

| Act Number | Session | Bill Number | Total Number of Committee Pages | Total Number of House Pages | Total Number of Senate Pages |
|--|----------------|------------------------|--|---|---|
| PA 71-100 | | 6933 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| <u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>State & Urban Development 222-223</i> | | | | <u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1246-1247 | <u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1123 |

H-110

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 3
974-1450**

THE CLERK:

Page 3 of the Calendar, going back to a matter that was passed temporarily, Calendar No. 227, Substitute for House Bill No. 6933, An Act Concerning Bid Requirements for Housing Authority Contracts.

MR. GILLIES (75th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman please hold. Can I ask those members who are going to leave if they'd do so so that we can hear the Calendar of business. The House will stand at ease until those that are going to leave have done so.

The House will come to order.

MR. GILLIES (75th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. GILLIES (75th):

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is simply to provide that in Housing Authority contracts, it is unnecessary to go to bid on those items which are being purchased where the cost does not exceed \$2,000. Under the present bill, it is necessary to go to bid, public bid, on those items of personal property where the cost will exceed \$1,000. As an attorney for a Housing Authority, I am aware of the situation where it is quite often necessary to make improvements or purchase supplies and it is very difficult when you have a Housing Authority of any size, to purchase anything that is not going to run a little bit in excess of \$1,000 and to go through the bidding procedure

djh

which is rather cumbersome, simply imposes an additional burden which I feel is unnecessary. The added \$1,000 is not excessive, the public is adequately protected and it is a good bill. I urge it's passage.

THE SPEAKER:

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

THE CLERK:

Page 3 of the Calendar, Calendar No. 237, Substitute for H.B. No. 5725, An Act Adopting a State Child Protection Act, File No. 190.

MR. COHEN (41st):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

MR. COHEN (41st):

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to yield to the gentleman from the 101st who has worked diligently on this bill who will be able to explain it in great detail.

MR. OLIVER (104th):

Mr. Speaker, pending reapportionment, it's still the 104th but I'll take the nod.

Mr. Speaker, in 1960 the United States Congress passed a Hazardous Substances Labelling Act which was a labelling law subsequently adopted in Connecticut in 1964 or '65. In 1966, the Child Protection Act was adopted by the United States Congress providing authority, in this case to the Food and Drug Administration for the branding of toys and other children's articles

**S-78
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 3
957-1456**

April 20, 1971

Page 19

Now, this would not cost the state anything. The State would get back it. It just permits them the use of tax exempt bonds. It's a good bill.

Question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage signify by saying, "aye". Opposed "nay".

The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

CAL. NO. 242. File No. 183. Favorable report of the joint committee on State and Urban Development. Act Concerning Requirements for Housing Authority Contracts.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, I move adoption of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

This is a bill that grows out of some practical experiences of Housing Authorities around the State. Under current law, they are not allowed to put out for bid any contract exceeding \$1000 and with inflation and practicality this has been a difficult and this bill extends that to \$2000. In other words, they would be able to let without public bidding contracts up to \$2000 and in cases where the public interest is involved, could waive that requirement and extend it to \$4000 but would have to give notice of that and the reasons for it. I move passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage say, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**STATE
AND
URBAN
DEVELOPMENT**

**PART 1
1-275**

**1971
Index**

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**STATE
AND
URBAN
DEVELOPMENT**

**PART 1
1-275**

**1971
Index**

THURSDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MARCH 4, 1971

SHALL HAVE THE SAME POWERS AS COMMUNITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS. Anyone in favor? Opposed? In favor?

