gotten himself or herself into that problem of drinking. There are reasons for it. I think this Assembly should delve into that, find out what some of the social problems are. Is it economics? Is it employment? Is it peer pressure? The fact that we're going from twenty-one to eighteen or nineteen or twenty really in my judgement will not solve that social problem. I think there are some underlying social problems that lead many young people to drinking, but I think the fact that we are thinking of going to eighteen, or going to nineteen or twenty is a step in the right direction. I personally support twenty years old. There are some inconsistencies in this legislation, there is no question. Some of the inconsistencies are, as you know, a youngster can own a package store, is able to own a tavern, and yet can't probably drink in that tavern. There's no question. That's inconsistent, but I think where we're out to try to solve the problem of some of the carnage that's on our highways, I think the step we have here before us to move to twenty years old is a step in that direction. I ask you all to listen to many of the people that are calling you. There are people that are calling me in New Haven are for increasing the age above eighteen so I would support twenty.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Morano, to be followed by Senator Ballen.

SENATOR MORANO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I had intended to comment when we got down to the final age that we would be voting on, but

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 136
jgt

I could not refrain from standing and answering some of the dialogue that I heard. Senator Gunther said not to forget that we represent our constituencies and I don't forget that I represent my constituency. I also remember that there are eighteen, nineteen and twenty year olds in my constituency and I'm here to represent them also. I live in a borderline town, in Greenwich, and I can remember back in the sixties, the carnage on our highways. I can remember the roadblocks on weekends. I can remember reading in the newspapers articles of arrests from Willimantic area, New London area, Hartford area. It's only a two hour drive to cross the State from east to west. I can remember as a member of the Teenage Study Committee going to Albany, urging the State of New York to raise their drinking age with the late Commissioner Mulcahy and with Dr. Shepard from the Drug and Alcohol Division of Mental Health. I can remember Senator Clark Hull, Senator Hickey joining me there, and I can remember the lobbyists laughing at us, telling us that we were wasting our time to ask the State of New York to raise their drinking age and I think that I shall be the first surprised person if they do lower it this time, and Greenwich had no patent on the accidents. They were having them in Salem. New York, Brewster, New York, Vista (?), New York, and they were very serious. Now I don't think there's any magic number on the drinking. I think it's part of our education process. I think we should pay attention to. You know, we allow these eighteen, nineteen year olds to be elected. They're eligible if they can go out and campaign and do it to become State Senators, and State House members. They can own a liquor store. They can work

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 137
jgt

in a liquor store and here we are today, after lowering the age of majority to eighteen, taking away the right to these eighteen, nineteen and twenty year olds, making second class citizens out of 'em. I think the problem lies perhaps in the homes where the parents ought to learn to be parents again and maybe we should be voting on free remedial courses how to teach parents to be parents once again. Maybe we should be thinking about the effects of alcohol on the broader scope, why the teenagers are condemned when they go to a party and they're drinking, the host or hostess or parent of that home will say get out of my house, you're drunk and the kid'll drive down the road perhaps have an auto accident, but it was an adult, that same host or hostess might put 'em in their own car and drive 'em home, so let's not condemn all of the kids. You know, we talked about, Senator Johnson talked about injustice. I think it's an injustice on the eighteen and nineteen year olds who can handle their glass of beer or glass of wine and take that right away from them. That's an injustice, so I think, if we are going to address this problem today thinking we're going to cure it by raising the drinking age to nineteen, we're only fooling ourselves. We're only fooling ourselves because you're going to make bootleggers out of the older kids. They're going to make their deals in the street as Senator Skelley pointed out, and we're not going to cure it by passing a law today. We're going to cure it by an education process. You know, I saw many times on my local high school campus at eight and eighty-three in the morning high school students walking around, walking over to the local coffee shop and probably to the local liquor shop, I don't know, but I once questioned the principal of the school and he said we believe

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 138
jgt

in freedom with responsibility and I said, "Dr. Byrd, I think you mean responsibility is should be responsibility for freedom." Don't condemn all the kids because most of 'em are good. We hear about the bad ones, but never the good ones, and to take away this right, a right that we gave them in 1972 or '3 when we lowered the age of majority, is wrong and I will oppose raising any drinking age.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ballen.

SENATOR BALLEEN

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of the amendment. I can't say with reasonable certainty that nineteen or twenty is the proper age and I don't think any member of this circle can, but I think we all realize that something must be done and it's indeed gratifying, after having sat here for the last several years and listened to and participated in the debate on this issue when no change was brought about and having always favored a change to a higher age, it's gratifying because I think from the sense of the comments that have been made this afternoon, a change is coming, and whether it's nineteen or whether it's twenty, it's certainly going to be a change, I think, in the proper direction. If we made no change at all, merely because it's not going to convince the young people or make sure that they don't participate in alcoholic beverages, I think we are abrogating our responsibility. I think it's our duty at least to pass the law and then try our best to see that it's enforced. Merely by saying it's not going to do any good,

I don't think that's addressing the problem at all. I would think that raising the drinking age to nineteen will cure one problem one big problem, and that is take it out of the schools, at least to some extent it will take it out of the schools, and over the years I've heard from every administrator, every headmaster and housemaster in my senatorial district and they've all said please raise the drinking age at least to nineteen to get it out of the schools. That we will do, I hope, this afternoon. The second big problem, of course, is the fatalities, the serious automobile accidents caused by the teenage driver while under the influence of liquor, and apparently from the statistics that have been brought out this afternoon, nineteen is the critical age for that particular argument, so to satisfy both arguments, Mr. President, getting it out of the schools which nineteen would accomplish, and hopefully, getting it off the highways to some extent, which twenty would accomplish, I would support the motion - the amendment to raise the drinking age to twenty. Thank you, Sir.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Zinsser.

SENATOR ZINSSER:

Mr. President, I thought when we started we were going to take a quick vote and I guess I was wrong and I guess the one thing that I've learned in the short period of time I've been over here that nothing causes more debates or creates more telephone calls than when we start talking about alcohol. Last year, it was the minimum markup, and this year it's the drinking age and I know you, like I, probably received a

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 140
jgt

lot of phone calls yesterday, with the snow storm, from young people. I know I must have had fifty or sixty at least and I know there are others that have had more than that, and I kept asking these young people who were calling me, what's the hurry? What is the big deal about being able to drink at the age of eighteen. You know, I think in this country, somehow, we try to rush our kids from infancy to adulthood and they miss everything in between, and I think that's a tragedy and I think that part of the problem here is the fact that we look at TV and they associate with their peers and this has become the thing to do and I think that we have to do something up here to try to, try to stem the tide, if you will. For us to do nothing, I think, would be for us to bewalking away from our responsibility because to say that no matter what we do up here they're going to go out and drink anyways is not being responsible. That's like saying if we pass legislation that says murder is a crime, people are still going to go out and commit murder, but that doesn't me we don't pass the law. I think something has to be done. I think we have to raise the age to twenty. I, quite honestly, would go along with Senator Gunther and raise it to twenty-one because the initial mistake was made back in 1972, and I think Senator Knous hit the nail on the head, it's very difficult to take something away from somebody after you've given it to them and for that reason we should have kept it at twenty-one but we didn't. Let's not compound that. Let's not make two mistakes. Let's vote now, keep the age at twenty, and the other thing I would like to point out, Senator Johnson, early on today, made a statement which I think is very, very true.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 141
jgt

If we do something here that alters this bill and it goes back to the House or wherever, we could lose the whole thing, so let's do what's right and let's vote and keep it at twenty or raise it to twenty. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Regina Smith for the second time.

SENATOR SMITH.

Just a brief comment, Mr. President, thank you. I think that we're all aware of the fact that alcoholism is a major problem not only for young people but for people of all ages. It's a major problem when it affects you personally, when it affects your family. It does, indeed, tear families apart and I really don't think of this as was mentioned, I think, by one of the Senators that we're taking away rights from young people. I think we have a very deep responsibility and obligation to protect the rights of all those innocent people on the roads, those innocent people who are killed and maimed and left crippled for life by drunken drivers as an outcome of these motor vehicle accidents. I think that that's a responsibility that we have to be very, very concerned with and if this is one way in which we can help to solve just one of these problems, it's just simply another consideration that we should be seriously contemplating and be willing to address. I'd also like to point out to those legislators from the Fairfield County area who are concerned with travelling over the border to New York, we, I think, we are seeing our

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 142
jgt

young people dying in our communities, on the roads in alcohol related accidents all around the State of Connecticut. They don't need to go over to New York. It's happening here and now and if this and which many of us believe it will help from other State's experiences is going to reduce those deaths of those teenagers, then I think we have a very deep obligation to support this legislation. Thank you Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Rogers.

SENATOR ROGERS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Up until about a week ago, I was strongly opposed to raising the drinking age and I emphasized in a debate just about three weeks ago in the Glastonbury High School where I thought the problems came from and I still say they come from the parents. To me, there's no sense in saying all of a sudden because you're eighteen you should be allowed to drink if you never have before, conversely, but parents who don't abdicate their responsibilities and do bring their children up from whatever age where they recognize the alcohol problem, they're the ones who are doing it or they're not doing it but today, as I said before, the average parent abdicates his or her responsibilities not only in this area but the attitude today in too many instances is one where the parents say here, school board, teachers, take my Susie, educate her, discipline her, don't let her get pregnant, but if she does, take care of it and don't tell me the problem, and the same thing exists with the parents. The parents have abdicated their responsibilities in teaching

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 143
jgt

their children how to deal with alcohol. The reason I have changed is the fact that so many constituents said yes, Bill Rogers, you're very right, but, how about those innocent people of all ages who are being killed on the highways because those parents in many cases have abdicated their responsibilities and have not trained their children how to deal with booze, so since the parents won't assume their responsibilities, we don't have many choices left. I would be against twenty. As a compromise, I would certainly accept nineteen mainly to get it out of the sphere of the high school. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Are you ready to vote? Senator Skowronski.

SENATOR SKOWRONSKI:

Very briefly, Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment and to raise the drinking age to age twenty. Mr. President, voting on this bill, we as the Senate and as representatives of the people in this State, are collectively making a decision whether to increase the legal drinking age from eighteen to twenty. This is a major policy decision. Which is the better and sounder policy for the people of our State? To allow our young people to drink at eighteen or at twenty? And I asked myself, Mr. President, what is the compelling need to allow the consumption of alcoholic beverages at eighteen rather than twenty? What is the great and overriding societal benefit of drinking at eighteen? And I don't think that there is such a great and overriding benefit. Has the present system

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 144
jgt

worked well? No, Mr. President, I don't think it has worked well. We've had problems with alcohol at school and all the academic problems that it created, all the disciplinary problems it's created, we've had (inaudible) car accidents, we've had property damage and numerous other problems. Yes, Mr. President there are good kids, responsible kids, at age eighteen and the majority of our eighteen year olds don't abuse the privilege, but I think it's better public policy and a wiser course for our State as a whole to raise the drinking age to twenty to eliminate some of the serious problems that have developed under the present system. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Skelley, who has the leave of the Chamber, for the third time. Is there any objection to Senator Skelley speaking for the third time? Hearing none, proceed Senator.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Mr. President, I just wonder what the next thing we're going to legislate in this legislature is. Senator Rogers pointed out a very good point. We have a very large problem with teenage pregnancies. I suppose the next thing we'll mandate is chastity belts or in fact an individual may not may go out with another individual until they become twenty years of age. Who knows? We may be able to mandate anything at different ages but I really think that we're treading in an entirely different arena here and I would hope that the amendment is rejected.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Are we ready to vote. The Clerk

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 145
jgt

will make the appropriate announcement that we're prepared for a roll call vote.

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.

SENATOR SCHINELLER:

Mr. President, would you just, for the benefit of the members of the circle, explain the vote that we'll be taking?

THE CHAIR:

The issue before the Chamber is motion to adopt House Amendment Schedule "C". House Amendment Schedule "C" struck out nineteen and inserted twenty. The essence of the vote is as follows: a yes vote is to leave twenty in the bill, a no vote returns to the bill the age of nineteen. Machine is open. Has everybody voted? Machine'll be closed and locked. Total voting is 36 necessary for passage is 19, voting yea 17, voting nays 19. The motion to adopt House Amendment Schedule "C" is defeated.

THE CHAIR: (The President in the Chair).

Clerk please call ...

THE CLERK:

I believe we have before us at this time House Amendment Schedule "F". House Amendment Schedule "F".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 146
jgt

SENATOR MUSTONE

House Amendment Schedule "F" provides for any person under the age of twenty operate a motor vehicle unless accompanied by a parent or guardian in which a police officer finds alcoholic liquor may be summoned by such officer to appear at a hearing held by the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles to show cause why the operating license should not be revoked. If at such a hearing the Commissioner finds that such person knew it and had reason to know that the alcoholic beverage was in such motor vehicle he may revoke the operator's license of such person for a period not to exceed sixty days.

THE CHAIR:

Do you move for adoption of the amendment? Senator Skelley.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Mr. President, question through you to Senator Mustone.

THE CHAIR:

You may proceed.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

My question is of age, the age is now twenty. Would that be contradictory to the amendment that was just defeated in this Chamber?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

No I think there is another amendment in which this motor vehicle section is also included in, so it would therefore change it.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 147
jgt

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Through you, Mr. President to Senator Mustone.

THE CHAIR

Senator Skelley.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Then are you urging the Senate to reject this and adopt on another amendment later in the afternoon?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes. I think it will be an upsoming amendment.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is for the adoption of the amendment and she has moved for the adoption, Senator Skelley.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Well, if I may comment further, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Skelley.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Just a point of (inaudible). If we adopt this amendment, we would have to change again by readoption of another amendment. I would suggest that the Chamber defeat this amendment so that we could readopt

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 148
jgt

any of the amendment that Senator Mustone may be offering to the Chamber later, so in fact it's, it's compatible to the action we have just taken.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone, I think the question raised by Senator Skelley, in view of the rejection of the House Amendment which now brings us to the age of nineteen, he raises the question of compatibility because this particular amendment addresses the age of the twenty years old as against nineteen which is now the age that we're dealing with.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

What is your position now on this amendment?

SENATOR MUSTONE:

I believe that it would be simpler to reject House Amendment "F".

THE CHAIR:

Motion is to reject House Amendment "F". Do you wish to remark further? All those in favor of rejecting House Amendment "F" signify by saying aye. Those opposed? The motion is adopted. We have now all the Senate Amendments. Clerk will please call the first amendment.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Senate Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 2985, offered by Senator Mustone. Copies have been distributed. They are on the Senator's desks.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 149
jgt

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes Mr. President. May I request waiving of the reading and simply explain.

THE CHAIR:

Motion's to adopt and waive the reading. You may proceed.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

This amendment, Sir, would change the age to nineteen years of age.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes. I'd be happy to withdraw the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Yes. It would be redundant in view of the fact that the substance of the bill, the bill itself, is nineteen. calls for nineteen, and it was amended by House Amendment which raised it to twenty. Do you wish to withdraw this amendment?

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes, Sir.

THE CHAIR:

Amendment is withdrawn.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7 1982

Page 150
jgt

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has in his possession Senate Amendment Schedule "B". Senate Amendment Schedule "B", LCO No. 3101 offered by Senator Mustone. Senate Amendment Schedule "B".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes. May I request waiving of the reading please, Mr. President?

THE CHAIR:

Motion's to adopt, waive the reading. Without objection, you may proceed.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

This amendment is on lines 64 through 67, would allow for anyone, and the nineteen is before us today, that a person would have to be nineteen years old in order to be a bartender. It would allow those eighteen to be busboys or waitresses, but would allow for only those who are nineteen to be bartenders, not eighteen.

THE CHAIR:

Do you wish to remark further? Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, actually I think the intent to cover the waiters, waitresses, busboys and all that at age nineteen or under nineteen, eighteen and up, but to restrict the bartender, I think it's a little

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 151
jgt

bit beyond what we ought to be doing. I think we ought to, if they can take and be of the majority at eighteen, and this might sound in conflict to my attitude towards the twenty year old drinking, but I still think that the eighteen year old bartender would certainly be in order. He's not going to have any more temptation than what the waitress and the waiter or anybody else that's handling any of the drinks. There's no reason you can't bring both of it down. There is another LCO 2753 which would bring all of it down to eighteen and allow them to take and serve in any capacity because of the majority age, but, again, supporting the nineteen year old drinking section, so I don't think we should delete the bartender. I don't think there's any harm in allowing an eighteen year old to be a bartender. I don't think he's going to be serving any more than any other area where we're going to find some abuses in the thing, so I think we should take and open up the ballgame and allow 'em to be a bartender.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone, Senator Gunther, Senator Schneller, would you please approach the podium please? Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes, Mr. President. At this time, I would be agreeable to withdrawing LCO 3101 and I would request that the next amendment be called by the Clerk by Senator Gunther's LCO 2753 please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The amendment is withdrawn.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 152
jgt

THE CLERK:

Clerk will now call Senate Amendment Schedule "C", Senate Amendment Schedule "C", LCO No. 2753 offered by Senator Gunther. Copies have been distributed.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, I move adoption and waive the reading. I'll explain it.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, you may proceed.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

This is quite simply an amendment that now that we're apparently going to take and raise the age of drinking legally drinking in the State to nineteen, that at least we should acknowledge that the waiters, waitresses, busboys and including bartenders can actually be hired at the age of eighteen. It's that simple. I think that there's no reason why we should restrict the, a person from being a bartender any more than the remarks I made before. I think that anybody that wants to abuse this can do it as a waiter, waitress, busboy or what have you.

