

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 2579	PA 486	1963
House	3356-3357	(2)
Senate	2659-2660	(2)
General Law	1206, 1240-1241	(3)
LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE		
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY		TOTAL 7P

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

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2012

H 68

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1963

VOL. 10, PART 9
MAY 27 - MAY 28
3302 - 3771

328.2s
C76pr
h
Leg. Ref.
Vault 3

CONNECTICUT
STATE LIBRARY

Monday, May 27, 1963

55.

The bill is passed.

EJN

THE CLERK:

Calendar no. 806, file no. 2579. House Bill No. 2579.
An Act concerning Appeals in Towns and Boroughs of Persons
Aggrieved by Traffic Orders and Regulations. Favorable
report of the Joint Committee on General Law.

MR. GREGORY (COLCHESTER):

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. GREGORY (COLCHESTER):

Mr. Speaker, this bill amends an existing statute
dealing with an appeals from traffic authorities. When the
statute was put down in the books was passed I think the
assumption was that no municipality but a city would have
a traffic authority. At the present the town of Wallingford
and I think in the near future some larger towns will also
have traffic authorities and the modification here would
allow a person who agrees from any regulation from any
such authority appeal in the alternative either to the
town council or town selectmen or warden in
the borough and there was no position provision for such
an appeal. It is a good bill. There was no objection to
it and I move its passage.

Monday, May 27, 1963

56.

MR. CARROZZELLA (WALLINGFORD):

EJN

Mr. Speaker, this bill clears up a very serious problem in our town. I think it is a good bill and I hope it passes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage. All in favor say Aye. Those opposed. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar no. 809, file no. 1009. House Bill no. 4504.
An Act authorizing Justices of the Peace to Sign Warrants for the Collection of Property Taxes. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on General Law.

MR. BARNES (MONTVILLE):

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. BARNES (MONTVILLE):

Mr. Speaker, this is to authorize ; the justices of the Peace to sign warrants for/^{the collection} property taxes as well as judges of the circuit court. I hope the judges won't mind.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage. All in favor say Aye. Those opposed Nay. The bill is passed.

S 53

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1963

VOL. 10, PART 8

MAY 31 - JUNE 3

2625 - 3077

328.2s

C76 pr

S

Leg. Ref.

Vault 3

CONNECTICUT
STATE LIBRARY

May 31, 1963

35

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks? All in favor, say AYE. Opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1003, file 935, substitute for HB 2524, An Act providing for Extending the Additional Temporary Retirement Allowance to the Age of Sixty-Five for State Employees having Social Security Coverage. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Public Personnel.

SENATOR GLADSTONE:

Mr. President, may calendars 1003, 1004, 1005 and 1006 stand over and retain their places on the calendar? And on page 11, Mr. President, may calendars 1007, 1008 and 1009 stand over and retain their places on the calendar?

THE CHAIR:

The named calendars will stand over retaining their places on the calendar.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1110, file 1008, HB 2579, An Act concerning Appeals in Towns and Boroughs of Persons Aggrieved by Traffic Orders and Regulations. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on General Law.

SENATOR GLADSTONE:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This allows the town counsel, board of selectmen of the town, or the warden or burgess of a borough in answer to the common council and the board of aldermen

May 31, 1963

36

as those persons who are able to take an appeal when they are aggrieved from a regulation of the traffic authority.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks? Question is on acceptance of the committee's report. All in favor, say AYE. Opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1111, file 1009, HB 4504, An Act authorizing Justices of the Peace to Sign Warrants for the Collection of Property Taxes. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on General Law.

SENATOR GLADSTONE:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Presently, judges of the circuit court may sign warrants for the collection of property taxes. This adds to that authority justices of the peace.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? Question is on acceptance of the committee's report. All in favor, say AYE. Opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1112, file 1010, modified HB 2397, An Act concerning Notice to Employees of the Husband and Wife Retirement Income Option of the State Employees Retirement System. Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Public Personnel.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

GENERAL LAW

PART 4

1031 - 1303

**CONN.
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
1963**

MC
6

GENERAL LAW

MAY 1, 1963

practice of the Board. I have not had an opportunity to do an extensive study of this problem. I direct your attention to the Supreme Court case, Bowles vs. Dillingham 321 U.S. 503, in which the Supreme Court upheld the OPA and the Rent Administrator who had the power which was being exercised in that case to reduce rents, or to put a rent-freeze on under the Emergency Rent Control Act. So I don't think there are any constitutional problem in the powers that would be granted to this (inaudible word) Fair Rental Practices Board.

