

HB 6161 PA 637 (vetoed) 1971

Transportation 368-369

House 2979-2985, 4311-4313,
4452-4455

Senate 2468-2469, 3093

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

TRANSPORTATION

**PART 2
338-674**

1971

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

state to maintain the surface, curbs, fences and walks on highways over railroad bridges constructed prior to January 1, 1955, and to maintain 100% of new bridges over railroad construction after 1961. Massachusetts and Pennsylvania (and New York on other than State Highways) require the railroad to maintain the framework and supports of such bridges. In New York, railroads are not required to contribute to cost of bridge maintenance of State Highways. In one State, Maryland, the railroad must assume 25% of maintenance costs. However, in recent years Federal Funds have been involved and railroad's costs have been zero. Rhode Island has no statute provision and the maintenance is generally determined by negotiation. Nine States; Delaware, Indiana, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, require no participation by railroad in maintenance costs, and Illinois can be considered with this group as there is no statute and usually railroad is not required to contribute to maintenance costs. Thus in the majority of these states, the public bears a major cost of maintaining highway bridges over railroads and the policy thread running through this appears to be a division of cost on a basis of benefits. With respect to bridges carrying a railroad over a highway this bill makes no change in the present law requiring the railroad to assume 100% of the maintenance. This is where this bill differs from Bill No. 6335. The continuing program for expansion of the highway system in Connecticut has required construction of several new bridges where no bridges now exist carrying the railroad over a highway, and several more are in the construction and planning stages. Under this existing law the railroad is obligated to assume full maintenance responsibility for these spans. Over the past eight years eight bridges in this category have been built or are proposed, affecting the Penn Central, which, in effect, means approximately 2,850 L.F. of additional bridge spans where no spans formerly existed; spans which are of benefit to highway traffic but of no benefit to the railroad, and spans which the railroad must maintain at its own expense under the existing law. As a matter of information to the Committee, we have prepared a tabulation, marked as Exhibit D, showing approximate maintenance expenditures in Connecticut by the former New Haven Railroad, and now the Penn Central on bridges carrying highways over the railroad. This shows that the average maintenance expenditure by the railroad in the years 1960 to 1970 inclusive averaged \$77,472 per year. In addition an average of \$198,500 per year was spent from July 196 to December 1968, which was reimbursed in accordance with Connecticut Special Acts. A tabulation of expenditures under these Acts is presented showing the various types of work accomplished together with the cost thereof. We would point out that expenditure programmed for this work in Connecticut for this year, 1971, amounts to only \$26,000 which, of course, reflects the serious financial problems of the Penn Central. Thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Chapin. Anyone else in opposition to 5561? The hearing is closed on that bill. The next bill is 6076, A TOLL-FREE EXIT LANE ON THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE AT STRATFORD. Rep. Provenzano has already spoken on the bill. Anyone else want to comment? Now the hearing is closed on this. The next bill is 6161 TRANSIT DISTRICTS. Anyone in favor of the bill?

Mr. Kanell: Mr. Chairman, I am Samuel Kanell, Deputy ~~Transportation~~

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 24, 1971

Commissioner. The apparent purpose of this bill is to eliminate the need for referendums which would expedite the establishment of transit districts, From this standpoint we support the bill because anything we can do to improve local bus service or for transportation service should be enacted and this bill by eliminating one step which would make it time consuming is desirable and therefore, should be passed.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Kanell. Anyone else to comment on the bill? The hearing is closed on 6161, House Bill 6233 PARKING AT THE NOROTON HEIGHTS RAILROAD STATION. Anyone in favor?

Rep. Frate: Representative Frate from the Town of Darien, this bill was introduced by me the Noroton Heights Railroad Station is in the Village of the Town of Darien and the town is convinced that we can get together with Mr. Kanell and solve our problems. So, I wish to withdraw the bill.

Rep. O'Dea; House Bill 6233 has been withdrawn. Next bill is H.B. 6237 we have had many comments on this bill from Mr. Kanell. Anyone else it was tied in with 5561? Hearing is closed on this bill. We now have 6323 REMOVAL OF GRADE CROSSINGS. Anyone to comment on this bill?