THE CHAIR:

Certainly a manifestation of your affection for the bartenders at that age level. Will you remark further? All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying aye, those opposed, nay. The ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 153
jgt

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has Senate Amendment Schedule "D" offered by
Senator Mustone, LCO 2754.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

Yes, may I urge adoption of the amendment and waiving of
its reading please to explain.

THE CHAIR:

You may proceed.

SENATOR MUSTONE:

The amendment would simply make the effective upon passage
date July 1, 1982.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Would you remark further on the adoption of this
amendment? All those in favor signify by saying aye, those opposed, nay.
The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk at this time would like to call your attention to
Senate Amendment Schedule "E" offered by Senator Robertson, LCO No. 2755.
That's Senate Amendment Schedule "E".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Robertson.

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7 1982

Page 154
jgt

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Mr. President, because of the previous amendment, I think that that amendment can be legitimately withdrawn.

THE CHAIR:

Amendment is withdrawn.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk will now call your attention to Senate Amendment Schedule "F", LCO No. 2551 offered by Senator Skelley.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Skelley.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment and allow the reading be waived and allow me to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, you may proceed.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Yes, Mr. President. This amendment addresses one of the problems that was brought to the Chamber by Senator Knous, or one of the considerations. It does change the effective date of the bill. It changes the effective date of the bill from July to January 1st, 1983. It also grandfathers those individuals that are eighteen years of age prior or up to January 1st 1983 so they would not be excluded from the, having the privilege of alcoholic beverages. I think this particular procedure is very important. One, we talked about eliminating people and taking away certain responsibilities that the legislature had given them prior to

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 155
jgt

this time. I think it recognizes the fact that we are recognizing that certain individuals are eighteen years of age, already do have this privilege and we're not denying them that privilege. I would ask for support from the circle.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mustone.

SENATOR MUSTONE

I urge rejection of the amendment. I think that if this body had given its good wisdom to raising the drinking age to nineteen, then I think it's a much cleaner, simpler way to do it to have an effective passage date as of July 1, 1982. I think this would provide for more confusion in bars and in package stores. It would be very confusing for bartenders or retailers to be able to make proper identification of when that person was born and when indeed he is grandfathered in, so I urge rejection of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Skelley.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Mr. President, due to the objection of the Chair, and while I don't do it very often, and my fond affection for Senator Mustone, I withdraw the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Any further amendments?

THE CLERK:

Regular Session
Wednesday, April 7, 1982

Page 156
jgt

The Clerk has no further amendments.

THE CHAIR:

The issue before the Chamber is adoption of calendar No. 171, House Bill 9489, File No. 82, 310 as amended by Senate "C" and "D". Roll call is in order. Clerk, please make the announcement.

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:

Machine is open. Please record your vote. Senator Wilber Smith. Senator Sullivan. Senator Owens. Machine is closed. Clerk please tally the vote. Result of the vote, 30 yea, 6 nay. The bill is adopted.

Senator Schneller, what is your wish at this time? We have reached that point where you're approximating five P.M. and we ...

SENATOR SCHNELLER

Mr. President, I would ask that we do our consent calendar and that we adjourn.

THE CHAIR:

Please give your attention to the Clerk who will call the consent calendar.

THE CLERK:

On page 2 of the calendar, page 2, calendar No. 80, calendar

H-310

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1982

VOL. 25

PART 3

555-923

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

CLERK:

Calendar Page 4, Calendar 62, Substitute for House Bill 5489, AN ACT RAISING THE DRINKING AGE TO NINETEEN.

Favorable Report of the Committee on General Law.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Robert Carragher.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

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

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker and members of the House, simply stated this bill increases by 1 year, from 18 to 19 years old the age a person must attain in order to purchase and consume alcoholic liquor in the State of Connecticut. Or obtain a permit to sell alcoholic liquor, and with certain specified exemptions, work with alcoholic liquor in permit premises, work in any capacity in a tavern or loiter, can permit premises, or be in a bar accompanied by a parent or guardian.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, as all of you know, this is an issue that has been long debated in this General Assembly. The General Law Committee, during this session listened to extensive, sometimes rather emotional testimony with regard to this issue. It is an issue very clearly and obviously that the people of this state feel very strongly about, either one way or the other.

When the bill was reported out of the committee, when I made the motion to report the bill to the floor, I made the statement that obviously there were strong feelings regarding this legislation, and that the time had once again come for the entire General Assembly to make a judgment on this very important social issue.

I did not feel that appropriate for the General Law Committee to make a final judgment on this issue. That is the basic reason that this bill is before this Chamber this afternoon.

What I would like to do in an effort to try to make the members aware of exactly what the situation is, is to run through some of the reasons, both pro and con, to go through and explain some of the testimony from various groups regarding this legislation, and then to appraise

House of Representatives Wednesday, March 31, 1982

the members of the House with regard to the position that we see, the posture that we see the New York Legislature in as of this moment, because we have been in contact on a number of occasions with the Legislature of the State of New York.

Mr. Speaker, there are people who feel very strongly that the passage of this legislation will reduce alcohol consumption among Connecticut's teenagers, will make alcohol less accessible to high school students, and will decrease the amount of alcohol related traffic accidents for the young people of our state.

We had testimony from many shoreline police departments, and school officials, and youth workers from Connecticut towns who predicted that 30 to 40% reduction in alcohol related accidents, were this kind of legislation to pass.

There were a number of parents who, in my judgment during the 12 years that I have been here, gave the most moving testimony that I have had the opportunity to listen to, pleading with this legislature, in many instances with their own personal experiences with their own children, pleading with us to raise the drinking age in this state.

There was extensive testimony from the Board of Directors from the Connecticut Association of Secondary Schools, represented by high school principals, who said

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

that too many teenage deaths, auto accidents and suicides are occurring because the drinking age is too low, who testified that according to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, that there are 3,300,000 teenagers in this country who are problem drinkers, whose drinking has interfered with their responsibilities, both at home and in school, and to have been in trouble with the police due to drinking.

They claimed that in the years after the drinking age has been lowered, the number of deaths between the age of 17 and 25 has increased 95% over the previous 5 year period.

In 1977, the Connecticut Commission on Public Safety reported that 1.3 of every thousand 17 year olds were involved in alcohol related accidents. They also said that in their judgement raising the drinking age most certainly will not stop teenagers from drinking, but in their judgment would reduce it by some amount.

Ladies and gentlemen, there was presented to the committee a study which was conducted in the State of Michigan which accumulated evidence connected with the lowered drinking age with alcohol related health problems, particularly traffic fatalities. The research has shown a decrease in the incidence of alcohol related accidents

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

since the State of Michigan raised its drinking age.

The study was designed to evaluate the effects of returning to a higher drinking age. The results of that Michigan study showed that alcohol related crashes, property damage, decreased for drivers 18 to 20. Non-alcohol related crashes also decreased, but the magnitude of the decrease is only half as large as the decrease in alcohol related crashes. That older drivers exhibited no significant change in the crash involvement. That raising the drinking age resulted in an 11 to 28% reduction in alcohol related injury, greater motor vehicle involvement.

The second major finding of the Michigan study was that there was no observed effect of raising the drinking age of the frequency of property damage crashes among 16 and 17 year old drivers.

The conclusion, basically of that study in Michigan is that a raised minimum drinking age reduces alcohol related crash involvement among young drivers.

There was also a study in the State of Maine which made the same conclusion. These results on raised drinking age along with previous research on lowered drinking age indicate that higher drinking ages are an effective counter-measure for alcohol related motor vehicle accidents.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

There are those who have testified, of course in opposition to this legislation. Some of their reasons are as follows.

That by raising the age there will be more alcohol misuse because it will be more attractive to adolescents. If not able to drink in a controlled environment, then more drinking will be centered around the automobile, leading to an increase in highway fatalities.

That a study of the drinking habits of high school seniors in 6 northeastern states by a Dr. James Rooney concluded, "more seniors drank. Those that drank consumed more and the number who by national alcoholic measures were heavy problem drinkers were higher in states with a 21-year-old drinking age." Dr. Rooney stated that "forbidden fruit was more attractive than the allowed fruit".

When Massachusetts raised the drinking age to 20 there were more traffic fatalities among the 16 to 19 year old age group. The Massachusetts Registrar of Motor Vehicles publicly called the law a flop.

These are some of the reasons that those people who oppose this legislation stated before the committee during the public hearing,

I would now like to report to you one other significant fact, at least in my mind, and obviously in the mind of a

krr

65

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

number of other legislators here today, because many of you have spoken to me about this. And that is, what is the situation going to be with regard to the drinking age in the State of New York?

We have done our very best to try to get a handle on what New York is going to do. At this stage, the State of New York has 2 bills pending. They do not have Joint House Committees. There is a Senate bill before the Senate and a House Bill in a House Committee. There is Assembly Bill 1995, which is presently in the Commerce, Industry and Economic Development Committee. That bill has 33 sponsors, out of 150 members.

There is Senate Bill 1581, which is currently pending before the Senate Investigations and Taxation Committee. The bill has 29 sponsors out of 69 Senators. It is our understanding the leadership in both Chambers will follow the direction of their Chamber members, and that leadership tells us that they do not intend to try to sway that vote in either house, either way.

The committees in New York will not act on these bills until the 3rd or 4th week in April. The earliest that a bill could reach the floor of either Chamber in New York will be early May. Which in essence means that clearly we will most likely be out of session here in

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

Connecticut by the time the State of New York takes action on this legislation.

I will be more than to answer any question that anyone has with regard to the documentation I have quoted here today. I have the studies before me if anyone is interested in looking at them.

I would simply say in summary, as the Chairman of the Committee responsible for this legislation, that I personally have on other occasions, and most certainly do now, agonize over what is right and what is wrong with regard to this bill. And in the past, I have been convinced, after listening intently to the debate and testimony on this legislation. I was convinced in the past that raising the drinking age would not have a significant effect on the teenagers of our state.

I have changed my mind, after having listened to the pleas of the educators and the parents and the police officers of our state. I still think that there are some valid arguments in opposition to this bill, but I must come to the conclusion that if the passage of this legislation raising the drinking age, saves the life or the future of 1 teenager in our state, that in conscience, I must vote for the passage of this bill.

krr

67

755

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. ATKIN: (140th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Atkin.

REP. ATKIN: (140th)

I again must rise in opposition to this bill as I have done for the four years I have been in this House.

I would like to start by saying that I'd like to ask anyone in this Chamber to show me how the demographic geography of the State of Michigan is at all similar to those of Connecticut.

Point, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about the State of Connecticut having two-third of our population within 1 hours driving distance of the New York State border.

I have sat in hearings around the state for 4 years, heard people testify that when the age of 21 in Connecticut, they thought of nothing of getting in their car and driving an hour several times a week to go to New York State to get a drink. And also, as I said before on this floor, I was one of those, and I quite frankly don't know how I got back some nights. It's a harrowing ride at 75, 80 miles an hour when you're 18 or 19 years old, on that highway, but I'd much prefer to see these youngsters staying within their

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

communities if they must drink at all.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to be brief. I have a report from the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles, Accidents in New York State Involving Young Drivers from Adjacent States. I'd like to summarize from the conclusion of this report, specifically concerning Pennsylvania, where the age is 21.

New York State accident data were analyzed comparing out of state driver involvement for Pennsylvania and other states, and again Pennsylvania is the only adjacent state with the age of 21.

The statistical analysis of this data show that there is a significantly higher percentage of Pennsylvania drivers under 21 involved in New York state accidents, in the proportion of accidents involved drivers from other adjacent states. If this percent was equal to the average of other adjacent states, there would be 132 fewer accidents involving Pennsylvania drivers. The point is, they will cross the state line. The point is, New York State has not yet raised their drinking age. The point is that New York State has been 18 since prohibition. I urge you to defeat this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REP, ANASTASIA: (138th)

Mr. Speaker.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Anastasia.

REP. ANASTASIA: (138th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Journal please note that I will be abstaining on voting or participation in this particular bit of legislation due to our laws and rules covering conflict of interest.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Journal will so note, sir.

REP. DEL PERCIO: (127th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. DelPercio.

REP. DEL PERCIO: (127th)

Will the Journal so note that I am abstaining for possible of conflict of interest.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Journal will so note, sir.

REP. RYBAK: (66th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Michael Rybak.

REP. RYBAK: (66th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, it is

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

not my style, I think most of you know to rise on a bill of emotional consequence like this. I usually confine my remarks to fiscal matters and leave these debates to other people.

Unfortunately circumstances, tragic circumstances in my district, in the last 2 years, and this is a western Connecticut district, that is close to New York, tragic circumstances have caused me to rise to speak in behalf of this legislation.

I have a petition presented by many constituents in my district, urging adoption of this measure, because of the lives that have been lost in my district due to teenage drinking and driving. And I would like to speak on behalf of the bill, and on behalf of them.

Three years ago, the legislature compromised on a split drinking age, as you remember, 18 for bars, and 19 for carry out, only to see the bill vetoed by our Governor as unconstitutional, and rightfully so.

The following year she indicated at the start of the session that she would not support any increase, thus stifling the efforts for that session.

But this year, however, the picture is different, and I ask those of you who have opposed this measure in the past to consider the changed circumstances.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

First a new Governor. Second, recent studies in both Maine and Michigan which raised their drinking ages to 20 and 21 respectively, show a 20% plus decline in alcohol related automobile accidents among teenage drivers following the legislative change. In Michigan alone, it is estimated that more than 1,600 drivers in the 18 to 20 group escaped injury or death as a result of the increase.

The statistics in both Maine and Michigan are irrefutable.

Since 1977 7 states, including Massachusetts and Rhode Island, have raised their drinking ages. The evidence seems rather clear, and people out there wonder why the General Assembly refuses to make this change, and after hearing the opposition's arguments for 3 years, I can understand their position, but I cannot accept it, and I think it basically goes like this.

If one is old enough to drive, vote, enlist and marry, then one is old enough to drink. All 18 year olds should not be judged by the same standards. Alcohol abuse is symptomatic of a deeper social problem, not confined to 1 particular age group, and finally, increasing Connecticut's drinking age will cause young residents to drive to New York for a drink, will lead to an increase in traffic fatalities along the western border and in Fairfield

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

County. And I'm very mindful of this argument, representing a western Connecticut district, and I'm not old enough to have forgotten those days when I was younger and that situation existed.

In my opinion, these arguments simply do not outweigh the greater public good, which will be served by raising the drinking age. Just as many many 16 to 18 year olds do not fully appreciate the serious responsibilities of driving an automobile. They cannot handle liquor. The 2, however, are a fatal combination, and just because some adults abuse their privileges, doesn't mean that we should encourage teenagers to do so.

A second argument you ought to consider is that peer pressure is not a major factor in things like teenage marriage, enlisting and voting. And the consequences of a split second error in judgment, judgment impaired by alcohol will not mean serious injury or death for the individual involved or innocent third parties who happen to be coming in the other direction on that highway. Not so for teenagers who drink and drive.

Yes, alcohol abuse is not confined to any age group; but alcohol related traffic accidents are disproportionately high among the young. No one will argue that raising the drinking age by 1, 2 or even 3 years will solve the problem

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

completely, but if it gets teenage drinking out of the schools or off the highways, it will have served its purpose, and I echo Rep. Carragher's remarks. If only 1 young life is saved, isn't it worthwhile.

I ask you to ask any of the parents, many of whom have signed this petition, who know from tragic experience. Thank you.

REP. MERCIER: (44th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Mercier.

REP. MERCIER: (44th)

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the rules, may I be excused.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Journal will so note.

At this time the Chair will put a question to the membership. Are there members who are looking for an excuse to be removed from the Chamber based on a possible conflict of interest. If there are, the Chair will acknowledge those members at this time.

REP. BRUNNOCK: (74th)

Mr. Speaker.

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Thomas Brunnock.

REP. BRUNNOCK: (74th)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be excused because of a possible conflict of interest.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Journal will so note.

