

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-284		7130	4	2	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Government Administration & Policy</i> 115-116 • <i>Government Administration & Policy</i> 126-127 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2255-2256 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1782

H-112

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 5
1968-2502**

Thursday, May 6, 1971

91.

MBS

favorable report and passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage, will you remark?

DR. MORRIS N. COHEN, 41st District:

Mr. Speaker, this bill sets forth the regulations under which our Commissioner of Health can carry on his duties. It strengthens and spells out his responsibility. It is a good bill and I hope it passes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage of the bill. All those in favor will indicate by saying aye, opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 682, Substitute for House Bill No. 7130.
An Act Concerning Fees for Copies of Vital Records and Permits.
File 639.

WILLIAM RYAN, 84th District:

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?

WILLIAM RYAN, 84th District:

Yes, under this bill burial permit fees are raised from 50¢ to \$1.00. All fees for reporting the birth of a foundling or abandoned child are abolished. Fees for birth certificates

Thursday, May 6, 1971 92.

MBS

are raised from 50¢ to \$1.00. The cost of a certified copy of birth, death or marriage certificate is raised from \$1.00 to \$2.00. Presently, the towns pay the cost of copies of birth and death records and it is proposed to extend this to marriage certificate. This bill is a reasonable one and in light of increasing administrative costs in our municipalities and I urge its passage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill? If not, the question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 7 of the calendar. Calendar No. 685, House Bill No. 7642, An Act Concerning the Assessment of Unit Housing, file number 638.

WOODROW T. VIOLETTE, 36th District:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

WOODROW T. VIOLETTE, 36th District:

Yes, this bill, Mr. Speaker, is a change in our present statutes which is along the line of some of our housekeeping

S-79

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 4
1457-1920**

May 12, 1971

57.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 627, File 639 Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Government Administration and Policy on Substitute H.B. 7130 An Act Concerning Fees for Copies of Vital Records and Permits.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Mr. President, the bill itself is self explanatory. It merely raises certain fees on death certificates, birth certificates which are felt are too antiquated and the costs will be picked up through this raise in the fees.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Page 9, top of the page Cal. 628, File No. 637. Favorable report joint standing committee on Government Administration and Policy Substitute H.B. 7409 An Act Concerning Fee for Index

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATION
&
POLICY**

**PART 1
1-333**

**1971
Index**

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 10, 1971

George
Hastings:

where you do have a four year term, that this sometimes deters people from going for a second term. This is not to say that a Town that decides to have four year terms under the home rule act could not do so, but in the opinion of my client this is unwise legislation to make this mandatory on all our municipalities.

Rep. Clarke:

Mr. Chairman, Rep. Clarke from Stamford, wouldn't you say that sometimes it gives an official a better chance to do a good job if he has four years to do it. In two years sometimes his program just about gets started.

Mr. Heiditz:

Well, may I say that if they were all like you, then they wouldn't have any problem.

George
Hastings:

Well, I think that this could well be, that first of all if you have two year terms you do have a little interruption of re-election, but many people do get re-elected and we have our two year Congressmen too - well I think our Congressmen - and I know it's been criticized, but I think our Congressmen in the House of Representatives in Washington do accomplish something despite running for re-election. It seems to me that this is a consideration, but that it should be up to the Town and it depends where you have a nine man Town Council and a City Manager government a query whether it's better to make people serve four years - you get your continuity in other ways, but you encourage public service I think in some instances by having shorter periods. Now you might be able to fashion some legislation to take care of the Town Clerk problem - I do think that that to a degree tends to take care of itself with bi-partisan endorsement which many of our towns have, once a town clerk gets entrenched, he's entrenched. Thank you.

Sen. Sullivan:

Thank you. Anybody else in regard to S.B. 915, either for or against? I declare the hearing closed on that.
S.B. 914, An Act Concerning the Terms of Municipal Clerks.

Edward J.
Tomkiel:

My name is Edward J. Tomkiel, Executive Vice President, Conn. Town Clerk's Association. I'm just here to speak very, very, briefly on municipal terms for Town Clerks. I wish you'd adjust one point here - your Town Clerk is the only individual at election time that must run the election - take care of the recording - and still run for office. I think a four year term for town clerks is ready now, it was ready about 8 years ago when they first proposed this bill. We have another bill, a tenure for Town Clerks after serving 10 years they automatically have tenure in office. May I just have the liberty to speak on one other bill - it's 7150 - because I have to go to another room - and that's the bill concerning the

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 10, 1971

Edward J. Tomkiel: vital statistics. This hasn't been changed for a number of years and this is just upgrading the fee system that all the other states in the United States have. I only have one objection on that and that's changing \$2.00 for the burial permit. I think this is a clerical error, I hope it is, it is now .50¢ - I think it should be raised to \$1.00, not \$2.00. Does the committee have any questions?

Sen. Sullivan: What bill is that?

Mr. Tomkiel: 7130. The rest of the bill is fine. Thank you for your time.

Sen. Sullivan: Anybody else either for or against S.B. 914? I declare the hearing closed. S.B. 916. An Act Concerning Municipalities Borrowing in Anticipation of State and Federal Grants. Anybody for this bill.