Mr. Stanley Ozimek, Connecticut Association of Housing and Redevelopment Authorities: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, in this case I represent the Connecticut Association of Housing and Redevelopment Authorities which comprise over 60 housing authorities as members. I'm also representing the East Hartford Housing Authority as its Executive Director, and the town of East Hartford with the commission of the Council and the Mayor. This bill which we, the Association, the town of East Hartford, and the East Hartford Housing Authority, are fully in support of - H.B. 6932. It's one way in which we could realize a pride in home ownership, not that private enterprise is not doing the job, but it has many obstacles in its way, and the number of private dwellings, or even co-ops., etc., could be higher, we feel. So does our town of East Hartford, and members of the Association who have voiced their opinion, Mr. Chairman and members. If this authority was granted to local housing authorities, which in every instance would have to receive prior municipal approval before embarking on any effort as provided in this bill. As we know, housing authorities, with municipal approval, have the right of eminent domain, while private enterprise does not have that sacred privilege. Land purchase today - prices are very exorbitant and it is felt that communities by working together with housing authorities, can certainly give a tremendous lift to the inadequacy, this shortage of homes for ownership, be they singles, two-families, or even larger in size. So speaking again for the Connecticut Association of Housing and Redevelopment Authorities, Mr. Chairman and members, the town of East Hartford, and I might add that our representatives from the East Hartford district will also have comments before this Committee, and the Housing Authority of East Hartford, we are fully in accord and in support of H.B. 6932. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Sen. Lieberman: Thank you. Anyone else wish to speak in favor? Against? If not, the hearing is closed. H.B. 6933 - AN ACT AMENDING SUBSECTION (g) OF SECTION 8-44 TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF AN EXPENDITURE THAT MAY BE MADE WITHOUT BID BY HOUSING AUTHORITY FROM ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS TO TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS. Speakers in favor?

Mr. Stanley Ozimek, Conn. Assn. of Housing and Redevelopment Authorities - Chairman, Legislative Committee: I don't want to overdo what I did yesterday, thanks to Mr. Tudan. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I'm also speaking again in behalf of Mayor Blackstone of the town of East Hartford, the members of the Town

THURSDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MARCH 4, 1971

of East Hartford, and the East Hartford Housing Authority, fully in support of this bill now under consideration. Why? First, it would be providing the same bidding procedures as the federal government allows in its operations. Under state statute, we in housing cannot do any more than follow state statute. Therefore, the federal requirement, where they allow us to purchase up to \$4,000 is lost by the wayside because of state statute. The reason is to make it much more simple under today's high costs, inflationary costs of purchasing, materials, supplies, contracts - to save time, to save money by negotiation without going to bidding, and making it much more rapid-fire to function and accomplish things for the betterment in our management of public properties. We are wholeheartedly in favor of this House Bill No. 6933, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, so that it may be uniform with what is already permitted by federal regulation, but not allowed under state statute. Thank you very much.

Sen. Lieberman: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak in favor of this bill? Opposed? The hearing is closed. H.B. 7164. - AN ACT CONCERNING PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES ON HOUSING AUTHORITY OR STATE LAND. Anyone in favor? Opposed? The hearing is closed. H.B. 7165 is AN ACT CONCERNING GRANTS-IN-AID FOR URBAN PROBLEMS. Any speakers in favor? Any opposed? The hearing is closed. H.B. 7167 is AN ACT CONCERNING ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CONNECTICUT HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY. Speakers in favor? Yes.

Mr. Robert Hirtle, Executive Director, Conn. Mortgage Authority: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, there are two bills - 7167, and there's another bill - 6072, both of which establish a Conn. Housing Development Authority. Both bills are patterned after the Illinois Housing Development Authority Act. The difference between the two bills is that bill would absorb into it the existing Conn. Mortgage Authority, all of its assets and obligations. The Mortgage Authority has not taken a position on the bill. We have no existing members of the Authority at the present time. However, I would like to go on record as being in favor of this bill, which would include the absorption into the Conn. Housing Development Authority. From an administrative standpoint, it's important that the state prohibit and stop the proliferation of similar type agencies. It may seem strange that a director of an agency which would be absorbed into a larger agency would be in favor of this type of a bill, but Connecticut is one of the few states that has not gone to this type of development authority. We have fourteen states which have a housing development authority, and Connecticut is not one of those states. We have four states which have mortgage authorities. Connecticut is one of those states.