REP. ROSSO: (30th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Peter Rosso,

REP. ROSSO: (30th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has LCO 2056. Please call, and I be allowed to summarize.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Clerk has in his possession an amendment, LCO No. 2056, designated House Amendment Schedule "A". Would the Clerk please call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 2056, House Amendment Schedule "A", offered by Rep. Rosso of the 30th District, entitled AN ACT RAISING THE DRINKING AGE TO 19.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The gentleman has requested leave of this Chamber to

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

summarize the amendment in lieu of Clerk's reading. Is there objection? Is there objection to summarization? Hearing none, you may proceed to do so, Rep. Rosso,

REP. ROSSO: (30th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, This amendment virtually leaves intact the entire file copy of the bill, with the exception, effective October 1, 1983, the legal drinking age in the State of Connecticut will be 20. I move adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. ROSSO: (30th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Rosso.

REP. ROSSO: (30th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For all the reasons that Rep. Carragher so aptly put, and for those of us who've had circumstances in our districts, I feel that while the 19 year old drinking age is a partial victory, I believe that the age of 20, which our sister state of Massachusetts presently has is more realistic in trying to combat the

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

problem of teenage drunken driving. I know as well as you that this bill alone cannot do that, and I think the arguments have been made earlier, I will not burden the House any longer except to ask that you accept this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A"?

REP. GELSI: (58TH)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Frederick Gelsi.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise with mixed emotions to support the amendment, and finally the bill. Coming from a border town, I'm sure that raising that age to age 20, the same as our sister state in Massachusetts, we will be able to at least cut down in the Town of Enfield, Somers, Suffield and surrounding communities around the Springfield area, bar wars and the 2:00 A.M. headaches of our police departments in those communities.

We will also stop all the college students coming out of Western Massachusetts, coming in to our end of the

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

state to throw their parties, destroy property, and yes also be able to share the serious accidents that happen on our side of the border.

The only place that I have mixed emotions on the bill, is I just don't know how we make people legally responsible for everything in their lives, and then cut them back in 1 area. I will support this bill, and I hope that the rest of the members will do the same. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. CAPPELLETTI: (71st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Cappelletti.

REP. CAPPELLETTI: (71st)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the amendment at age 20, and to give some argument in support of that. I would like to say that when the statistic came out in the General Law Committee that 67% of Connecticut's population lived within 1 hours drive of New York, I was impressed with that statistic. I was so impressed, as a matter of fact, that I made inquiries and found that our sister state, Rhode Island, who adopted the age of 20 for

krr

78 766

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

their drinking age, in their state, 100% of their population lives within 1 hours drive of Connecticut. The people in Rhode Island did what they thought was best for their state, and I would hope that we would do what is right and best for our state.

And in support of that, let me say, let me give you some statistics that I have from Massachusetts. Massachusetts also, in 1979 raised its drinking age to the age of 20. In the 15 to 19 year old category, in the year of 1980, they were able to reduce their traffic related, alcohol related to 20.8%. Percentages mean very little. People's lives mean a great deal.

In Connecticut, we have repeatedly shown, and I have some information that I will make available to everyone at their tables, compiled by CADAC, in the various age groups from the various age cohorts. It shows repeatedly and it's a 10 year analysis from the year that Connecticut adopted the, lowered the drinking age to the present, 1981.

It shows conclusively and repeatedly that the age group that shows the highest representation within their age group in alcohol related motor fatalities, are the 19 year old group. In the year immediately preceding the lowering of the drinking age, or the age of majority legislation in Connecticut, the total number of accidents,

kod

79

House of Representatives Wednesday, March 31, 1982

motor related fatalities, was 113. The following year that only went up 2 to 115. Yet the 19 year old involvement in those accidents went up 85%.

I urge you to accept this, adopt this amendment, to vote positively on it, and I would also like to tell you that, one other bit of information. There is legislation pending in New York. There is legislation, as has been mentioned, that would raise the drinking age to 19. There is also legislation pending in New York that would phase in, over a three year period, the drinking age. It is Senate Bill 936A, introduced by Melvin Zimmer. So that on or after January 1, 1984, the drinking age in New York would be raised to 20 on a 3 year phase in if this bill is adopted.

There are no arguments, I guess for raising the drinking age to 20, but they are raised. I would ask you to support this amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Eugene Migliaro.

kod

80

767 A

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the amendment. I've had statistics and data here since 1976, it's the reason we put this bill in. And I heard today here in regards to the New York border. I've heard that argument time and time again, year after year after year. What they don't tell you is that prior to lowering the drinking age, those who were going across the New York border, our statistics and data show that the loss of life due to drinking was far less than what it is today. It has to tell you something.

Another thing that I understand that was said earlier, worried about the youth going over to New York and driving 70, 80 miles an hour, 60 or 50 or what have you, away from your home. Well, just for the record, in my town alone, 4 youths in my town in one year were killed coming out of the same tavern. And their ages were 18, 17 and 16. So don't tell me about your statistics. Because they are statistics, that these kids will never have a chance to vote or to have the rest of their life to live by and to do what they want in life. They were never given a chance.

And I hear about statistics. Four kids in my

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

town. And this was just last year. And I've been trying since 1976 to do something. There's 4 kids that won't be around because we didn't take action in 1976. How many more kids won't be around. And if we won't take action. There's a letter I've been carrying here since 1977. I read it every year and I'm going to read it again. And this is from a tavern owner.

Please accept this letter as my support for your bill to change the legal drinking age back to 21, or whatever. Personally, even 20 is sufficient. As a former restaurant owner with my brother, a restaurant in Southington, my experience with 18 year old drinkers is vast. I feel they not only destroyed any faith we had in them, but they have hurt many good tavern and bar businesses. I'm sure a survey of decent bar owners, and I'll emphasize the word decent, would reveal support for your bill.

The under 21 clientele are good spenders, but are awful dangerous. They cannot control themselves and usually drink solely to get drunk. I would go on and on about this. (And then he highlights it. I think it's a very important statement that's coming up.) I'm only 32, but I feel the majority of a drinker depends not on

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

his ability to down shots, but on his ability to consume liquor at a pace and a level where control is maintained and health was not threatened.

And that's what it's all about. These are kids yet. They can't control themselves. This is where the 21 year old group fail. Unfortunately, they have made many bar owners rich, but many police officers regret Friday and Saturday nights. And believe me, that is the Gospel truth. We are having those kids go out there and commit suicide because of our inability to act. Because some of us on the floor of this house are concerned about the 18 year old vote. And you want votes, but at whose expense? I'm going to read you something else. Here's the punch line.

Youth counseling center in Southington, out of 423 clients between the age of 12 and 18 who have been seen at the counseling center since opening in February of '73, the following is a list of youths who drink in excess between 1 and 5 times per week and we feel they are potential alcoholics. 1973, number of youths, 12. 1974, 14. 1975, 19. Now we give them the right to drink at 18 and it goes up to 54.

You can't dispute the figures, you can't dispute

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

the facts that these kids are committing suicide out there because we won't do anything about it to stop them. You'll hear the argument, if you're old enough to fight, you're old enough to drink. Well, I went in the Corps at 17 years old. I was old enough to fight. But when I drank, I drank with men. You take a 17 or 18 year old that's in a school system, you either play the game if you want to ride on their wheels or you don't play, or you don't ride. So what do they do? They contribute to the young set, 1st year, 2nd year, and in many cases now, junior high school students, the booze, the beer, the whiskey.

It's easier for a kid to go into a package store at 16 or 15 and pass himself off for 18 than it would be for him to pass himself off for 20 years old or 21. I've talked to an awful lot of youth groups in colleges and high schools, and I asked them their opinion of it. And you'll be surprised how many of these kids say, up the drinking age because it is hurting. And it's hurting the youth of our country. And it's hurting our high schools.

I don't know what it is. Just a little while ago we passed a drink, that the package store would be open on Sundays. We're so concerned about the drinking and

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

the age of the kinds that they drink at. But yet, we give them the opportunity now. They can get it on Sunday now. I voted against that bill. I'm pretty damned consistent when it comes to that stuff. Because I know the kids are the ones that are going to be affected by it.

I've seen many people find their courage in a bottle. Many, through my life span. And now we're doing the same thing for the youth. Twelve years old, 10 years old, 14 years old, it's a great future for these kids. And I'm going to hear later somebody say about statistics. Damn the statistics. Well you're right, these kids are a statistic that I don't appreciate in death row. We're not even going to give them a chance to become a statistic in voting or anything else. We're going to finish them quick. I urge this body, that if you don't accept this amendment, for the love of God, give us the 19 year old. We've got to stop this mad suicide on the highway. And the innocent people that are being killed because we've been lax in our duty. I urge you to accept this amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. SORENSEN: (82nd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Robert Sorensen.

REP. SORENSEN: (82nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, in the 4 years that I have had the honor to serve in this body, I have opposed raising the drinking age. This year by no means is any exception. I oppose it also this year, with extremely mixed emotions. As a member of the General Law Committee, the testimony, as Rep. Carragher has already alluded to, was indeed moving, by parents, school officials, police chiefs, the various interested parties.

Anyone, and I want to make this point clear, who opposes raising the drinking age should not be made to feel that they are contributing, as my friend Rep. Migliaro says, to mass suicide. I think that's totally wrong to say. Rep. Migliaro also said that we should not discuss statistics, we should talk about the individuals. I agree with you, Gene. Let's look at some reports that have been done in the past few years about this. One of those reports was sponsored by the

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

Connecticut Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council, who established a separate task force on youthful drinking in Connecticut. It came up with several recommendations, but I'd just like to paraphrase 3 of them for you.

Their 4th recommendation which was on the drinking age, basically in a statement, the legal drinking age in Connecticut should remain at 18. Very simple, very plain. Based on information gathered at task force meetings and workshops, the majority of members voted against raising the drinking age. The members agreed that this would not prevent nor minimize youthful drinking problems. And they alluded to several arguments which have already been mentioned.

At 18 you can buy a house, enter into a legal contract, get married, you have to register for the draft, and perhaps be forced to fight for your country, vote. Those things take a great deal of maturity. But it takes more maturity to open up a 6-pack of beer than it is to enter into a lifetime contract of marriage. It takes more maturity for an individual to walk into a bar and buy a beer than it does for someone to have to pull the trigger in a war. It takes more maturity for someone to vote.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

What are we talking about? Who are we fooling? Unfortunately, I think what we're doing is we're fooling ourselves and we're fooling the very people that we're trying to protect. You can have the drinking age in Connecticut and the United States at 99. You tell me at what age an individual is responsible to handle the alcohol. How can we pick an arbitrary age out of the sky and say at 20 years of age, that individual is responsible enough, he can handle the alcohol.

Changing the legal age will probably not change drinking behavior, many of which involve long term consequences. There is no philosophical justification for prohibiting purchase of alcohol at this age. Indeed to single out alcohol as a uniquely forbidden fruit would emphasize the symbolic importance of drinking as an adult prerogative and hence promote the desirability of drinking among youths. It's pretty plain.

According to the most recent review of youthful drinking surveys by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, one of the most prestigious agencies in the United States of America on drinking and alcoholic statistics, the lowering of legal drinking ages to 18 which occurred in the early 70's seems to have been a

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

response to or a recognition of the already established social drinking pattern. In essence, to raise the drinking age might have as its major effect the creation of a new group of lawbreakers.

And the 3rd recommendation, the small group for whom alcohol is intensely important can always manage to secure it legally or illegally. When I was in high school, the age was 21, that an individual could drink or vote, or whatever. You know as well as I that if these kids want to get the alcohol, they're going to get it, whether it's 18, 19, 20 or 21. If they want it, they're going to get it. They'll find a way. Marijuana is illegal. They want it, they get it. If we make buying liquor, purchasing liquor, at age 18 illegal, they're still going to get it. We're not fooling anybody.

We're going to vote this through, well probably it's going to go through at 20 or at least 19. When we go back to our constituents we're going to say, we did a good deed. But did we really. Or did we in the long run hurt more than we helped?

Let's talk about consistencies. We just voted 2 bills in this Assembly, one of which raised the time that individuals could buy alcohol on Sundays until 11:00 o'clock. That one sailed through. We voted another

kod

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

one that said, sure, you can buy liquor on Election Day. I think that one had a little more trouble to go through. But it went through. Now we're saying, we have a problem. We have to control the amount of liquor available to these individuals. But yet we raised the time that individuals can buy it, we extended a day that they can buy it. How serious were we? How serious are we? Do we really want to help these kids? I really think we do.

Rep. Cappelletti and I have spoken several times about this issue. She is a very sincere individual and sincerely wants to help these kids. So do I. But I think what we have to do is place our emphasis on education, rather than legislation. We have to educate the young people in the State of Connecticut to the abuses and the problems with the abuse of alcohol. That has to take place in the classrooms, in the churches, in the homes, and throughout the community. It has to be a total community effort.

By us just simply saying we raised the age, I guarantee you that we will never ever see money appropriated for education on alcohol and drug abuses because we'll say we no longer have a problem. We raised it to 20. It's out of the schools. Don't worry about it. They're not

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

drinking. What are they going to be doing? You're going to force them to drink in cars. You're going to force them to go into the parking lots, drink in the cars, because they can't go into a bar, in a controlled situation, and partake of alcohol.

I don't own a bar. I don't frequent bars. As a matter of fact, I don't even drink. I don't smoke. I'm a very boring person. But let's look at what we're doing. Think about it. I have used emotionalism on many issues in this Chamber, you're all well aware of that. But I think what you have to do is take that emotionalism and really cut through it and look to the basic problem. The basic problem is we want to try to help kids. We want to prevent death. Why is an 18 year old who loses his license, God, we know that's tragic, why is losing his license any more tragic than a 40 year old who is driving in a car and is killed and leaves a wife and 3 kids. Have we talked about that? No. We're focusing on youth, saying that it's terrible. Of course it's terrible to have a life snuffed out at 17, 18, 16. Do we legislate to raise the age, or do we make, as Rep. Tulisano and the Judiciary Committee are doing extensive work with this year, do we make the penalty

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

for drunk driving tougher? Is that the way we get at it? Or maybe we get at it by raising the age of someone who can drive to 18, from 18 to 20?

I'm not sure what the answer is. But I know that the answer is not raising the age to 19, 20 or 21.

Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A"? Rep. Jack Rudolf.

REP. RUDOLF: (139th)

Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I rise to speak in this Chamber, but when a subject such as this comes up, I am compelled to let the people of Connecticut know that we have a responsibility here to protect the young people of Connecticut. And to listen to a school teacher tell the people of Connecticut that we're trying to save lives, and that he's not in favor of raising the drinking age, appears to be somewhat ludicrous.

I am the husband of a school teacher who sits with me in the evening and tells me about the availability of liquor, about the child that indulges in drinking before breakfast, about the child who spends his time in the parking lot at school drinking, and he's stoned

kod

92 779

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

before he gets to his first period class. Are we proud? Do we have reason to be proud of our stoned students? And I would suggest that we have a lot of making up to do.

My fellow colleagues, is it so wrong that a student that attends high school and graduates high school, that in order for him to be part of the in crowd, he must drink? Well, let me speak for those who do not drink, who are in the majority, those good students, of one youngster who came home early one evening and said to his dad, I came home early dad because they're all stoned, they're all drunk at the party and I care not to drink. And let's speak about the good.

But what is the responsibility of this legislative body, or this General Assembly? It's clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that when our law enforcement agents tell me as an elected official, that in order for them to enforce the law, to untie their hands because they can't arrest these youngsters. He said, please Rep. Rudolf, go back to the General Assembly and tell them to stop giving these youngsters a license to get drunk on.

And I want to applaud the General Law Committee for bringing this bill out to raise the age. And

kod

93

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I haven't said it yet, but I am rising here to support Rep. Rosso's amendment. I wish he'd gone to 21 because when I was here 9 years ago, I supported lowering the voting age to 18. And I think I made a mistake. And in so doing, so I feel I've granted Mr. Speaker, the right to lower the drinking age. And I think I made a terrible mistake. I think we ought to put it back to 21.

The future our youth in the State of Connecticut, and let's not make any mistake about it, these children belong to all of us, we represent every damn one of them. The future of our youth in Connecticut, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, is in our hands here today. And to the speaker, the prior speaker, the school teacher, I want to point out that these youngsters are still in their formative years. They're not adults and they can't handle it.

The law as it is written today, my colleagues, provides the youth with a license to drink. And when I see youngsters, 12, 13 and 14 years of age, attending our school system drunk, we've got a lot of thinking to do. I urge all of you, I urge all of you to think seriously, to make it your responsibility to finally say

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

we in Connecticut are concerned about our young people and vote to support this amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further? Rep. Alexander Zarnowski.