George Hastings: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, George Hastings, 799 Main St., Hartford, representing the Conn. Conference of Mayors. The Conference of Mayors is very much in favor of this bill - what it does with a number of detailed safeguards that I won't elaborate on, they're right in the bill, with safeguards it permits a Town to borrow in anticipation of receiving State or Federal aid under various programs that exist from time to time for the aid of municipalities. This has control by approval by the comptroller of the State of Conn. and what it would accomplish it would prevent the delay, some of the delay, that exists between the planning and the first newspaper headline of some good thing for a Town or City and its final realization as an actual project. If you know, if you're reasonably sure that you're going to get the money, this doesn't do you any good as far as getting started on the project. If you can borrow in the regular borrowing market, short notes, get the money, get the project started, and then when the Federal government gets through with its final checks and rechecks, your notes can be picked up by the grant that you're going to get. This is something that's very dear to the hearts of the Mayors of the Towns and Cities of Conn. and I ask you to consider it favorably.

Sen. Sullivan: Thank you. Anybody else for it? Anybody here against it? If not, I declare the hearing closed in regard to S.B. 916. S.B. 955, An Act Providing For State Assistance to Local Communities for Creation of Senior Citizen Centers. Anybody for this bill?

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 10, 1971

Sen. Sullivan: Anybody else in favor of H.B. 6868. Anybody opposed? If not I'll declare the hearing closed in regard to 6868. Oh, did you want to make a statement? H.B. 6869, A Referendum on Action of Town Meeting. Anybody in favor of? Anybody opposed? If not I'll declare the hearing closed in regard to H.B. 6869. H.B. 7180 - 7130. An Act Concerning Fees For Copies of Vital Records and Permits. Anybody in favor?

Gerard B.
Mullin:

My name is Gerard Mullin, Health Director's Assistant, City of Hartford. We are in support of 7130 in its entirety. I planned to read a few figures off but Mr. Tomkiel I believe from Manchester noted in this bill that the \$2.00 fee for burial should be compromised at \$1.00 - from .50¢. We in Hartford handle 3500 burials a year - of these approximately 1/2 are non-resident due to the fact that we have the hospitals - most of which are shipped across the country - this takes time; also approximately 1/3 of these deaths are either violent or untimely - needs a medical examiners records and they are difficult to handle. We cannot handle a record for .50¢, we cannot handle a record for \$1.00, we want this in its entirety if we can have it. However, I am authorized by the City, that if this one item is detrimental to the entire bill, we will compromise on it. However we do prefer the \$2.00. I had intended to make that first statement (inaudible) I'd just like to read one thing on a financial position -- inaudible -- so if I can just read this first paragraph here then I'll be done. This is a commentary on a companion bill - substantially the same as this - The cost of maintaining Hartford's Vital Records service is climbing steadily but unfortunately the revenue from fees for burial permits and for copies of birth, death and marriage certificates has not been keeping pace; for example about a decade ago - 1957 - 58, fee revenue of \$26,898. covered 70% of the years expenditures of \$38,441. In the city's current fiscal year 1970 - 71, just prior to our town budget, fees estimated at \$30,500. are covering only 47% of the year's estimated expenditures of \$64,655. Now we expect that expenditure to go up over \$70,000. to operate through this year. The 1970 - 71 percentage would have fallen even lower had not the legislature raised the marriage license fee from \$2.00 to \$5.00 in 1965. Now all I'm saying is this to conclude with in one minute - I've only been in Conn. 15 years, operating under the same fee schedule - I do have employees with 30, 35, 40 years who do not recall the last change in this fee schedule since other than the marriage fee and the City of Hartford - we are talking about this strictly as a revenue bill - it can only get worse because we still have to put on more people - we are operating 9 full time people in Vital Statistics plus volunteers if we can get them (inaudible) Mr. Tomkiel

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 10, 1971

- Gerard Mullin: said, if I could repeat, we - on the \$2.00 - we can settle for the dollar, we're not dictating this, but we voted for this original bill at the last session and we had good reason for the \$2.00 - in Hartford.
- Rep. Neiditz: Does the City of Hartford handle the vital statistics for other neighboring towns?
- Gerard Mullin: Yes - we have the Health Dept. handle them in Hartford by special legislature - now in our registration we handle 10,000 births a year for example, out of the 50,000 for the state - that's - we have 8% of the population and 20% of the births. Now of those births, almost 70% now are non-resident - we have the hospitals for practically the whole County. Thank you.
- Sen. Sullivan: Anybody else in favor of H.B. 7130? Anybody opposed? 7130. I declare the hearing - are you - which one.
- John Q. Tilson: 7130. I am John Q. Tilson speaking, as the Chairman has indicated, on behalf of the Conn. Funeral Directors' Association and with objection to one item in this bill. We have no objection to the increase of the death certificate to \$2.00, but there has been serious objection among our people to the increase in the burial permit from .50¢ to \$2.00. I understood the Town Clerk's Association also felt that the proposed burial change was too much and I think I heard the City of Hartford indicate that they weren't happy with \$1.00, but that this would be a reasonable amount which would fit in with what our people feel the amount should be. You really did me dirt, I put myself down at the head of the list and today is the day you picked to do it by the other way around. Thank you.
- Sen. Sullivan: If there's nobody either pro or con for H.B. 773, I declare the hearing closed - 773 - I declare the hearing closed in regard to that. H.J.R. 31, anybody? I declare the hearing closed in regard to that. If there's no objection I make a motion that we close this hearing.

Hearing closed at 4:05 P.M.