

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-354		6713	2	1	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Finance 604-605</i> 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>2411(consent)</i> 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>2207</i>

H-112

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

10.

THE CLERK:

BUSINESS ON THE CALENDAR. TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1971, Page 1
of the Calendar. CONSENT CALENDAR.

THE SPEAKER:

May we have your attention since we have reached
Calendar Business. The Clerk has called the Consent Calendar.

The gentleman from the 95th.

MR. SARASIN: (95th)

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's
favorable reports and passage of the bills on today's Consent
Calendar, which are:

Cal. 683, Sub. for H.B. 7242, AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF
GROTON TO ISSUE PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT BONDS AND BORROW MONEY
IN ANTICIPATION THEREOF. FILE 755.

Cal. 739, Sub. for H.B. 5192, AN ACT CONCERNING LOAN REPAYMENT
SCHEDULES OF CREDIT UNIONS. File 741.

Cal. 740, Sub. for H.B. 6943, AN ACT CONCERNING THE COMPENSATION
OF SAVINGS BANK ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS AND DIRECTORS. F. 745.

Cal. 741, Sub. for H.B. 6946, AN ACT CONCERNING CHARITABLE
CONTRIBUTIONS OF SAVINGS BANKS. File 734.

Cal. 744, Sub. for H.B. 6713, AN ACT CONCERNING BUSINESS
ENTERPRISES WHICH FAIL TO PAY PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES. F. 730.

Cal. 746, Sub. for H.B. 8930, AN ACT CONCERNING CHARTER
POWERS IN REFERENCE TO MUNICIPAL OFFICES, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS
AND AGENCIES. File 731.

Cal. 747, H.B. 8509, AN ACT CONCERNING MINIMUM PROVISIONS IN
AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY POLICIES. F. 742.

roc

S-80
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL.14
PART 5
1921-2435

May 20, 1971

Page 11

local property taxes. I move its passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 716. Favorable report of the joint committee on Finance. Substitute House Bill 6713. An Act Concerning Business Enterprises Which Fail to pay Personal Property Taxes.

SENATOR CUTILLO:

I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill will allow a City or District Health Department to withhold or revoke any license issued by them, to operate a business enterprise, if the personal property taxes levied against that business have not been paid in full, within one year, from the time the taxes were due and owing.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have; the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 723. Favorable report of the joint committee on Judiciary. Substitute House Bill 8021. An Act Concerning the Ownership of Joint Deposits and Accounts. Clerk has an amendment.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, will the Clerk, please read the amendment?

THE CLERK:

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

FINANCE

**PART 2
330-726**

1971

decision of the municipality itself.

Rep. Violette: Thank you sir. Any questions from the Committee?

John McKean, Tax Collector from the town of Windsor, member of the state tax collectors legislative committee. I wish the committee would consider favorably bills 5702, 5703, 5704, and their counterparts 7874, 7871, 78--. Bill 5702, calls for local property tax collector to be notified in both transfers. We think this is only fair and just and if we are notified when a sale of personal property takes place, it allows us to move rather quickly in, and possibly save a loss of a tax. Plus the fact we are hopeful that if attorneys know that they are supposed to notify the tax collector that in drawing the necessary papers they will pro-rate the tax, so that way we will save the a many of a loss. I can tellyou we do lose an awful lot of money in personal property tax. 5703 would establish a minimum \$1.00 interest rate. We feel this will hurt nobody and we are very hopeful that it will get in those low tax amounts like 3 or 4 or 5 dollars. People have a tendency to take those small taxes, and put them aside and forget them. Then we have to ...for the bills time and time again, it costs postage it takes time, and then at the end of six months, they are still a very small and insignificant interest charge, and there is no penalty at all. So, we feel that if you did have this \$1.00 minimum interest that we would be reimbursed for the postage spent anyway. Plus, the fact we feel that we would get a lot of them in without the necessity of fianally sending a Sheriff. 5704, local tangible personal property tax means, we put this one in for many many years and we feel that this would be a great toll on the collection of personal property taxes. I know in the cities they have staggering amounts of personal property taxes and automobile taxes that we rather which are not collected. We in the small towns don't have those, that great amount. But, we do have this problem, and to give you a typical example of what happensa gasoline filling station closes over night, the property apparently that is taxed goes back to the parent company, when we find out about it to send a bill out that man who leases the property may be gone, however, the property is actually there, the parent company has it it may still be in the same location, and we can't do a blessed thing about it. We feel that we should have this protection and if you will consider the bill favorably, we would certainly appreciate it. Finally, I would like to say that I think Public Act 98 which you passed two years ago, is perhaps one of the greatest Acts that ever was passed by this state legislature to help tax collectors. I know in my own instance the collection on back taxes soared from an estimated, roughly 7900 up to about \$15,000. So, we did better than 100% on the back taxes. Thank you.

Donald J. Miklus, Controller of the town of Westport, speaking in favor of HB 6713 where-by a health permit would be denied to Food establishments if their taxes were not paid. During the past several

years the Town of Westport has experienced a substantial loss in personal property taxes from restaurants and food establishments that have not paid their taxes for a year or two and have subsequently gone out of business for various reasons. If this bill was enacted we feel that there would not be any difficulties in administering it with the tax department and the department responsible for issuing the health permit. A procedure similar to this is presently in effect in the Motor Vehicle Department where the registration is withheld because of non-payment of Motor Vehicle Taxes. Since all towns and cities, as well as the state, are having difficulty providing means of income other than taxes, a bill of this kind will enable municipalities to collect all the taxes levied upon the taxpayer and making each one pay their share of the towns operations. It will help to bring the tax collections closer to the 100% level as compared to the 95-98% level as most towns are presently experiencing. Based on this explanation and the facts presented, we support H.B. 6713.

Mr. William Kaminski: Director of the Long Meadow Association, a condominium of 215 family units, in Milford, Connecticut. I am here to speak in favor of Bill 642, and 7639. I would like to point out and repeat what Senator Stevens mentioned previously, it is very important that the wording be changed on line 32 and/or. The reason for that is that this bill addresses itself to a reassessment on 10 year basis with a municipality. At the present value, it was allowed to be made by the builder himself. And, you could appreciate that the builder could in some cases favor himself by keeping the value of his original homes at a minimum in order to attract sales for the first group of homes. The bill intends to change the method of assessmentcommon interest and service.....What happens this is just an example, using our association as an example, we have what we call the common charge, used for the payment of services. The high of common charge is \$32.45 per month and the lowest common charge is \$17.85 per month. The average cost of services is \$20 to \$27.50. The difference between the highest and the lowest is 45%. Far below the average service cost which is equally distributed to all unit owners. What the new wording will do, by allowing the common charge or the common interest be assessed by the assessed valuation that is the valuation placed on the units by the municipalities, would be the disparity of 45% and to a 21% difference. In other words using an example that does now exist. If the assessed valuation was used as a basis for the determining of the common interest, which in turn determines the cost of services, the 32.45 - 17.85 example would change to 32.45 - 25.64. The 25.64 would be still under the present or lower than the average cost. However, it would be 21% difference as opposed to 45. That all this bill intends to do. We feel very strongly that the allowing of the wording of the unit ownership act, which merely, directs itself toward the wording of fair value, without qualifying it is not a good way of determining the fate of 215 families and multiplied by many, many condominiums.....we feel that perhaps the municipality would give us a fair base, in determining