REP. ZARNOWSKI: (115th)

Mr. Speaker, thank you. I rise in opposition to this bill. I've seen too many children when I was Mayor of the City of West Haven, that came in, were brought in by the police

(microphone malfunction)

The office used to be right next to the police department and the turmoil that it caused when they were brought in dozens at a time.

I say it belongs home with the parents. If parents are allowing these children to get alcohol, if they have it in the home, if the children have the access to this alcohol, this is what it should go back to. I was opposed to lowering the drinking age to 18, but once they granted the 18 year olds the right to vote, the right to drink, to fight for their country. I think they're able to do almost everything that every other adult has a right to do, buy, the purchasing power, a

House of Representatives Wednesday, March 31, 1982

home, get married without consent. So I say if we lower this age, or raise this age from the 18 year old, we're doing a disservice to this country and to the youth of this country. Let the parents talk to these children. Tell them if they drink with grace, they're accepted anyplace.

But by raising the age limit at this time once you've given it to them, you're only going to create more drunks, in my estimation. So I oppose this bill and I hope that everybody thinks before they vote on this amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further? Rep. Tom Ritter.

REP. RITTER: (3rd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this amendment, this bill, and my reason is, while statistics may prove that younger people get into more accidents, I think it's appalling that the statistics that we have through all of our ages, whether you're 40 years old, 50, 60, we really do have a major problem of alcohol and drug abuse. If you're going to address this problem as a whole, my feeling would be that number one, you should have really tough drunken driving laws

House of Representatives Wednesday, March 31, 1982

that respond to everybody. In fact, I'd be in favor of a bill that would throw you in jail the first time you get convicted for drunken driving. We should have education and really tough laws.

If you're going to go about it this way, in terms of taking away the right, I honestly believe it's much more logical and if you really care about the public safety and well being of everybody, you should abolish alcohol. And I mean that very seriously. It's much more logical to abolish alcohol than to take it away from a certain segment of our population. And we all should be aware of the problems that we see in our everyday life and be consistent in the way that we address this problem. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. CAPPELLETTI: (71st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Norma Cappelletti.

REP. CAPPELLETTI: (71st)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There have been some

kod

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

comments made during the debate that I feel I just have to answer to. Rep. Sorensen made an allusion to the fact that we arbitrarily picked an age. I hope I made that quite clear that that was not done. It was not arbitrarily picked. I have information, as I said, before me that shows conclusively the age group that contributes mostly to the alcohol related problems and has the greatest representation within their cohort group, is the 19 year old. I did not make my decision to support this amendment for 20, indeed I have a similar amendment for the 20 year old, I did not make that decision lightly. In some figures that I have from CADAC, the 19 to 20 year olds who were admitted and readmitted to CADAC agencies, which means they're only the ones who sought treatment for alcoholism, they were elevated between the years of 80 and 81, there was an increase of 14.9%. In the 16 to 18 year olds, within that same age group, there was a 22% rise. Whereas in 25 to 21, that age group, it showed only a .2% increase. I think that is information that is pretty indicative.

Also, for the information of the General Assembly, I have to correct a statement that Rep. Sorensen made when he spoke of the CADAC Commission's stand on raising

kod

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

the drinking age. True, Rep. Sorensen's statement was correct. But that was before March 9, 1982, at which point, and I have a communication from them, on March 9, 1982, the Connecticut Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission voted to support legislation which would raise the drinking age.

At that time I believe they were in support of the 19 because they thought that was the bill, but I have spoken with them recently and I have every reason to believe that they would be supportive of raising it to the 20 year old because this information that I have that pinpoints the 19 year old as the greatest culprit in this problem, is information from them which I have discussed with them.

Also I get a little tired, I know you have all, I don't want to prolong this debate, I know you have all been through it before, but I really do get a little tired hearing the same arguments made constantly with the age of majority. Yes, at 18 they have the right to vote. There are 12 million 18 year olds who could vote in this country. And my latest statistics show that there are only 2 million who even avail themselves of that opportunity. What does one have to do with the

kod

99

786

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

other? Why because one note can take an 18 year old who is at the height of their physical prowess and train them, hone their reflexes, why does that mean that they can consume alcohol? Where is the logic in that argument? I don't see it.

I don't want to prolong this. I think it's an important issue. I would urge you all to support the 20 year, this amendment, and I would ask that when the roll be taken, it be taken by, when the vote is taken it be taken by roll. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The requisite 20% having been satisfied, when the vote is taken on this amendment, it will be taken by roll. Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A"?

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John Zajac.

kod

House of Representatives Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I'm not sure whether even the proponents of raising the drinking age are aware that this particular amendment, the way I read it, delays raising the drinking age to age 20 to October of 1983. Now there are other amendments in the Clerk's file that will simply raise it age 20 starting this year. We just passed a bill earlier, it wasn't on drinking age, but we accelerated the effective date. And I think that if we are in agreement that we have in fact a problem that everyone is alluding to, that we have all the educators, the principals, the board of education, the police departments, the letters of testimony that I have that are seeking this, that it's a now problem. And they want it changed now. Not in October of 1983.

We've debated this for years since it was passed in 1972. Now if you want to push it off another year and you want to wait until New York does whatever they do with it, but I for one frankly don't care what New York does with the bill. Massachusetts has passed it. Rhode Island has passed it. New Jersey has passed it. And the people in Massachusetts didn't say what is

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

Connecticut doing with it. And Rhode Island didn't say what is Connecticut doing with it. And neither did New Jersey say what did they care last year what New York was doing with it.

So as far as what New York may or may not do, but the fact is as someone put on the floor as a point and a fact, they haven't done anything since Prohibition, but the fact is, and think about this, ladies and gentlemen, those of you who are left, the fact that they are thinking about it this very year tells you something, does it not? That the problem is so great that even liberal New York this year is contemplating doing something with it. Because everybody around them, including New Jersey, has done it.

So I think you have to agree really the bottom line is, do we have a problem? The answer to that is yes. And I only wish that all of you this very year served on the General Law Committee and were privy to the type of testimony that came our way. And I know you can't, just like I can't be on all your committees, and sometimes when you allude to bills that you've heard testimony of, I wish I was there and could have heard it for myself.

kod

102

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

But to see parents and these people, other people, come and literally beg the committee, literally beg the committee to do something about this problem, I think you'd be aware that indeed there was a problem to solve. And for those that don't believe the statistics that they hear, which was the cry two years ago, let's wait, let's wait to get some statistics. We have no track records.

So what we've done is let the other states, in fact, set the track record. Let the other states take the initiative, the leadership, to solve the problem and then we have egg on our face and say later on that indeed, Massachusetts, Bay State's higher drinking age cuts teenage fatality traffic cases by 39%, right in our own Hartford Courant, dated Sunday, April 13, 1980.

The facts and the stats are there. We have waited for them. This is a now problem. I'll vote on the other amendment to raise it to 20, but I'm voting against this one which postpones it until October of 1983.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A"? Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A"? Rep. Richard Thorpey.

kod

103

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. TORPEY: (11th)

Mr. Speaker, I've listened to some brilliant orators here and I wish I could swing you, and apparently I haven't. The facts and figures that have been quoted, reports that have been referred to, all very dazzling. But at the public hearing the remark was made, there are no new arguments, just new graves.

Now I think there were two basic points that were made. There was about an equal number of people that spoke for and against. And both made valid points. On the one hand, you have the police, the educators, parents, youth advisors, begging us to raise the drinking age limit. On the other hand, you have the business people asking to leave it alone. And it was pretty clearcut they both made good points. So I think the question comes down to one thing. What price are you willing to pay for the almighty dollar? That's the question you have to answer.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A"? Rep. Joe Broder.

REP. BRODER: (48th)

Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to prolong debate on

kod

104

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

this because I know there will be a lot of other amendments offered by other people. I'd just like to point out that perhaps sometime, a month from now, there may be a state Senator or state legislator speaking in a Chamber similar to this in New York State. And what he'll be saying is, look what happened in Connecticut. They left their drinking age at 18. And indeed 25%, 45%, 75% of the youth in our state is within one hour or two hours of Connecticut's border, and won't it be easy for them to drive over there. We know Connecticut's not going to do anything because their Legislature has already adjourned. Ought Connecticut to be a follower or a leader? I submit on this issue, we should lead.

REP. RUDOLF: (139th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further? Rep. Jack Rudolf.

REP. RUDOLF: (139th)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify one thing here that in my remarks concerning the amendment, I was inaccurate. Rep. Zajaz pointed out, and rightly so, that the amendment takes us to October 1 of 1983. And I am not willing to wait that long. The bill calls for

kod

105 792

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

October of 1982 and that's my position. I support the bill.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

Would all the members please be seated. 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.

REP. MISCIKOSKI: (65th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

To what point do you rise, Sir? In dependency of a vote?

kod

106

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. MISCIKOSKI: (65th)

Point of abstaining from the vote because of a conflict of interest. I don't want to corrupt the Legislature.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Speaker will allow you to arise to that point, sir. The Journal will so note, Rep. Miscikoski. 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. Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 5489, Schedule House Amendment "A".

Total number voting	141
---------------------	-----

Necessary for passage	74
-----------------------	----

Those voting yea	63
------------------	----

Those voting nay	78
------------------	----

Those absent and not voting	10
-----------------------------	----

SPEAKER ABATE:

The amendment fails.

House Amendment Schedule "A".

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

In line 5, after the word "aye" and before the period, insert the following:

"AND ON AND AFTER OCTOBER 1, 1983, ANY PERSON UNDER TWENTY YEARS OF AGE"

In line 33, insert an opening bracket before the word "am", strike out the brackets before and after the number "18" and strike out the number "19"

In line 34, insert a closing bracket after the word "been" and insert the word "WAS" after the closing bracket

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further on this bill? Rep. Richard Balducci.

REP. BALDUCCI: (27th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 1989. If he would call and allow me to summarize please.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Clerk has in his possession an amendment, LCO No. 1989, designated House Amendment Schedule "B". Will the Clerk please call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 1989, Schedule House Amendment "B", offered by Rep. Balducci, entitled AN ACT RAISING THE DRINKING AGE TO 19.

kod

108

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. BALDUCCI: (27th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very quickly, this amendment raises from 16 to 18 the driving age in the State of Connecticut. And grandfathers in all of those people who will be 16 between now and October 1, 1982, the right to gain their driver's license. I move adoption of the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will the House of Representatives please come to order. Will the House please come to order. The question now is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "B". Will you remark further on its adoption? Will you remark further on the adoption of House "B"?

REP. BALDUCCI: (27th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Balducci.

kod

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. BALDUCCI: (27th)

Mr. Speaker, having sat through these types of discussions on the drinking age for many, many years and never really taking part in the discussion, I have heard over the period of time about problems we have had with the drinking age. And I basically support the theory of raising it to age 19. I just voted for an amendment which would raise the drinking age to 19 and 20.

One of the basic arguments has been that 18 is the age, 18 is the age for drinking, we should be allowed to do that. 18 is the age for which we should be allowed to be drafted. 18 is the age to own property. 18 is the age to vote. Since drinking and driving seem incompatible as far as accidents go, I felt it was proper to have before us a piece of legislation that would raise the driving age to age 18. I also have a couple of reasons for wanting to raise the driving age to age 18.

Having been a former teacher, I have two problems. And that's the problem of trying to have our students remain as students, having our young people remain as young people. It's bad enough that they wish to grow up so quickly, but we put an extra burden on them by allowing them to drive at the age of 16. It seems that

kdj

110

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

at the age of 16, they all wish to own a motor vehicle. And in order to own a motor vehicle, they must obtain a license, they must obtain insurance, they must maintain their motor vehicle and they must supply it with the necessary gas to operate.

In order to do this, many of them have chosen to take jobs. There is nothing wrong with having jobs. Some of the students may find it a necessity to have a job. But I also feel that many of them do that for the simple reason stated of supporting their motor vehicle. It doesn't allow them the time to participate in things such as athletics, in theatre, in student government, in music, etc., etc.

I think kids end up losing their identity many times and I think this serves a dual purpose. A, in helping to keep students and b, helping remove the potential of disaster through drinking and driving prior to age 18.

Mr. Speaker, I move passage of the amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Mr. Speaker.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. David Lavine.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Mr. Speaker, I would first question although I am not going to raise the issue, whether this amendment is properly in force. There may be a link in the Representative's mind between a driving license and a bottle of liquor, but I don't really believe that they necessarily come out of the same committee. Nor do I believe that the questions which are put to people when they go for their driving license. I think we certainly have seen a statistical relationship between youth and driving and I'm sorry we didn't pass the previous amendment which I think would have done more to alleviate the problem than this amendment.

But I don't see that this is really a matter that we should be looking at in terms of this bill. I missed the talk about the other types of transportation for the young people. I missed the discussion of the buses we should have. I missed the discussion of putting money into carpooling. I missed the discussion of making alternate transportation a possibility in cities and between cities.

All that seemed to have escaped the maker of the amendment. The one thing I think the amendment would do is put a stake through the bill. And I think we would not

kdj

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

have passed today a raise in the drinking age. So I would heartily oppose this amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

REP. SMITH: (108th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Martin Smith.

REP. SMITH: (108th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. May I absent myself on this particular amendment for a possible conflict of interest?

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Chair will so note.

REP. POLINSKY: (38th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Janet Polinsky.

REP. POLINSKY: (38th)

I rise and take issue with my friend and colleague, Rep. Balducci. I know what he speaks about. I can't disagree with it. What does concern me and what I have found in my own right and what I presume many mothers have found in their lives, particularly mothers who work, when you

kdj

113 800

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

are out working, when you are not at home, when you can't go shopping, when you can't take the dog to the vet because you're out working, you sit and count the days until your child has taken his driver education. Has taken the examination and gotten his license and then finally drives the car.

And can run to the laundry and can run to the drugstore and can run to the vet and do all those errands that you just don't have time for because you're out working. I think this amendment, well-intentioned though it may be, would do more harm than good.

I think that our parents, particularly the working mothers and Lord knows there's a lot more of them now than there were five and ten and fifteen years ago, would really, really be in a lot of trouble if we passed this amendment. So I would urge that we reject it because, Lord knows, when my kids turned 16, I said "Hallelujah."

And I think many, many other mothers would agree with me. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "B". Will you remark further on this amendment?

kdj

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. HOFMEISTER: (117th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. William Hofmeister.

REP. HOFMEISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur with Rep. Polinsky and I would like to also mention to you to Rep. Balducci that my new glasses give me a lot of trouble trying to see. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further?

REP. CAPPELLETTI: (71st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Norma Cappelletti.

REP. CAPPELLETTI: (71st)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise to oppose the amendment for all the reasons that have been given. But also I would imagine that something like this would have a fiscal impact on the state and I do not see any fiscal information. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "B"? If not, all those in favor of

kdj

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

adoption, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ABATE:

All those opposed nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Nay.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The nays have it.

House Amendment Schedule "B".

After line 107, insert sections 7 to 11, inclusive, as follows:

Sec. 7. Subsection (a) of section 14-36 of the general statutes, as amended by section 17 of public act 81-172, is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(a) No person shall operate a motor vehicle upon any public highway of this state or private road on which a speed limit has been established in accordance with subsection (a) of section 14-218a until he has obtained from the commissioner a license for such purpose, except that any person over (sixteen) EIGHTEEN years of age who has not had such a license suspended or revoked may, while under the instructions of, and accompanied by, a person who is at least eighteen years of age and has been licensed for not less than two years preceding such instruction to operate a motor vehicle of the same class as the motor vehicle being operated, who shall have full control of the motor vehicle as proved by law and except that any person holding a valid operator's license issued by another state may, for a period of sixty days following establishment by him of residence in this state, operate a motor vehicle of the class for which such license was issued in such other state upon such public highway or public road. No license to operate a motor vehicle upon such public highway

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

or private road. No license to operate a motor vehicle upon such public highway or private road shall be issued until the applicant therefor has signed and filed with the commissioner an application under oath, except that renewals from the year immediately preceding need not be under oath, stating such information as the commissioner requires; nor shall such license be issued until the commissioner is satisfied that the applicant is over (sixteen) EIGHTEEN years of age and is a suitable person to receive such license, PROVIDED THAT SUCH LICENSE SHALL BE ISSUED TO ANY APPLICANT OTHERWISE MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SECTION WHO ATTAINS THE AGE OF SIXTEEN YEARS BEFORE OCTOBER 1, 1982. Each applicant for a new operator's license shall, at the discretion of the commissioner, file with such application a copy of his birth certificate or other prima facie evidence of his date of birth. No person shall cause or permit the operation of any motor vehicle by any person under (sixteen) EIGHTEEN years of age, EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN THIS SUBSECTION. (No license shall be issued to any person between sixteen and eighteen years of age until the spouse, being eighteen years of age, of a married minor applicant, or one of both of the parents or foster parents, as the commissioner requires, or the legal guardian, of such applicant has filed a certificate with the commissioner in such form as he may prescribe, requesting or consenting to the issuance of such license, provided if any such applicant has no qualified spouse and his parent or foster parent or legal guardian is deceased, incapable, domiciled without the state or through any circumstance unavailable or unable to sign or file the certificate, such certificate of request or consent to the issuance of such license may be signed by the applicant's stepparent or his uncle or aunt, by blood or marriage, provided the person signing the certificate is at least eighteen years of age. No license shall be issued to any person between sixteen and eighteen years of age unless the applicant presents to the commissioner a certificate of the successful completion in a public secondary school, a state vocational school or a private secondary school of a full course of study in motor vehicle operation prepared as provided in section 10-24 or of training of similar nature provided by a licensed driver's school approved by the commissioner, including, in each case, successful completion of not less than six clock hours of behind-the-wheel, on-the-road instruction and passes an examination as prescribed by the commissioner. The commissioner may accept as evidence of sufficient training a certificate signed by the spouse, being eighteen years

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

of age, of a married minor applicant, or by a parent, grandparent, foster parent or the legal guardian of an applicant which states that the applicant has successfully completed a driving course taught by the person signing the certificate and that such signer has had an operator's license for at least two years preceding the date of the certificate or, if the applicant has no spouse, parent, grandparent, foster parent or guardian so qualified and available to give such instruction, such a certificate signed by the applicant's stepparent, brother, sister, uncle or aunt, by blood or marriage, provided the person signing the certificate is qualified and at least eighteen years of age. The commissioner shall provide forms for such certificates, which shall be called home training certificates. The commissioner may recall any license issued to a person under the age of eighteen years, upon violation by such person of any statutes or of any regulation promulgated by the commissioner.) If the commissioner requires a written examination of any applicant under this section, such examination shall be given in English or Spanish at the option of the applicant, provided the commissioner shall require that such applicant shall have sufficient understanding of English for the interpretation of traffic control signs.

