

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

<u>HB 393</u>	<u>PA 766</u>	<u>1969</u>
Hearings 0		0
Senate 3599		1
House 5796-5800		5

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

6p

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

H-102

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1969

VOL. 13
PART 8

3571-4022

Friday, May 23, 1969

29

MR. GREEN: (144th)

Yes, thank you. This action of bringing the teachers and other municipal employees within a group of people who are now absolved from the automatic rights of attachment without a Court order.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1034. Modified House Bill No. 7176. An Act concerning the Appointment of Public Defenders for Certain Motor Vehicle Offenses. File 1101.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 1st.

MR. KENNELLY: (1st)

Mr. Speaker, may Calendar 1034, Modified House Bill No. 7176, File 1101, be referred to the Joint Committee on Appropriations?

THE SPEAKER:

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

THE CLERK:

Page 9. Calendar 1036. Modified House Bill No. 7994. An Act to Establish a Real Estate Guaranty Fund. File 1103.

THE SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the gentleman from the 81st, will the

H-107

CONNECTICUT

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HOUSE

SPECIAL SESSION

PROCEEDINGS

1969

JUNE 23-25 JULY 21-23

VOL. 13

PART 13

5748-5937

1-180

1-116

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

23-D

folks are willing to reconsider this and pass this measure.

dem

Thank you very much.

REP. DUNN - 17th D.

Mr. Speaker, my dear friend and colleague, Mrs. Thornton, not being in her seat, perhaps she won't mind my speaking on her behalf. But, I know that she was upset when she discovered that the Act took effect on the exact same date that their Town Council was in session and asked to have a referendum and so the time for re-scheduling this would have been extremely difficult to say nothing of its illegality questioned and I know that she joins Mr. Tudan in expressing deep gratitude in having this done because it certainly would have tremendously inconvenienced the town of Glastonbury and we on this side do thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Those opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1556. Sub. for H.B. No. 6393. An Act concerning the State Grants in Lieu of Taxes. "Emergency Certification" - copies on your desks.

REP. O'NEILL - 7th D.

Mr. Speaker, in Substitute for Bill No. 6393, I move passage of the Act, of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

REP. O'NEILL - 7th D.

5797

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

24-D

Mr. Speaker, this bill was put in trying to make a reasonable effort in this present climate of in-equality. To eliminate the inequities of the state grant system that extends throughout the state of Connecticut. Obviously, for the city of Hartford it would mean a great deal and, as a matter of fact, we have so much that it would be unfair if we got the full share. In view of this, the bill was structured to prevent Hartford from really getting the full share, and we cut it back, we put on a "ceiling" and this may seem a bit unfair to the city of Hartford but we accepted in the interests of good legislation and in the enactment of a true state wide formula, which will continue down through the years and won't have to be monkeyed with from time to time. I think you also recognize in the bill that the town of Mansfield is treated separately, and the reason for this is that no matter what formula we tried to devise, the vastness of the University of Connecticut and the smallness of the town of Mansfield in its grand list, just wouldn't come out with any kind of specific formula that we could write state-wide, so we accepted them, as you can see. I think that this is a good bill. A good way to prevent a continuation of little inequities all over the state - and a good way to achieve some uniformity. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge its passage of the bill.

REP. COLLINS - 165th D.

Mr. Speaker, I would raise not a point of order, sir, but perhaps a point of information. On most of the members desks on this side at least, we have one page of apparently a more

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

25-D

... ghty bill. There has been some reference to exemption of dem
two towns on this and unfortunately nothing and no language to
that effect appears on the portion Section 1, that we have here.
I wonder if the entire bill is on the members desks in accordance
with the Rules, or if just one page has been handed out.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is my understanding that this bill has three pages as
being presented now by the gentleman from the 54th and the gen-
tleman from the 165th.

REP. COLLINS - 165th D.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that some members have three
pages and other members have one. I wonder if we might just
stand at ease a minute to give us a chance to look at the other
two pages?

MR. SPEAKER:

Certainly. The House will stand at ease. When the gentle-
man from the 165th is prepared to proceed, just indicate, and
we will call the House back to order.

REP. MCKINNEY - 141st D.

Mr. Speaker, we would only state that in essence we certainly
approve of a new formula that would uniform the situation across
the state. I would say, sir, that I think its a terrible day to
be discussing a bill which increases the grants in lieu of taxes
in the state of Connecticut by twenty to twenty five percent and
I would also suggest that its a difficult day to if you have read
this bill, to take one of the most complicated of formulas and

5799

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

26-D

try and determine what we're doing. I can imagine that there will be great rejobing in Mansfield and in some other areas, but I certainly feel that with this tremendous step, and this is a big step, that we should have considered this many, many weeks ago. dem

REP. O'NEILL - 7th D.

Mr. Speaker. I think the Minority Leader is correct and it is perhaps difficult to evaluate these formulas, however, we have worked very hard on it and as the lady from Mansfield and the gentleman from the 5th in Hartford, Mr. Yedziniak, who was most instrumental in putting this bill together. But, its just one more good argument for annual sessions.

REP. ERVIN - 140th D.

Mr. Speaker, just a question for clarifications. On the exception on the front page. "Except that was acquired and used for Highways and Bridges." In my town, we have of course, the Connecticut Thru-way, and we also have two restaurants that are adjacent to it, which are owned by the state. Would those restaurants be excepted from this Act?

REP. O'NEILL - 7th D.

Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, if the property the restaurant is on state owned property, that was originally taken as part of a highway or bridge taking, the exclusion would be in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Those opposed? The bill is passed.

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

27-D.

indicate by saying aye. Those opposed? The bill is passed.

dem

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 932. Modified Senate Bill No. 177. An Act Authorizing Tenants to Deposit Rents in Court to Remedy Conditions Dangerous to Life, Health or Safety.

REP. BROWN - 148th D.

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committees Favorable Report and passage of the bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A."

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A" and House Amendment Schedule "A." The clerk informs me that as of yet this body has not adopted Senate Amendment Schedule "A."

REP. BROWN - 148th D.

I would so move adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A."

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A."

Will you remark?

REP. BROWN - 148th D.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which would allow with Senate Amendment Schedule "A" would allow tenants to deposit rents with the Court, the Circuit Court when it is found that such housing is not up to standards in terms of the "Housing Code" and the "Building Code" that when one third of the tenants actually sign a petition that they can then ask for the Courts to review the