Chairman Spiegel: Thank you very much, sir. Is there anybody else on S.B. 887? Anybody in opposition to S.B. 887? Anybody on S.B. 1203? Anybody in opposition to S.B. 1203? All right, we will close the hearings on both those bills. Rep. Carrozzella?

Rep. John Carrozzella, Wallingford: First of all, I would like to speak in favor of H.B. 2579. This has to do with an appeal from an order of a traffic authority. Now it states in the present statutes that the appeal is to the Common Council, or to the Board of Aldermen of the city. However, there is no reference to what would happen in a town or a borough.

Now we have this very problem in our town. There is a question of where you appeal. Now I think there is an error in the statutes, and I think this should be resolved by adding the words, "to the town council or board of selectmen of the town, or to the warden and burgesses of the borough wherein such traffic authority is located".

Under the present statute the only provision for appeal is with respect to a city. What happens in a town or a borough?

Chairman Spiegel: Just a minute please, Mr. Carrozzella, is this a misprint? Just above the change, it says "take an appeal therefrom to the court

MC
40

GENERAL LAW

MAY 1, 1963

ment has already stated its position on this bill.

We will close the hearing on this bill, and open the hearing on S.B. 1331.

S.B. 1331 (Committee) AUTHORIZING EDWARD WINSHIP TO APPEAL FROM AN AWARD OF THE HIGHWAY COMMISSIONER.

Chairman Spiegel: Anybody in favor? Is anybody opposed? The Highway Department has already stated its position on this bill.

We will go on to H.B. 2579.

H.B. 2579 (Reps. Sabota and Carrozzella) APPEALS IN TOWNS AND BOROUGHES OF PERSONS AGGRIEVED BY TRAFFIC ORDERS AND REGULATIONS.

Chairman Spiegel: Is anybody in favor of this bill?

Matthew Gallagher, Town Attorney, Wallingford: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Town of Wallingford has a Town Council form of government which went into effect on January 1, 1962. The statute concerned is Sec. 14-313, and deals with the matter of appeals from traffic authorities. Now, as the statute stands at the moment, there isn't a provision in the statute for appeals from traffic authorities in the towns other than to the Court of Common Pleas. Rep. Carrozzella who submitted the bill, and remarked earlier to the Committee, indicated that this was a mistake in the drafting of the original law. I don't think this was quite the situation. I think the intent was correct, but I think he was slightly in error to this extent, that when the law was originally drafted, or originally written, there probably weren't any towns in the state that had this situation.

Now, as the statute now stands, appeals from traffic authorities may be taken in cities to

MC
41

GENERAL LAW

MAY 1, 1963

the Board of Aldermen or the Court of Common Council, as the case may be. I think the only matter here is to provide for appeals in towns having Town Councils, in order to avoid the inconvenience to a person, or group, as the case may be, appealing as the statute now provides to the Court of Common Pleas, which I think you will agree is quite an inconvenience. This would merely accommodate the situation whereby in towns having a Town Council, appeal could be made to that body, and make the situation synonymous to that existing in the cities.

I might say this - this is outside the scope of this bill - but I wouldn't be at all surprised Mr. Chairman if in other statutes where reference is made to Boards of Selectmen, the Town Council, and Boards of Aldermen, this may turn up again, because the key point I think involved here is the matter of a Town Council which is something new to towns. In fact, offhand, I don't know if there is another, and this is not a very big state, but I don't know another town that has a Town Council. With the new law, the home-rule act, I am sure there will probably be other towns in the future adopting charters to provide for same. This is the only case in point of law.

Chairman Spiegel: Are there any questions by the Committee? All right, thank you Mr. Gallagher. Is there anybody else in favor of this bill? Is there anybody here in opposition to this bill? If not, we will close the hearing on H.B. 2579, and we will open the hearing on H.B. 4494.

H.B. 4494 (Committee) AN ACT CONCERNING NOTICE REQUIREMENTS IN ACTIONS AGAINST GOVERNMENTAL UNITS.

Chairman Spiegel: Is anybody in favor of this bill? Is anybody in opposition to this bill? I might note for the record that this is a bill drawn by