Sec. 8. Section 14-39 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

Any person over (sixteen) EIGHTEEN years of age who is licensed to operate a motor vehicle in the state or country of which he is a resident may, subject to the provisions of section 14-216, operate any registered motor vehicle of the class for which such license was issued in such other state or country upon the highways of this state for the same period allowed by the state or country of his residence of this state without complying with the provisions of this chapter requiring the licensing of operators; provided no nonresident shall operate a public service motor vehicle in this state without obtaining a public service operator's license from the commissioner, except as provided in section 14-34. AS AMENDED BY SECTION 4 OF PUBLIC ACT 81-394, and section 14-44, and no nonresident shall operate a motor vehicle with a load greater than the capacity designated in section 14-267a, AS AMENDED BY SECTION 23 OF PUBLIC ACT 81-472. Each such nonresident shall cause to be displayed on the motor vehicle he is so operating the distinguishing number or mark required by the state or

country within which such motor vehicle is registered and he shall conform to all the requirements of the general statutes regarding equipment, marking and operation of motor vehicles registered in this state, except that the commissioner may enter into reciprocal agreements with the motor vehicle commissioner or other like authority of any other state, district or country concerning the equipment, marking or inspection of motor vehicles and may grant privileges concerning the noncompliance with the Connecticut laws requiring certain equipment, marking and inspection of motor vehicles if substantially similar privileges are granted regarding the equipment, marking and inspection of Connecticut registered vehicles operating in that state, district or country. Violation of any provisions of this section shall be an infraction, except that any person who violates any provision of section 14-276a, AS AMENDED, shall be fined as provided in said section.

SEC. 9. Subsection (a) of section 14-40a of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(a) No person shall operate a motorcycle upon any public highway of this state until he has obtained from the commissioner of motor vehicles a license for such purpose, except that any person over (sixteen) EIGHTEEN years of age who has not had such a license suspended or revoked may apply to the commissioner for a learner's permit. The commissioner may in his discretion, after the applicant has successfully passed all parts of the examination for an operator's license as required under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section other than the driving test, issue to the applicant a learner's permit, containing such limitation as the commissioner deems advisable, which shall entitle the applicant while having such permit in his immediate possession to drive a motorcycle upon the public highways, other than multiple lane limited access highways, for a period of sixty days. Any such permit may be renewed, or a new permit issued, for an additional period of sixty days. No such license shall be issued until the applicant therefor has signed and filed with the commissioner an application under oath, except that renewals from the year immediately preceding need not be under oath, stating such information as the commissioner requires; nor shall such license be issued until the commissioner is satisfied that the applicant is over

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

(sixteen) EIGHTEEN years of age and is a suitable person to receive such license, PROVIDED THAT SUCH LICENSE SHALL BE ISSUED TO ANY APPLICANT OTHERWISE MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SECTION WHO ATTAINS THE AGE OF SIXTEEN YEARS BEFORE OCTOBER 1, 1982. No person shall cause or permit the operation of a motorcycle by any person under (sixteen) EIGHTEEN years of age, EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN THIS SUBSECTION. (No license shall be issued to any person between sixteen and eighteen years of age until the spouse, being eighteen years of age, of a married minor applicant, or one of both of the parents or foster parents, as the commissioner requires, or the legal guardian, of such applicant has filed a certificate with the commissioner in such form as he may prescribe, requesting or consenting to the issuance of such license. No license shall be issued to any person between sixteen and eighteen years of age unless the applicant presents to the commissioner a certificate of the successful completion in a public secondary school of a full course of study in motor vehicle operation prepared as provided by section 10-24 or of training of similar nature provided by a licensed drivers' school approved by the commissioner, including, in each case, successful completion of not less than six clock hours of actual road instruction. The commissioner may accept as evidence of sufficient training a certificate signed by the spouse, being eighteen years of age, of a married minor applicant, or by a parent or a foster parent or the legal guardian of an applicant which states that the applicant has successfully completed a driving course taught by the person signing the certificate and that such person has held an operator's license for at least two years preceding the date of the certificate, or, if the applicant has no spouse, parent, foster parent, guardian so qualified as available to give such instruction, such a certificate signed by the applicant's stepparent, brother, sister, uncle or aunt, by blood or marriage, provided the person signing the certificate is qualified and at least eighteen years of age. The commissioner shall provide forms for such certificates, which shall be called home training certificates. The commissioner may recall any license issued to any person under the age of eighteen years, upon violation by such person of any statute or of any regulation promulgated by the commissioner.) If the commissioner requires a written examination of any applicant under this section, such examination shall be given in English or Spanish at the option of the applicant, provided the commissioner shall require that such applicant shall have sufficient understanding of English for the

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

interpretation of traffic control signs.

Sec. 10. Section 14-46 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

Each physician shall report immediately to the department of health services, in writing, the name, age and address of each person known to him or to be subject to recurrent attacks of epilepsy in any of its forms or to recurrent periods of unconsciousness uncontrolled by medical treatment. The department of health services shall report to the commissioner of motor vehicles the name, age and address of each person whose case is so reported and who is (sixteen) EIGHTEEN years of age or over. Such reports shall be for the information of the commissioner of motor vehicles in enforcing state motor vehicle laws, and shall be kept confidential and used solely for the purpose of determining the eligibility of any person to operate a motor vehicle on the highways of this state. Failure of a physician to report to the department of health services as required by this section shall be an infraction.

Sec. 11. Section 14-214 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

Any licensed operator, being eighteen years of age and having had an operator's license to operate a motor vehicle of the same class as the motor vehicle being operated for at least two years preceding the date of such instruction, may instruct a person (sixteen) EIGHTEEN or more years of age, not a licensed operator, in the operation of a motor vehicle. Any person so instructing another in the use of any motor vehicle except a motorcycle shall be so seated as to control the operation of the motor vehicle and shall be responsible for the operation thereof. Violation of any provision of this section shall be an infraction."

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on this bill?

REP. DE ZINNO: ((84th))

Mr. Speaker.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. De Zinno.

REP. DI ZINNO: (84th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, will the Clerk please call LCO No. 2841?

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Clerk has in his possession an amendment, LCO No. 2841, Designated House Amendment Schedule "C". Would the Clerk please call and read the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 2841, Schedule House Amendment Schedule "C" offered by Rep. DeZinno, 84th district, substitute House bill 5489 entitled AN ACT RAISING THE DRINKING AGE TO NINETEEN.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The amendment in is in your possession. What is your pleasure, sir.

REP. DE ZINNO: (84th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

On adoption of Amendment Schedule "C", will you remark now on its adoption?

kdj

123

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. DE ZINNO: (84th)

Yes sir, Mr. Speaker. And I will try to keep it very short, sir. There's a straight implementation of raising the drinking age to age 20. There is no delay of implementation. It would be effective October 1, 1982. I ask that when the vote be taken, it be taken by roll call, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ABATE:

In the opinion of the Chair, the requisite 20% has not been satisfied. The vote as taken will not be taken by roll. Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "C"? Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "C"?

If not, all those in favor please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ABATE:

All those opposed nay.

kdj

124

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REPRESENTATIVES:

Nay.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted and ruled technical.

Will you remark further on this bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "C"?

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Peter Fusscas.

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment there in the LCO, 2054. Would the Clerk please call the amendment and may I take leave of the House to summarize?

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Clerk has in his possession an amendment LCO No. 2054, Designated House Amendment Schedule "D". Would the Clerk please call the amendment?

CLERK:

LCO No. 2054, Schedule House Amendment "D". Entitled AN ACT RAISING THE DRINKING AGE TO NINETEEN.

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

May I take leave to summarize, sir?

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Clerk has called the amendment, Rep. Fusscas, and I assume your intent is to summarize the amendment? Is there objection to summarization? Hearing none, you may proceed to summarize the amendment, Rep. Fusscas.

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

Thank you, sir. This amendment addresses the question of driving and it simply says that anyone under the age of 18 who drives and drinks will lose their license until they are 18 or six months, whichever is longer.

It also says anyone caught with alcohol in their car will have their license suspended for 60 days.

I move adoption and when the roll is taken, that it be taken by roll call.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The question initially is on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "D". A request has been put to this Chamber for a roll call vote.

All those in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The requisite 20% has been satisfied. When the roll is taken, it will be taken by roll. Will you remark further

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "D"?

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

Thank you, sir.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Fusscas.

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't see how we can separate the question of drinking and the question of driving. As Rep. Ritter said, the two go hand in hand. However, we are addressing those minors in this bill, so this particular amendment only addresses drinking when you're a minor.

Drinking is not a Constitutional right. Driving is not a Constitutional right. It's a privilege. And this says simply that anyone who, under the age of 18, drinks and drives, regardless of content or the amount of alcohol or liquor, will lose their license until they are 18 or six months, whichever is longer.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have taken a great step forward by raising, by approving the amendment by limiting drinking to age 20. And this, I hope, will go a long way towards depriving those people who abuse the privilege by drinking under the age of 18, going to New York, what

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

have you, by taking their license away. And I urge every one of us in the General Assembly to continue to get tough on a very, very serious problem. And I urge adoption of this amendment. Thank you.

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "D". Will you remark further? Rep. Gene Migliaro.

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pose a question to the proponent of the bill through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

State your question please, sir.

REP. MIGLIARO:

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, through you, Rep. Fusscas, according to this amendment, if we adopt this amendment and the previous amendment that we just adopted with a drinking age of 20, I think waters it back to 18 again.

Correct me if I'm wrong.

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Fusscas, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

No, sir. In my estimation, this bill only addresses driving under the age of 18. It does not address the legal age of drinking. It only addresses a certain penalty for drinking under the age of 18.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Migliaro.

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Mr. Speaker, again through you, a question on line 35 to Rep. Fusscas.

SPEAKER ABATE:

State your question, please.

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Thank you. Rep. Fusscas, on line 35, according to the way I read it, in this section or until such minors' 18th birthday or for six months. In other words, 18th birthday would indicate to me that the agent has a right to drink to the age of 18. According to the way I interpret the amendment.

And if this were until such minor reaches the age of his 20th birthday, I could support this amendment. So to Rep. Fusscas, I would like to get his opinion on line 35.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Fusscas, will you respond sir?

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you. At this time, if I may, I would like to withdraw my amendment. No further questions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Fusscas.

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

Mr. Speaker, I thought that this was invalidated by the previous amendment, but I understand it isn't and I would like to pursue this further if I may.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The amendment is still before us then, sir. Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "D".

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

If I may answer, sir, Rep. Migliaro's question.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Proceed, please.

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

This addresses two different statutes. This only addresses driving between the ages of 16 and 18. And it

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

has no bearing on the age of 20 in which you can drink. It just merely says that, if you are, it addresses the driving statutes which says that if you are drinking under the age of 18, you will be deprived of your license under the terms of the bill.

REP, MIGLIARO: (80th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Migliaro.

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Mr. Speaker, if I may apply my question to one of the legal minds before the House, I would be very appreciative. I would like to ask Rep. Tulisano if he has read the amendment, and if I may get an interpretation on whether in line 35, which states, 18 years of age, will have any effect on the previous amendment we just passed, which increased the drinking age to 20. Through you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Tulisano, do you care to respond, sir?

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

Mr. Speaker, yes. Far be it from me to be the final decider of this issue, but it seems to me that, the minors for purposes of drinking will be 20 under the previous amendment. And that the alcohol is the issue in the area,

krr

131

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

and there seems to be a distinction being made because your 18, based on operation, you're treating 2 people, some minors differently than other minors. Minors under 20 for purposes of operation. I don't think you're supposed to treat them differently. I think you have an equal protection problem.

But, as I've indicated, I think it was said under 20, it would be okay, or everybody under 18, and that's the cutoff ages, 20 and 18, dealing with alcohol. It's got nothing to do with actual operation, and it's got to do with the age of majority for alcohol, and it happens to be 20 under the previous amendment. And I don't think it makes any sense as far as the law is concerned, from my opinion.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Just a question. I'm just trying to hear, Mr. Speaker. There's talking in the background. Was the answer yes or no? I believe it was no.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Tulisano is of the opinion that action on this

krr

132

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

amendment would be inconsistent with action on the prior amendment.

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Tulisano.

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to oppose the amendment before us, besides the grounds just discussed. Dealing with line 2, operating a motor vehicle at a time when there is a measurable amount of alcohol. I really don't know what that means either, in terms of a good piece of legislation.

I suspect might mean on here, what is improper to have in your blood stream. It is not illegal for individuals to operate with .001. I presume it might be measurable, and yet we are going to punish some people for operating almost like a status offender, if you will, if you recall

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

the old law dealing with children. I mean, it's not a crime for people to operate a vehicle with measurable amounts of alcohol. It is a crime to operate a motor vehicle with certain amounts of alcohol which are measured, and in this case it doesn't clarify what we're saying.

So once you've developed some machine that can make that determination, or some chemical analysis, you will make some people being treated unequal again, under the law, which I think is improper, and for that reason I think we should oppose this amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John Zajac.

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I oppose the amendment also with tongue in cheek for being criticized for not wanting to get tough on the drinking, driving laws, but also can already see where this bill has gone with an amendment that in fact, addresses itself to a piece of legislation that indeed did not have a public hearing, that probably should be referred

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

to Judiciary, and I'm sure should this bill pass in any form and get to the Senate, that's exactly what would happen, a motion made to be referred to Judiciary.

I'm positive that if we indeed want to act on raising the drinking age, getting it out of the high schools, then let's keep the bill nice and simple and clean and vote it up and down, or down on that basis, without junking it up, quite frankly with all kinds of judicial matters, and blood tests that we have not in fact, addressed in the General Law Committee on the bill of raising drinking age. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoptio of House Amendment Schedule "D"? If not, would all the members please be seated. All the members please be seated. Staff and guests, please, 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? Would the members please check the roll machine. The machine will be locked. The

krr

House of Representatives Wednesday, March 31, 1982

Clerk will take the tally.

Would the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "D".

Total number voting	143
Necessary for passage	72
Those voting yea	33
Those voting nay	110
Those absent and not voting	8

SPEAKER ABATE:

The amendment fails.

House Amendment Schedule "D".

After line 107, insert section 7 as follows:

"Sec. 7. Section 14-111a of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

Any minor (1) operating a motor vehicle, unless accompanied by his parent or guardian, in which a police officer finds alcoholic liquor as defined in section 30-1, or (2) OPERATING A MOTOR VEHICLE AT A TIME WHEN THERE IS A MEASURABLE AMOUNT OF ALCOHOL IN HIS BLOOD AS DETERMINED BY A POLICE OFFICER, may be summoned by such officer to appear at a hearing before the commissioner of motor vehicles, or an agent duly authorized by said commissioner to show cause why his operator's license should not be revoked. If at such hearing the commissioner or his agent finds that such minor knew or had reason to know that alcoholic liquor was in such motor vehicle OR THAT SUCH MINOR HAD A MEASURABLE AMOUNT OF ALCOHOL IN HIS BLOOD, he may revoke the operator's license of such minor for a period

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

not exceeding sixty days IN THE CASE OF A FINDING UNDER SUBDIVISION (1) OF THIS SECTION OR UNTIL SUCH MINOR'S EIGHTEENTH BIRTHDAY OR FOR SIX MONTHS, WHICHEVER PERIOD IS GREATER, IN THE CASE OF A FINDING UNDER SUBDIVISION (2) OF THIS SECTION. "

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further on this bill?

