

<b>Act Number</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Total Number of Committee Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of House Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of Senate Pages</b>
PA 71-140		930	2	1	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Finance 176-177</i></li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1762(Consent)</i></li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1113</i></li> </ul>

**H-111**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 4  
1451-1967**

Wednesday, April 28, 1971

12.

MBS

Calendar No. 509, House Bill No. 9112, An Act Concerning Criminal Conversation, file number 434.

Calendar No. 511, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 0930, An Act Concerning Definitions for Purposes of the Motor Fuel Tax, file number 184.

Calendar No. 512, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 0432. An Act Concerning Municipal Authority to Issue Bonds; file number 251.

Calendar No. 513, Senate Bill No. 0723. An Act Concerning Reinstatement of Oxoboxo Associates, Incorporated, file number 241.

Calendar No. 514, Senate Bill No. 0494, An Act Concerning Seizure of Fireworks, file number 256.

Those are the items on today's Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

You've heard the motion of the gentleman from the 95th. If any Representative objects to action on any of these bills on the Consent Calendar? If not, the question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bills. All those in favor indicate by saying aye, those opposed. The bills are passed.

RONALD A. SARASIN, 95th District:

Mr. Speaker, I move the following items be placed on the Consent Calendar pursuant to Rule 48:

On page 8, third from the bottom, Calendar No. 519, House Bill No. 5254, An Act Concerning Estates of Welfare Recipients,

**S-78  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

April 20, 1971

Page 7

THE SPEAKER:

Clerk has received a Bill from the Committee on Corrections.  
HOUSE BILL NO. 9207. An Act Concerning the Construction of a Community  
Correctional Center for Hartford County. Referred to the Committee on

Clerk has a number of House Resolutions which he will hold till he  
assesses who will vote them in.

Turn to page 1, of your Calendar, bottom of the page.

CAL. NO. 163. File No. 184. Favorable report of the Committee on Finance.  
Substitute for Senate Bill No. 910. An Act Concerning Definitions for  
Purposes of the Motor Vehicle Tax.

SENATOR RIMER:

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

Section 12-455 which this bill proposes to repeal, refers to Section 14-  
1 for the definition of distributor, fuel, motor vehicle and person as used  
in Chapter 221. Section 14-1 which now states the definition is located  
in Chapter 246 entitled Motor Vehicles. This bill provides for the defini-  
tion of the above terms and incorporates them into Chapter 221 which is  
entitled, Gasoline and Special Fuel Taxes. The fact of the matter is, that  
we're not changing the definition, we're changing the location of the defini-  
tion, into the tax section of the General Statutes.

THE SPEAKER:

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

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**FINANCE**

**PART 1  
1-329**

**1971  
Index**

John Tarrant: of a local property tax and if we use the California type law here, the amount of the flat rate would have to be so high, it would be almost prohibited. The third thing we looked into was whether or not this tax list was administered at the State level in lieu of the local property tax on motor vehicles whether or not we would not then be construed as having an unscrupulous high motor vehicle registration rate, because we would have to get about, a minimum of \$30.00 per car average at the State level. Now, with the \$15.00 now the registration pointed up to get \$5.00. The fourth thing and the most imposing was the fact that the motor vehicle department now registers on a staggering basis which is a great thing for the motor vehicle department and levels off the big loads of work and everything else, but it made the possibility of imposing a State tax in lieu of the local property tax pretty much out the window. That is all I have to say on that. Now I would like to address myself to bills 5221, 5819, 5985, 6840, 6843 and 930 all of which were bills that the tax department asked the signers to put in for us. Now bill 5221 we favor the principal involved in this bill and bill 6096 and 6335 seeks to do the same thing. 5221 is a skeleton bill, but we are in favor of doing what these bills seek to do. Bill 5819 that opposes a penalty for late payment of motor vehicle fuel taxes and looking around the room I think there is going to be some objection to this. Rep. Spain thought that there should be a dollar limit on this bill, and of course we would have no argument with that, there probably should be, on the other hand gentlemen we have this problem, you have large tax payers paying \$150,000. a month, maybe, on their motor vehicle fuel bill and if they come in 5 days late, if you were to hire that kind of money for 5 days it would cost you \$150. at today's rate. The State has to have a constant flow of its income that's why we put a particular limit on when the money comes in and have a constant flow of its income, there is no prohibition against these companies paying this earlier of they want to. We realize that the mail has not been particularly good and that some of them may come in without fault and I don't think that up to now that we have been unfair assessing tax penalties as there are, but on the other hand we do believe that the penalty as acknowledged are too low in view of the size of the commitments by the oil companies. The next bill I want to discuss, if I may, is 5985 this was put in to broaden the appeal rights under the Motor

John Tarrant: Vehicle Motor Carrier Road Tax. Some of you fellows that were here at the time this law was put in, it was put in, in rather a hurry and the appeal rights of the Motor Carrier exists in two lines. All it says is that "any carrier aggrieved may put in, may appeal to the Superior Court in Hartford County" we think and the tax payers think that, that isn't quite enough and we have broadened the appeal somewhat along the line of the appeal rights of other taxing statutes. Bill No. 6840 here we merely want legalized what we have been doing administrative fiat anyway. The law says the owner of the tank truck transporting gasoline shall be exhibited in a place where it is obvious to the public, the name shall be exhibited in this way. Since that law has been enacted we have accepted trade names, but the law as it stands needs amendment to legalize accepting the trade name and that's why we put that bill in. Bill #6843 the original interest of the law was to help mass transportation by exempting  $\frac{1}{2}$  the gasoline tax on buses using the streets in the various towns and cities. It was never intended to apply to chartered busses or school busses and that is the extensions that we are up against with respect to this law right now and we would like that changed so that it applies only to established routes and not to charter bus routes, charter use. Bill #930 here we seek to spell out a motor fuel tax law certain definitions that are now found in subsection 11, 12, 26, and 31 of the Motor Vehicle law 14-1. Up to now that was incorporated in the gasoline tax law by reference and that was alright when they the motor vehicle department assessed the gasoline tax, since that has been turned over to the, to us we would like those definitions put in our own law rather than just referred to, we think this is a better way of doing business. We also hear that those sections might be changed sometime for motor vehicle purposes and would not go along with the tax assessment purposes. There are a few additional bills which we did not put in, which touch upon the tax department function. 909 and 931 which are identical and which we oppose because the language of the bill is inaudible on the statement of purpose on it. It might well lead to our having to look to all automobiles sold in 1972 when the Federal Government requires certain anti-pollution equipment be put on vehicles. These bills say that such equipment should be exempted from the sales tax and it would be an administrative headache to say the least to look for that on all sales of motor vehicles. Also, opposed are identical bills #454 and #5826. Some of these restored classics and classic automobiles