REP. VAN NORSTRAND: (141st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. VanNorstrand.

REP. VAN NORSTRAND: (141st)

Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief, because obviously there's been a lot of debate about this. This bill has been before us 2 or 3 times before, since I've been in the Assembly, and on each occasion I've opposed it. I have opposed it as a matter of logic, but to me the wrong debate is always occurring here, that either you have 18 year old, with majority, or you do not. And that you cannot start picking and choosing rights for which someone will be considered an adult or not.

I remember an amendment last year had the situation where you could not drink until a certain age, but you could get a liquor license, and own the place, but you couldn't

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

drink it. That makes no sense. Either you are an adult, or you're not. That is where logic has brought me year after year on this issue.

I hope as long as I ever serve here, I will have the relative flexibility to change on some things, and I am changing today, and I am voting for this bill, and I am not doing it out of logic. I think it is illogic, but after what has been experienced in my community, and the carnage that has occurred on the highways in this state, I've had enough. I think that this is a small step. It is the minimal intrusion on my logic, if you will. It's the minimal intrusion on the concept of 18 year old majority, but for that reason I'm going to support this bill.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on this bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "C"? Will you remark further on this bill as amended by House "C"?

REP. ATKIN: (140th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John Atkin.

REP. ATKIN: (140th)

Mr. Speaker, thank you. Just briefly, Mr. Speaker. I know there were a lot of people not in the Chamber when

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

a previous amendment was passed. The bill now has raised the drinking age to 20, and I'd just like to briefly say, concerning my earlier remarks that the bill that will be pending the New York State Legislature, raises the age to 19.

So even if New York were to raise it, if we pass this bill to 20, we'll still have the problems that I alluded to earlier. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on this bill as amended?
Will you remark further on this bill as amended?

REP. CAPPELLETTI: (71st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Cappelletti.

REP. CAPPELLETTI: (71st)

Just so the information is complete, and I too know that there were many members out of the Chamber when I informed the Chamber that there was an additional bill in New York State Legislature that would phase in the drinking age, and it would eventually in January 1, 1984, raise it to 20 years of age. Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further?

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Linda Emmons.

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Mr. Speaker, I had preferred the age of 19, and I think that some people did not realize their vote on what was not a roll call vote a few moments ago. And I have heard people around me say, well they're not going to vote for the bill now that it's at 20. I feel that that's unfortunate, and I'm not sure that some of the procedures that occurred was an attempt to kill the bill altogether.

But I would like to encourage those people who want to see the drinking age raised, but would prefer 19, to send this to the Senate. They too have wisdom sometimes and I could hope that this debate would be heard and the vote rational, and if 19 is the only age in which we can get it on the books, that they will amend it down to 19, and it will come back, and we will have an orderly process in the House, and people will know what they're voting for, and do what I think many had intended.

I wasn't planning to speak on the bill, and I have 2 teenage boys, and I have watched these boys grow, and I

krr

140

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

watched all the kids who go down to the package store at 7:00 o'clock at night, and my center of town is teeming with cars and kids running in to several package stores, because we have all them located right down in the main part of town.

And I would say that there are probably 50 to 100 kids between the ages of 14 and 18 and they are basically boys who are down there, and somebody who's a senior in their class is buying booze for them, and buying beer, and then they all go off to the Killingworth dump, or some other good place, and they sit there and they consume it, and then they rush home at 1:00 in the morning and then we have our accidents.

I truly believe that if you don't have the ability to get, have your seniors in your class buy liquor, you will have less drinking in high school. It's an absolute fact, and if you talk with the package store owners, you'll find the kids that are buying, the younger kids, are not graduates of a high school, because a guy that's graduated from high school doesn't talk to those kids that are still left in high school. They don't socialize with them, and they have nothing to do with them.

I will probably lose my mailbox for the next 2 weeks for having gotten up to speak, but I really think that it

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

is time to do something about it. I understand and hear Rep. Sorensen who talks about these kids being mature, and adult. Well, let me tell you they're not, and everybody who's in this room who is a parent knows that half the kids aren't adults, and you're glad that they're not married, and you're glad that they're not raising children, and I don't see how you can possibly sit here and say, that they're adults and therefore they should have the right to drink.

I would urge you to vote for the bill, and I would hope that if 20 is not acceptable to the Senate it will come back down to 19. But I would hate to see the bill die, because of the methods that went on, and there are people who do not want the bill to die at 20.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Christopher Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 4953. If the Clerk would call the amendment and also read it.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Clerk has in his possession an amendment, LCO

krr

142

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

No. 2953, designated House Amendment Schedule "E". Would the Clerk please call and read the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 2953, offered by Rep. Shays, et al, entitled AN ACT RAISING THE DRINKING AGE TO 19.

After line 107, insert section 7 as follows:

"Sec. 7. This act shall take effect upon the enactment, of legislation raising the legal drinking age to twenty or greater, by the State of New York."

SPEAKER ABATE:

The amendment is in your possession, sir. What is your pleasure.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

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

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would have far preferred a drinking age of 19, and I had a similar amendment that would have attempted, and taken effect, had the State of New York adopted a drinking age of 19. But for anyone living in Stamford or Norwalk, as Rep. Atkins points out, raising the drinking age to 20 will have no effect on us whatsoever,

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

other than to drive people to New York State.

The argument that you've heard, it seems to be a logical amendment, and I hope you would adopt it.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John Zajac.

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to oppose the amendment for what I said earlier, but I'll probably say it in a little different words this time.

As I said before, Rhode Island and Massachusetts, looking easterly and looking northerly to us, have passed 20 years. Why do we have to look southerly to New York and have them be the fulcrum of what we set in our age, and what they do. New Jersey. I would also point out a little piece of information that's worthy on this particular amendment.

A member of the committee who took upon herself to check over the line in Brewster, how many Connecticut cars were parked over there buying liquor now. And I would point

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

out at the present, at the present drinking age, there would be no reason for anyone from Fairfield County or otherwise to go over the New York line, except for the price differential, certainly not the drinking age, and yet the parking lots were reamed with Connecticut cars,

Therefore, I am not one that would support this amendment, saying let's wait with New York. If they're going over now, those that will continue to want to take this chance and go over, so be it. Let's straighten it out for the 95% of the rest of the state. Let's send it to the Senate, as Rep. Linda Emmons said. Let's test their minds and wisdom on whether they will buy 20, or whether the best we can get out of this legislature is 19, and if they send it back to us at 19, then we know that that's what we have to look forward to because that's the compromise between the 2 houses. Not whether New York dictates to us. Let's take the lead from what Rhode Island and Massachusetts have already, in fact dicated to us,

I oppose the amendment, on a would be, if, some other state does something if and when.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. SCHMIDLE: (106th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Mae Schmidle.

REP. SCHMIDLE: (106th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment. I too strongly believe that Connecticut should do what's right for us, and what's right for our young people. The groups that came to testify before this, in committee were the most responsible groups in the State of Connecticut who were interested in and who cared for the children. CEA, the Connecticut Education Association came and spoke in favor of raising the drinking age. The PTA, the parents who are concerned about the young people are in favor of raising the drinking age. The secondary school administrators came and nearly pleaded with the committee to raise the drinking age.

And it's true, there were several groups who were opposed to raising the drinking age. One of them was the Drug and Alcohol Council, and they said, well, we have education. Let us continue education. We've been trying to educate young people for 10 years, and it really hasn't worked, and I am not convinced that it's going to work if we continue in the same direction that we're now going.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

The restaurant and cafe' groups came and they testified against raising the drinking age. One woman representing the cafe' group stood in front of our committee, and said, I want you to know that I take better care of your 18 year olds when they're in my bar than you do when they're at home. I think that's a terrible statement to make.

Another very young attractive woman came to testify before us, and she said that she was a bartender and she was 19 years old. If we raised the drinking age, she would lose her job, plus her boss is paying to have her teeth fixed, and she wouldn't be able to get her teeth fixed, if she couldn't be a bartender.

I think those are terrible reasons for not raising the drinking age.

The other thing that they testified was that there are 80,000 young people, the age of 18 in our state. You're talking about 19. That's probably another 80,000. We're talking about the impact on 160,000 young people in our state, and all responsible groups who deal with young people who feel we should raise the drinking age, and I think Connecticut should do what's right for us, and not what our neighbors do. Thank you.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Robert Jaekle.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment says what should be very obvious to all of us in the Connecticut General Assembly. Connecticut is not an island unto itself. We are a very small state. I stood by silently when I heard Rhode Island's raised their drinking age. Massachusetts raised their drinking age. Let's join. So New York's off to the side. Well, you know, New York isn't just off to the side, way out there.

For a lot of us in the State of Connecticut, New York is the closest boundary to our municipalities, to our children. I know it is in my town.

I went through the era in high school where the drinking age was 21, and I can remember my friends, my peers, driving to New York State to drink. The drive to New York never bothered me. It seems it was the drive back home that caused the problem.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

This amendment will say, when the loop is completed around the State of Connecticut, when all our surrounding states have raised their drinking age, then indeed it would be proper for Connecticut to have their age raised.

Frankly, if every state had a higher drinking age I'd be the first one to ask to raise ours, for our own self defense for the huge influx of 18 and 19 year olds into Connecticut.

This amendment, I think, envisions somewhat of a regional compact. All states working together to raise the drinking age. Talking about an hours drive to New York, I'm not willing to say all states beyond New York. I'm not talking about a 5 or 6 hour airplane ride somewhere to get legal liquor, but New York State is just too close to too many of our young people in this state, that I am afraid that the horrors of the late 60s, where fatal accidents weren't occurring on our local --

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Jaekle, excuse me. Would the House of Representatives please come to order. Would the House please come to order. I'm sorry, Rep. Jaekle. That's the second time that that's happened to you today. I would hope that the membership would be more aware of their disruption. You have the floor, sir.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Maybe I ought to jazz up my act, Mr. Speaker.

I remember the horror stories when I was in high school, and the accidents weren't taking place as often on the local roads. There were serious fatal accidents occurring on the interstates between, well from my perspective, my town and New York State. That's what I've been afraid of. I do care what New York State's legal drinking age is. That is not irrelevant. It is not a question of leading v following. It is a fact. In our small State of Connecticut that liquor over the state line of New York is too easily accessible.

When New York State raises their drinking age, I'd like to see our state raise theirs at the same time. Not waiting for a year or two for the legislature to act. This amendment clearly says the effective date of raising our drinking age will be upon enactment by the State of New York, raising its drinking age. It will happen in concert. The loop will be closed. Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut would all have a higher legal drinking age, and I think we would find there wouldn't be these little runs from Massachusetts to Connecticut, or to New York. We would all be able to live safer, and I think our childrens' lives would be enhanced by that sort of cooperative arrangement.

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

That's why I support the amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Eugene Migliaro.

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I won't go through 15 minutes of repetitious testimony, but I will just site a couple of things.

We hear, and I've heard enough about the New York State line. I could care less about the New York State line, or what the legislative body in the State of New York does, and I don't think that we should be held in hostage, if I may use that word, dependent on whether this bill will become a reality because of what the New York legislative body will do.

I will site once more, for the record, 1971, prior to lowering the drinking age. Total accidents, 28,387. Drinking drivers, 3,308. Drinking drivers under 21, 430. How many of that 430 went over the New York line. Your guess is as good as mine. Because we didn't have the

krr

151

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

18 year old then. It was 21. 1972, we lowered the drinking age. I didn't. I wasn't here. 36,171 accidents. 3,900 drinking drivers. 689 under the age of 21. An increase of 36%.

So don't sell me the bill of goods about the New York line, and people going across it. The records show that when the drinking age was 21, there were less fatalities and drinking drivers under the age of 21, than there are now, and they still had access to the borders of New York.

So then let them go to New York and have their accidents there.

In closing, you will not get a 15 or a 16 year old child to go to New York for a drink, but you will get the 18, and if the 18 wants to go to New York, which they did in the past, the records show they handled their booze better over the state line. So let's go back to what it was and get down to the statistics that we're saving lives.

I oppose the amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. STEEVES: (116th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Borden Steeves.

REP. STEEVES: (116th)

I rise to oppose this amendment. I feel that we should not be saying that Connecticut is an island unto itself. I think what we should do is make New York the island. New Jersey is 19. Pennsylvania is 20. Why not make Connecticut 20, and put New York as the island unto itself.

I rise to oppose this, and move on to the bill.

Thank you.

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John Zajac.

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Very briefly. Second time on the amendment, speaking against, Mr. Speaker. I would simply say that we're not the loop, not the completion of a loop, in fact, we would be the missing link rather than the loop. And I do in my heart try to appreciate the problem of the boundaries. But we have a boundary to the north of us at Mass. and we have a boundary easterly to Rhode Island, and they have had the problem and addressed it, and they never once said, we'll

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

pass a bill it, raising it on the premise of what Connecticut may do. They addressed the problem.

We may have more or a problem on our southerly border, yet we have to look at what's good for the totality of Connecticut, and all the problems that exist with drinking. Drinking is only 1 part of it. I will read, in brevity, one little paragraph here of a local man in Wallingford, a paper which said, for instance, that complaints about minors being served in bars go in cycles. Rose said. He's the investigator for the liquor commission. The investigator said the State Liquor Commission today, Friday night, apprehended a 17 year old bartender working illegally at a local tavern.

The drinking age thing is proliferated not only to car fatalities, drinking on the highway, but also in the bars, bartenders, drinking in schools. The whole problem has to be addressed by raising it, not only on 1 border, but on what it has done for the educational system and everything else involved, and that's why I oppose the amendment, not with any feeling or lack of feeling on what my friends and colleagues may experience to the south, because perhaps they do have more problems that we centrally may have, but I have to oppose it on the basis that we should do in Connecticut what we feel is right regardless of what

kr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

New York or another state may do.

REP. BELAGA: (136th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Julie Belaga.

REP. BELAGA: (136th)

Mr. Speaker, thank you. I stand to support the amendment. And I think what we see here is an interesting case of an area of the state that has had a unique experience, that those communities that border the New York area have already learned what it's like to live with a differential.

And although in the past, Massachusetts and Rhode Island have changed their drinking age, they did not go through the traumatic experience that those of us who live in our region have already been through.

It's a little shocking to me, doubly traumatic as I discover that Bobby Jaekle is old enough to be my son, but in fact, the experience that I have with the 21, --

(Defect in belt)

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Carragher.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

-- in that the committee gave considerable thought to this particular idea, and one of the reasons we did is that Rep. Shays had talked to me, and I'm sure to others about this particular idea.

However, the problem I see with taking this approach is simply that those of you in this Chamber who may possibly recall the opening remarks that I made when I brought this bill out today, will recall that I discussed the multitude of issues that are involved here. The multitude of issues. One of that multitude happens to be the question of the State of New York, which I addressed, but that is only one part of the situation here. There are many other aspects involved.

And it would seem to me, and even though I have sympathy with those from Fairfield county and elsewhere who may have a special problem here, it seems to me that the day that this legislature of the State of Connecticut starts legislating on the basis of what the State of New York, or any other state is going to do, it seems to me that we are abdicating our fundamental moral responsibility right here.

There are many other issues involved here, and we have a responsibility to make the judgment, for better, for

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

worse, based on all of those issues. I would point out to you that there is a fundamental defect in this amendment as the bill now stands before us, and that is, that the bill as it now stands before us, will raise the drinking age in Connecticut to 20 years old, on Oct. 1, 1982.

If you pass this amendment, it is only going to be contingent upon New York passing a 19. So I don't think that's going to solve the difficulty here. Someone saying I have the wrong amendment in front of me?

Excuse me, I noticed that Rep. Shays did change that, so the last statement I made is not correct.

I would, however, stand by the original statement that I made that the State of New York's actions is only 1 part of the whole puzzle here. That there's a lot more at stake. There's a lot more reasons. I think it would be a mistake to tie us into New York. We have a moral responsibility, and we should act that way. I therefore oppose the amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. ALLEN: (143rd)

Mr. Speaker.

krr

157 843

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Yorke Allen.

REP. ALLEN: (143rd)

I rise in opposition to this amendment. My district is smack on the New York state line. Rep. Belaga's is quite some distance from the New York state line. I see no reason why we should wait on some other state. We should act the way we think.

Many of the people in our part of the state are refugees from New York State and are darned glad to be in Connecticut. And let's act as Connecticut people and not wait for New York maybe to do something. Let's kill this amendment.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment? If not, all those in favor of the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "E", please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ABATE:

All those opposed nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Chair will put the question again.

All those in favor of the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "E", please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ABATE:

All those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The nays have it. The amendment fails.

Will you remark further on this bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "C"?

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. John Zajac.

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO 2954. Mr. Speaker, I request the Clerk to call.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Clerk has in his possession an amendment, LCO 2954, designated House Amendment Schedule "F". Would the

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

Clerk please call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 2954, House Amendment Schedule "F", offered by Rep. Zajac, 83rd District, entitled AN ACT RAISING THE DRINKING AGE TO 19.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Rep. Zajac, have copies of this amendment been circulated as required, sir?

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

I believe not, sir. I've just been handed this. It's a redraft of an earlier amendment, but by virtue of the voice vote raising to 20, this simply updates the 19 to 20 on that one.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The Chair will put the Chamber at ease for a brief period of time until this amendment can be photocopied. I would recommend you do a few copies for each side of the aisle, sir.

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Thank you.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The House of Representatives please come to order. House Amendment Schedule "F", LCO No. 2954 has been called. The gentleman is seeking leave of the Chamber in order to

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

summarize this amendment?

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Is there objection to summarization? Hearing none, you may proceed to do so, Rep. Zajac.

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Mr. Speaker, this is technical in nature. At least I feel so, and all it does is bring the statutes in conformity. It brings up a motor vehicle statute which was the only thing, in my opinion, we did not address in committee.

Where it required permission by parents or guardians in the car, in fact, if a minor was found with liquor in the car, that particular statute just was for germaneness, consistency, should be elevated to 20 as the rest of the statute and file copy did, and that's all this amendment does.

I move the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ABATE:

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

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Mr. Speaker, my explanation was the amendment. I'd

krr

161

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

just ask support of the Chamber for affirmative action for it before we send it to the Senate.

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "F"? Will you remark further on the adoption of this amendment?

If not, all those in favor of its adoption, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ABATE:

All those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

SPEAKER ABATE:

The ayes have it. It is adopted and ruled technical.

House Amendment Schedule "F".

After line 107, insert section 7 as follows:

"Sec. 7. Section 14-111a of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

Any (minor) PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF TWENTY operating a motor vehicle, unless accompanied by his parent or guardian, in which a police officer finds alcoholic liquor as defined in section 30-1, may be summoned by such officer to appear at a hearing before the commissioner of motor vehicles, or an

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

agent duly authorized by (said) THE COMMISSIONER, to show cause why his operator's license should not be revoked. If at such hearing the commissioner or his agent finds that such (minor) PERSON knew or had reason to know that alcoholic liquor was in such motor vehicle, he may revoke the operator's license of such (minor) PERSON for a period not exceeding sixty days."

SPEAKER ABATE:

Will you remark further on this bill as amended by House Amendment Schedules "C" and "F"?

Would all the members please be seated. Staff and guests, please, all staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Would all the members please be seated. Would the members please be seated. Would 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? 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?

krr

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 31, 1982

CLERK:

House Bill 5489, as amended by House Amendment Schedules "C" and "F".

Total number voting	143
Necessary for passage	72
Those voting yea	89
Those voting nay	54
Those absent and not voting	8

SPEAKER ABATE:

The bill as amended passes.

CLERK:

Page 5, Calendar No. 66, Substitute for House Bill No. 5797, AN ACT INCREASING THE AMOUNT OF DEPOSIT COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE SERVICES MAY REQUIRE AS SECURITY UNDER THE SALES TAX AND ADMISSIONS, CABARET AND DUES TAX. Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Ronald Smoko.

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

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

kgg

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

CLERK:

Calendar page 31, potential disagreeing action.

Calendar No. 62, Substitute for House Bill No. 5489,

AN ACT RAISING THE DRINKING AGE TO AGE NINETEEN as amended by House Amendment Schedules "C" and "F" and Senate Amendments Schedules "C" and "D". Favorable Report of the Committee on General Law.

The Senate rejected House Amendment Schedules "C" and "F" on April 7, 1982.

REP. CARRIGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Mr. Carrigher.

REP. CARRIGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committees Favorable Report and passage of this bill in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on the Joint Committees Favorable Report and passage of this bill in concurrence with the Senate. Will you remark, sir.

REP. CARRIGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has LCO No. 2841 which

kgg

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

was previously designated House Amendment Schedule "C". Would the Clerk please call and read that amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk has LCO No. 2841 previously designated House Amendment Schedule "C". Would the Clerk please call and read the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 2841 designated House Amendment Schedule "C" offered by Rep. DeZinno of the 84th District.

In line 5 strike out nineteen and insert twenty in lieu thereof:

In line 33 strike out nineteen and insert twenty in lieu thereof:

In line 67 strike out nineteen and insert twenty in lieu thereof:

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The amendment is in your possession. What is your pleasure, sir.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker, I move the rejection of House Amendment Schedule "C" in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on rejection of House Amendment

kgg

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

Schedule "C". Will you remark on its rejection.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker and members of the House, as all of you know, this amendment in fact, would raise the drinking age to 20 years old in the State of Connecticut. It was passed by this House and was rejected by the State Senate.

It is my intention and I want to make it clear at the outset that regardless of whether or not I happen to personally feel that the drinking age should or should not be 20 years old, it is my intention to do all I can to make sure that when this bill leaves this Chamber today, that it is in concurrence with the Senate and will be on its way to Governor O'Neill's desk.

we have debated this issue at great lengths for a number of years in both Chambers. I will, therefore, be brief and simply say that I want to send this bill not back to the Senate, I want to send it to Governor O'Neill for his signature and for that reason, I favor the rejection of this amendment.

At this time I would like to yield to Rep.

Brunnock.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Brunnock, do you accept the yield, sir.

kgg

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

REP. BRUNNOCK: (74th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to show that I'm abstaining on this for a possible conflict.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk please note.

REP. MERCIER: (44th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Mercier.

REP. MERCIER: (44th)

For the same reason.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk please note.

REP. ANASTASIA: (138th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Anastasia.

REP. ANASTASIA:

For the same reason, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk please note.

REP. DEL PERCIO: (127th)

Mr. Speaker.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Del Percio.

REP. DEL PERCIO: (127th)

For the same reason.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Thank you, sir.

REP. MISCIKOSKI: (65th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on the rejection of House
"C". Rep. John Miscikoski.

REP. MISCIKOSKI: (65th)

Mr. Speaker. I'd love to talk on this bill but
I have to take a walk on it as part of the conflict of
interest.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Thank you. The Journal will so note, sir.

Will you remark further on the rejection of House
Amendment Schedule "C"?

REP. SORENSEN: (82nd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Robert Sorensen.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

REP. SORENSEN: (82nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to me that little over a week ago we were implored to raise the drinking age to 20 and it seemed like there was an overwhelming commitment to raise that drinking age to 20. We felt 19 wasn't high enough. Let's raise it to 20 so we can stop this carnage on the highways.

We've got to get it out of our highschools. That commitment was so strong and was so eloquently expressed by so many people on both sides of the aisle. But what it seems like, here's a case where perhaps political practicality is going to outweigh that tremendous commitment that people had.

I think that's a sad state of affairs. If you really firmly believed and still believe that that age should be 20, then I don't see how in your conscience, those of you that were in favor of that, can vote to reject that motion. To vote to reject the amendment.

Is your commitment one that only lasts for a week? Is your commitment one that is so weak that political practicality will override that? The people in this Chamber are well aware of where I stand.

I have spoken in the last four years on every

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

occasion that this drinking bill has come up. I have spoken that it should remain at 18. You know my arguments. I'm not going to go over them again. You're all well aware of it.

But what I'm disappointed in is what I understand is going to happen. If the commitment is that weak, then I'm very sorry to see that. If the commitment is strong, and you're going to allow that commitment to override the political practicality of it, and you really firmly believe that it should be 20, then that's what you should vote.

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Linda Emmons.

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Arriving in response to the last speaker, because I had not intended to speak on this bill, I voted for the 20 and I wanted it at 19. However the way the vote went the last time the opportunity was either you voted for 20 and hoped the Senate would bring it to 19, or you killed the bill, and I felt that when we voted on it a week ago and I still happen to agree 19 is the age that is going to be able to fly and therefore I do not feel at all hypocritical about voting to accept the

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

Senate amendment. I just wish we had done it properly last time.

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further? Rep. Zajac.

REP. ZAJAC: (83rd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in response to Rep. Sorensen, I'd simply point out also that many of us mentioned on the floor in the debate last week that the committee in fact over the years that deliberated it in realization, practicalities have always thought that 19 was the best that we could get out of the committee.

Recently, I had the opportunity to hear an interview on radio, WPOP, of the Governor, and again, political realities are such that he will sign at least, he said the age 19 bill, should it reach his desk. He has some reservations to some problems with age 20. He said over the radio he would have to then confer with the Governor of New York, and wait upon the action of New York.

So, I would also say to Rep. Sorensen that as many times happens in this Chamber, as well as we've done with other issues that we've sent to the Senate and compromised

kpt

House of Representatives Wednesday, April 14, 1982

and one who's grown up as a half pint all my life in this case think that a half a pint is better than a liter, sir.

I urge you to adopt the recommendation of the House Chairman, Rep. Carragher.

REP. STEEVES: (116th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Borden Steeves.

REP. STEEVES: (116th)

Mr. Speaker. Now that we have been ostracized or criticized or spanked by Rep. Sorensen, I don't feel that he has heard the body or even read the feelings of the body here today.

I had a poll taken and just like Ivory Soap, 99-99/100 per cent of the people said 20 or 21 should be the drinking age. Not 19. Not 18. Twenty or 21. I feel today that I should stick to 20 or 21. However, when the Governor says that he will veto a 20 year age drinking law, then we take what we can get and we'll go for 19, irregardless of our own feelings. We are taking a step in the right direction and I feel that we just as has been said, will take what we get and we'll like it for this time. We can come back again next year and get something better. Thank you.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Eugene Migliaro.

REP. MIGLIARO: (80th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't be repetitious either. But I can assure you of one thing. When I hear assinine statements coming from the other side of the aisle I get a little bit upset.

When I have to listen to somebody come in here and try to insult my intelligence and tell me that because we voted for 20 that maybe we're doing the wrong thing and be coy about it. We're dealing with kids lives in this state and it's nothing to take lightly.

Maybe Mr. Sorensen's ego is hurt because he didn't get his way this time. But when I see an individual get up and talk about the KKK to protect people and their lives and then ignore something like this that is very evident, because of the statistics that have been proven that these kids are killing themselves and then to come in here and make a mockery of it, turns me off.

I don't think anybody was swayed by his remarks which he tried to do, tried to act like a politician over there and figured he could sway people to vote against these

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

amendments so the bill will die. He's got another guess coming.

Governor O'Neill says he will sign that bill at 19. He didn't indicate he would sign it at 20, but he has made a commitment publicly that he will sign that bill at 19. The original bill that I put in was 21. And I'd love to see it 21. I'd love to see it 20. But I'll accept 19, because at least it will take it out of the highschools, and if you can't lean on that and realize that, then something has to be done with your mind as far as I'm concerned.

You've got to be sick not to recognize how these kids are being affected, particularly in the highschools by the drinking, the 18 year olds and what they're doing.

This bill is important. Nineteen is important and I'll tell you why it's important. Under the present statutes, under the present laws, and 18 year old and believe me there are many 18 year olds in highschools, and some 19 and 20 as well, because not everybody's bright. They don't get out at 17 and 18. They can carry that booze in their cars, on the grounds and the local pd's can't do a thing about it, because legally they could have it in their possession. And when they have a free period, they go out in that yard and they booze it up. If a 19 year old

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

bill passes which it should and I hope it will today, they can stop that and you're keeping it away, not from only 18 year olds but down to kids that are as low as 12 years old in that school system, because the junior high is important.

So for Mr. Sorensen to say that 19 means nothing, and that he thinks he has a moral victory, because people are questioning between 20 and 19, I say shame on him. Instead of teaching, he ought to go back to school.

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Fusscas.

REP. FUSSCAS: (55th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just hope that the lives, the young lives that are saved by raising the age to 19 would convince Rep. Sorensen to have voted for that bill and I also hope that the lives that are saved by raising the age to 19 will convince him, should he come back to this Assembly to vote to raise the age to 20 or 21.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further? Rep. Richard Torpey.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

REP. TORPEY: (11th)

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I think it's a very serious subject, but it's rather humorous that it's developed into a would-be attack on Rep. Sorensen. But you've all been around the loop long enough to, I hope you recognize the strategy he's using. He's trying to just sucker you off base and certainly you recognize that.

I want 20. I'd like 21. I want 20 and I'd vote for 20. But if he gets enough of your ego up and you're going to stay with him for the 20, he's going to win his point. So don't get suckered off on that, and forget it, he's just pulling your leg.

Vote for this thing.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Chair should like to remind the members of our rules. Personalities are not permitted in debate. It is not the man, but it is the measure that is the subject of debate.

Will you remark further?

REP. CREAN: (81st)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Crean.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

REP. CREAN: (81st)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Regardless of what's been said, I feel that I will fulfill my commitment and continue to vote for a 20 year old drinking age.

For 21 years I've worked in a business that has unfortunately had to deal with the results of young drinkers. Everyone points to automobile accidents as a major problem with young drinkers. I totally agree with that, but there are other problems.

There are cases on record of alcoholic poisoning because young people have never been taught how to drink. The arguments have been raised that 18 year old was the proper age because people at 18 can fight, and they can vote. Our school systems for years have been teaching people civics and how to vote. Everyone who has teenagers like myself realize that they have been taught their whole life how to fight and how to compete.

The other day I didn't speak during the debate and I was amused by many of the speakers who consider keeping 18 the right age. Many of them don't have teenagers. A lot younger than I am, I guess they remember when they were teenagers. I don't. I wondered what the great lobby group is to keep this at 18, or even at 19. I've had no one in the Town of Southington, including teenagers ask me to

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

keep the drinking age at 18. They have not asked me to keep it at 19. The majority of people, including those people who make a dollar off drinking have asked me to vote and support bringing the drinking age back to 21.

I would suggest to people who really are not familiar with this subject to some night spend \$30.00. Buy a keg of beer and invite the teenagers around the neighborhood over and tell them, go ahead, have as much beer as you want to drink, and then you would make a judgment whether you'd let them get behind the wheel of a car to drive. Most of you would probably lock the door and have them stay right there.

I'm not going to back off from my commitment and I'm not going to let the legislature in New York tell me how I should vote on this bill. No one in my community voted for anyone in the New York legislature and they don't expect New York to tell us or them how they should run their towns or how they should run the laws or how they should run their state. So I urge everyone to continue to support the amendment that raises the drinking age to 20.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Thank you, sir.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on the rejection of House Amendment Schedule "C".

Will you remark further on its rejection? If not all those in favor of the rejection of House "C" please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Chair is in doubt. Try your minds again.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Carragher.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Let's put it on the record them. I move the vote be taken by roll call.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

A roll call will be ordered at this time.

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

Would the members please take their seats.

The machine will be opened.

The House of Representatives is now voting by roll. Will the members please return to the Chamber.

There is a roll call vote in progress in the Hall of the House. Will the members return to the Chamber immediately.

May I have your attention please. The Chair should like to remind the members this is a motion to reject. In effect, the yes is a no and a no is a yes. If you wish to reject House "C", you vote green. Thank you.

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Would the members please check the voting boards to determine if their vote is properly cast? If so, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will please take a tally.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

Will the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

Motion to reject House Amendment Schedule "C"
to House Bill No. 5489.

Total number voting	144
Necessary for adoption	73
Those voting yea	99
Those voting nay	45
Those absent and not voting	7

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The motion carries. House "C" is rejected.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Carragher.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has LCO No. 2954 which was previously designated as House Amendment Schedule "F". I would ask the Clerk to please call that Amendment and I would ask that I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk has LCO No. 2954 previously designated House Amendment Schedule "F". Will the Clerk please call the amendment.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

CLERK:

LCO No. 2954 designated House Amendment Schedule "F" offered by Rep. Zajac of the 83rd District.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker, I would first of all move for the same reasons for the rejection of House Amendment Schedule "F".

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Gentlemen, proceed with summarization, please.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this amendment was introduced by my good friend and the ranking member of the General Law Committee with whom I have worked very closely on this bill and many others, Rep. Zajac.

I feel badly to have to move for the rejection of this amendment but reality is reality. This amendment would have included a provision making anyone under age 20 subject to a hearing on the revocation of his or her

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

operator's license for being found with alcoholic liquor while driving. That is what this amendment does. However, for the reasons previously stated, I think it's necessary to reject the amendment and send this bill to the Governor for his signature.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The motion is to reject House Amendment Schedule "F". Will you remark on the rejection of House "F"? Will you remark on its rejection? If not, all those in favor please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Those opposed nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The ayes clearly have it. The Motion carries.

House "F" is rejected.

Will you remark further on this bill?

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Carragher.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has LCO No. 2753, which was previously designated as Senate Amendment Schedule "C". I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and I would ask that I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk has LCO No. 2753 previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "C". Would the Clerk please call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 2753 designated Senate Amendment Schedule "c" offered by Sen. Gunther of the 21st District.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The gentleman seeks permission to summarize in lieu of Clerk's reading. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered. Rep. Carragher, you may proceed, sir.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment Schedule "C" introduces the exemptions for persons 18 or over and 16 or over as the operator's license revocation provision and grandfathers 18 year old to hold a liquor permit or a financial interest in a permit premises on the bill's effective date, and I would move for its adoption.

kpt

House of Representatives Wednesday, April 14, 1982

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on adoption of Senate Amendment "C". Will you remark on its adoption?

Will you remark on the adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "C"? If not, all those in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Those opposed nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The ayes have it. Senate "C" is adopted and it is ruled technical.

Will you remark further on this bill as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "C"?

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Carragher.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has LCO No. 2754, which was previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "D". Would

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

the Clerk please call and read.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk has LCO No. 2754 which was previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "D". Would the Clerk please call and read the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 2754, Senate Amendment Schedule "D" offered by Sen. Mustone of the 13th District. After Line 124, insert Section 8 as follows:

Section 8. This act shall take effect July 1, 1982.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Amendment is in your possession. What is your pleasure, sir.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker, I move its adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "D". Will you remark on its adoption.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Yes, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Carragher.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as is quite

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

clear, this will change the effective date of this legislation from October 1, 1982 to July 1, 1982.

I understand from the senators that I have talked to, that the reason for changing the effective date back to July rather than October was so that this law can go into effect prior to the start of the next school year next September.

I think it makes sense, and I move the adoption of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on the adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "D"? Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Those opposed nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The ayes have it. Senate "D" is adopted and it is ruled technical.

Will you remark further on this bill as amended by Senate "C" and "D".

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Carragher.

REP. CARRAGHER: (5th)

Mr. Speaker, we have debated this issue as I've said before at great length. At the outset today, I said that I would do all I could to make sure that this bill was in conformity with the Senate when it left this Chamber so that it could go on to Governor O'Neill for his signature.

At this moment in time, that's where we are. I would suggest very strongly to all of those people in this Chamber who have expressed a very strong interest in raising the drinking age in the State of Connecticut to now vote yes on this bill whether you want it 20 or 21, or whatever. This bill has passed the Senate. It can pass here. The Governor will sign it, and I suggest we do just that.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further? Rep. Christopher Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment LCO No. 3243. If the Clerk would call the amendment and

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

I then be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk has LCO No. 3243 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "G". Will the Clerk please call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 3243 designated House Amendment Schedule "G" offered by Rep. Shays of the 147th District.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Thank you. Members of the House, this amendment provides that a person who purchases alcohol in the state in which he leaves cannot come to Connecticut to purchase alcohol and the attempt of this amendment is to eliminate the possibility of residents from states with a drinking age of 20 coming in to the state which has a drinking age of 19 to buy their liquor. And it does this by amending or adding to line 5 where it defines minor. Minor means any person under 19 years of age, that's a definition of someone who can't buy liquor in the state and then says add this line, or any person under the legal drinking age

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

of the state where he resides.

And then it just has the additional language that would explain that if you were a student in the State of Connecticut from another state, that you would have the right at age 19 to buy liquor.

I move adoption of the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Krawiecki.

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

Through you, a question to Rep. Shays.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you state your question sir.

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

Rep. Shays, would it be your impression that an individual comes into the State of Connecticut who is age 20, who is then allowed to buy in a state that says the drinking age is 19 can do so? Would that be your analysis on that question?

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays will you respond sir?

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that would not be my analysis at all. If someone is of the drinking age of 20 then he would have the ability to buy liquor in this state because if the drinking age is 20 in his state he has the right to buy it in his state or this state.

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

And through you, Mr. Speaker, would it then be the intention of this amendment to allow 19 year olds to presumably buy in Connecticut and then transport back into Massachusetts or wherever?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If you were a resident of Massachusetts and you came into the State of Connecticut and you were age 19, this amendment would prevent you from buying liquor in this state.

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

It would prevent it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Through the Chair, please, sir.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through, you, Mr. Speaker, that's correct. It would prevent you from buying liquor. Even though the drinking age for residents of the State of Connecticut is 19, if you were age 20 in another state that had a drinking age of age 20, you could not come into this state and transport liquor into another state.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Krawiecki, you have the floor, sir.

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

With all due respect to my good colleague, Rep. Shay, I think on its face, this is an attempt to kill in a different manner than we've already heard attempted so far today, a bill, and I would certainly recommend that this body reject this amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on House "G".

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Tulisano.

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

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

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Please state your question, sir.

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

Through you, Mr. Shays, who would the burden be under this amendment and under the statute of determining, of making that determination? The package store owner or restaurant owner?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The burden would be the same individual would have to determine whether a resident of the State of Connecticut was age 19 or age 18.

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Then is it the proponent's intent therefore for the owner of each shop that sells alcoholic beverages to know the legal ages of the 50 states?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays will you respond.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Clearly, the owner, an individual who sells liquor should have a table that would enable him to know what the drinking age was of that state.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Tulisano, you have the floor, sir.

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays for the second time.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

No, Mr. Speaker. For the first time. I just moved the adoption and I sat down. Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. I intend to vote for age 19 and I have not during the course of my seven years ever participated in a debate on the drinking age except when it came to, when this bill came to us last week, I offered an amendment which was soundly defeated and perhaps this one will be as well.

I ended up voting against age 20 and contrary to Rep. Sorensen, and Rep. Emmons, if the age had been 19 I would have supported that bill. I do see a need for drinking to be eliminated out of highschoools. I do have trouble with a 20 year old in a college not being able to

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

drink when those around him are drinking and I believe that it would make a group of, a number of individuals tremendously lawless.

Now this amendment is clearly, and I would hope that you would take my word. Vote on it under the merits and if you think the merits are not just, please vote against it, but I think that we will have a problem and I frankly believe this amendment if it fails now, will come back to us a year from now when proponents of a drinking age point out that we have students, young people, rather, from neighboring states with a drinking age of 20 driving in this state, much as we might have students and young people going into New York because there's a younger drinking age.

So this amendment is very clear and if you've looked at the file copy, the file copy defines minor. That's what determines whether you're old enough to drink, and it merely adds that additional language. It's not complicated and I notice the laughter as if this were a silly amendment. It's not silly at all. It's a real life story. You're going to have people coming in from other states to buy liquor here because our drinking age is lower than the drinking age in neighboring states.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "G".

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Frederick Gelsi.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Mr. Speaker, coming from a border town, I should be rising to speak for this amendment. Not an attorney, I really don't know how constitutional it would be. It seems to me that it's a lawyer's bill and we'd make all the lawyers on either side of the border a little bit richer and they probably would all love us.

I believe it was found a few years ago where we tried, or when the legislature at that time tried to change the law that an individual could drink in a bar or restaurant at 18, but could not buy packaged goods at a higher age and I believe it was 19 or 20, I don't remember what they had done at that time and it was very definite stated that it was unconstitutional.

If we want to fool around with this bill, we'll pass it. I don't even know why I'm getting up here to argue against the amendment. I think we ought to defeat

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

it, get this bill passed and I would hope that our leadership would send it directly to the Governor for his signature. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

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

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Tulisano.

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote against the bill at 19 also, but regardless of that, this amendment shouldn't pass. It really puts an undue burden on the purveyors of alcoholic beverages in the state. As the proponent has indicated, he expects the sellers to know the legal age of each and every one of the states in the United States to make a determination.

In addition to that, I presume, therefore, they would also have to know that to be fair about it, whether or not it was from a foreign country what the legal age was in that foreign country.

I mean, that is really a bit of a burden. We cannot expect people in this state to begin to know all

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

of the laws of the state in this nation. They don't even know the laws of this state. I mean, it's very difficult for everyone to understand these. So please I mean, I understand he has good intentions, but I really think it's so ineffective that it is to be rejected.

REP. ALLYN: (43rd)

Mr. Speaker, for the second time.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Rufus Allyn.

REP. ALLYN: (43rd)

Mr. Speaker. To question Rep. Shays. In some states and in some counties in this country, we still have the prohibition against any liquor. Would this mean that a person coming from a state or a country in the United States where that county or state prohibits the sale of alcohol, I'm thinking close to us probably is on Martha's Vineyard. Some areas on Martha's Vineyard you're not able to buy any liquor.

Also, in North Carolina, in some of the counties. Would those persons be able to buy liquor in Connecticut, though they come from a state which doesn't allow liquor sales?

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays, will you respond?

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no, it would not affect the counties, because they would go on what the drinking age was for the state. It would have nothing to do with what particular laws of selling liquor in a particular country.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Allyn, you have the floor sir.

REP. ALLYN: (43rd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that's really an inconsistency. You're trying to acquaint, trying to say that we in Connecticut are going to enforce another state's drinking age, but we're not going to enforce a state which prohibits drinking altogether.

I think it's really a bad amendment. We should defeat it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Paul LaRosa.

REP. LA ROSA: (3rd)

For someone who has a little bit of experience with maybe serving alcoholic beverages, I would just like to make a few remarks that when you are asking the question

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

can I see your id card and ask them if they are 19 years old, then you ask them another question, what state do you come from and what is the law in that state, are you 20 years old?

To be practical, I can almost visualize what the answer's going to be. They're going to say, mind your own business, because it's none of your business where I come from. You asked me for an id card and it's 19, here it is, you either serve me or you don't, and you create more hassles, more problems and whatever.

Even though I am part of the restaurant business and I don't feel it's a conflict, I will vote for 19 because as far as I'm concerned, anyone who knows me that I think I'm one of the few people that when I don't want to serve anyone, I ask them for an id even if he's 35, and if he can't produce it, I say, I'm sorry, you just cannot be served and he leaves.

So I think that this amendment is ridiculous and it should be defeated.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Shays.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. For the second time, speaking on this amendment. The problem that you're going to encounter is 19 year olds in Massachusetts and Rhode Island who can't buy liquor in that state coming into this state to buy liquor. That's the problem.

This amendment would prevent those individuals from coming into this state to buy liquor. Someone who's 20 in Massachusetts or Rhode Island can buy liquor there. They can buy liquor in Connecticut, there's no difference, they have no incentive to come to Connecticut.

Now there was some reference to the unconstitutionality of this amendment. Most lawyers would clearly stand up and point out to you that liquor has a special provision because of the 18th Amendment, and it gives the states the power to enact legislation unrestricted by commerce clause. The only constitutional question really, is whether we are restricting interstate commerce and whether we are allowed to. The 18th Amendment enables us to do that. We can have and we can restrict interstate commerce.

This amendment is a serious amendment and I may be the only one voting for it. I wasn't laughing about it. You all are going to be laughing when you find, aren't going to be laughing either when you see the results of

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

a difference in the age from one state to the other.

So, it clearly is a sensible amendment. It's not even a difficult amendment in terms of words. You have a minor who is 19 years old and then you just have the additional language or any person under the legal drinking age of the state where he resides.

When an individual checks to see if you're old enough to drink, he knows just from the card he sees what state you're from. 99% of the individuals he would have to deal with from another state will be from Rhode Island or Massachusetts. So, clearly, to bring up something innocuous about someone from Iowa, to me is really not a point that would deserve to defeat this amendment.

If this amendment is defeated, maybe the most persuasive argument is by Rep. Carraher. If you don't want to send it to the Senate, maybe that would be a reason to vote against this amendment, but certainly not on the merits of it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "G"? If not, all those in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The noes clearly have it. House "G" fails.

House Amendment Schedule "G"

In line 5, after the word "age" insert the following: "OR ANY PERSON UNDER THE LEGAL DRINKING AGE OF THE STATE WHERE HE RESIDES. FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS SUBDIVISION, A PERSON WHO IS A FULL-TIME STUDENT AT AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THIS STATE SHALL BE DEEMED TO RESIDE IN THIS STATE."

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on this bill as amended?

REP. BROUILLET: (2nd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Arthur Brouillet.

REP. BROUILLET: (2nd)

I didn't speak last time on this bill, Mr. Speaker, First of all, I want to identify myself as a school teacher, not in a heroic way, but to share some of the wrath directed at Rep. Sorensen.

I hope that the people that are voting to raise the drinking age to 19 are going to follow through on the commitments with bills that are coming up. For instance, the bill in Finance to put back \$1 million replacing

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

federal cuts for the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Commission. I don't know what the exact fees will be on liquor, but I hope you go beyond replacing the money and you go even further with another million dollars to be appropriated to the high schools for drug and alcohol abuse education.

At one time in Hartford, the elementary schools sent three specialists around dividing the city up. They talked on sex, which is very interesting to the 7th and 8th graders. They had their complete attention. But, drug and alcohol abuse, because of lack of funding, that was cut out.

The second thing, I wasn't here when you removed the mandate on driver education and subsequently withdrew the \$20 subsidy, so most places that I know of, and I don't have the facts and figures, like Hartford just did away with driver education at the high schools. Yet, you have a great concern for driver education and what's happening to the carnage on our highways.

Another thing, we've extended drinking hours all over the place. Now you could have Bloody Marys at 11:00 to help the early morning people on Sunday. You've extended hours to Sunday night. But remember one thing, and I'm saying this really to appeal down the road, you've extended permits at the college campuses. You can drink

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

right there very readily instead of even walking out of campus and going to your neighborhood drinking place.

I think that many of these things that I'm talking about, now let me look at today's paper. Vermont lawmakers favor keeping drinking age at 18. They kept it at 18, but you know what they did, they did a couple of things that will maybe do the same things you want to do. They imposed a fine of up to \$1,000 and a possible 2 year jail term for selling liquor to minors.

They also hiked the fine for teenagers who use false identification to buy booze from \$100 to \$500. If you're truly concerned in the future, you should seriously think of going back to the Ribicoff days of an automatic 30 day suspension for drunken driving. That would include me, if I have too much beer, or you also from your favorite watering holes if you have any.

This would include all of us. There were no political favorites in that bill either, by the way. Drunken driving, that's it, 30 days. You would impose fines on bartenders or permittees to sell to people that are drunk, or look drunk. I'm glad Rep. LaRosa, said as a bar, well, actually a restaurant owner that he's one of the person that says, hey, you've had enough. Not many people do it because they don't want to get into a hassle and lose a good customer.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

Or, Rep. Randolph from Norwalk, how true I hope it is that those people, not Norwalk, Rudolph, I'm sorry, I beg your pardon, that was not meant as any kind of a cert, you have my apology. I hope it's true that your wife as a teacher doesn't see people coming in to school stewed after first period, and I hope you report back to us later when the bill is changed, because I think that goes back to the administrators at the school who really don't have the guts to face the issue and hold the parents accountable and put the kids out of school.

I really hope these things happen. You're going to be mixing 19 year olds on campus drinking with by the way, most kids graduate high school at age 18, so you're going to be mixing the 18s with the 19 year olds. I'm saying the most popular thing to do is to vote to raise it to age 19. I'll tell you why. Eighteen year olds don't register. They're so turned off by politics and politicians like myself and others so you'll never get hurt by the 18 year old vote, don't worry about that. What I'm saying is other commitments that you have to make to yourself.

There are other commitments and one of them I hope you remember is that bill out of Finance where you're going to also put more money in there for drug and alcohol abuse education going into these highschoools.

kpt

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

That's why I'm opposing raising the drinking age.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further.

REP. STEEVES: (116th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Borden Steeves.

REP. STEEVES: (116th)

Now that we have become, we are about to become the New York state or Massachusetts and Rhode Island, that isn't why I rise at this time.

I think that we should consider now that we're going to 19, that we should have to come back and take a good hard look at the id cards that we, not me, but this Chamber voted out last year, because a driver's license many students do not have driver's license today. They have no method or no legitimate id card that many of the bartenders will accept, so that's something we have to take into consideration.

It probably should have been tacked on as an amendment on one of these bills here today. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

If not, would the staff and guests please come to the well

kpt

House of Representatives Wednesday, April 14, 1982

of the House. Would the members please take their seats. All unauthorized 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 return to the Chamber immediately.

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

Would the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill No. 5489 as amended by Senate Amendment Schedules "C" and "D"

Total number voting	143
Necessary for passage	72
Those voting Yea	103
Those voting Nay	40
Those absent and not Voting	8

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The bill as amended is passed.