Mr. Gill: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I have a prepared statement which I would like to submit in connection with this bill, in support. Basically as we have gone through the hearings on the various bridge crossing bills, we have shown that the same threat, the same policy rather, threads through our support of all of these bills, the same is true with respect to this bill. I would point out that for the reasons that we have advance in these other bills we also support this bill and suggest that the benefit derived by the public in connection with change grade crossings and authorization thereof, be born by the party benefiting. So for that reason I will submit my statement and Mr. Chapin has a short statement also, in connection with this.

Rep. O'Dea: Anyone else to comment on 6323? If not the hearing is closed on 6323. The next one is 6335 THE MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OF STRUCTURES OVER OR UNDER RAILROADS. We have had many, many, comments on this one. The next bill is -----

Mr. Gill: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is George Gill, Assistant General Attorney, Penn Central Transportation Company, Debtor. Again as in the case of the previous bills I have a prepared statement which I would like to introduce and have copied into the record as our support for this bill. Mr. Tucker is also present here, I believe he has a statement, and will speak on it to be followed by Mr. Chapin. Basically this is, as we have indicated previously. is the bill we most prefer and urge favorable action on.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Gill. Mr. Tucker do you want to comment again?

Mr. Tucker: Yes, Mr. Chairman, my name is William H. Tucker, Senior Executive Representative, Penn Central Transportation Company. I have a 5 page statement in support of this bill which was introduced at our request and I'd like to summarize it briefly. If I may? The statement that I have Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, simply points out

H-113

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 6
2503-3010**

Monday, May 17, 1971

136.

roc

MR. ROSE: (69th)

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark.

MR. ROSE: (69th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. This bill is requested to take care of a situation that happened in Waterford where an ordinance was passed by the RTM and a number of people of the Town wished to petition against that ordinance as is allowed under the Special Act. Unfortunately, quite a number of the people who signed the petition signed their names improperly, not according to the way they are listed on the voters' lists and therefore the petitions were declared invalid. This bill will allow an extension of time to permit the petition to be attempted again. I think it is a proper bill and I hope it will be passed.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. If not, the question is on acceptance and passage. All those in favor will indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. THE BILL IS PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 913, Sub. for H.B. 6161. AN ACT CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRANSIT DISTRICTS BY VOTE OF THE LEGISLATIVE BODIES OF MUNICIPALITIES SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE COMMISSIONER OF TRANSPORTATION.

Monday, May 17, 1971

137.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 108th.

MR. TACINELLI: (108th)

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark.

MR. TACINELLI: (108th)

This bill would provide for the establishment of transit districts in any municipality whose legislative body may vote to do so. The bill would also permit joining with one or more other municipality to form such a district. Following such vote, the clerk of the municipality shall forward to the Commissioner of Transportation the plan of the proposed transit district together with the vote of the legislative body of such municipality and said commissioner shall approve or disapprove such plan within a reasonable time. If the commissioner approves the district as authorized by such vote the district shall be established to include each municipality so voting. The key to this bill, Mr. Speaker, would be that this bill relieves the electors of this responsibility and charges the legislative body to act accordingly. It is a good bill and it should pass.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. The gentleman from the 92nd.

roc

Monday, May 17, 1971

138.

MR. MAHANEY: (92nd)

Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to this bill. The need for rapid solutions for the transportation problems of the State becomes more pressing each day. Highways are congested, rail service is inadequate and in recent weeks we have learned that bus service is being curtailed in many of the towns and municipalities throughout the State. The General Assembly, through this bill, has become cognizant of the values of municipalities combining to form transit districts. Unfortunately our present statutes require a rather cumbersome and time-consuming procedure which hinder the municipal authorities in their efforts to serve their communities. H.B. 6161 permits the elected leaders to take prompt action towards solving local transportation problems when they arise. Transportation districts represent a move towards a comprehensive, coordinated effort to alleviate some of the transportation problems of the State. This bill provides for approval of transit districts plans by the Commissioner of Transportation. Thus insuring that inovated plans or programs can be implemented without duplication of effort and that Connecticut will develop an integrated approach to intercity travel. While many programs for moving people between and within the cities cannot be implemented for lack of funds, we cannot passover this opportunity to significantly contribute to solving the problems of the municipalities. I submit that this is good legislation and I urge its passage.

roc

Monday, May 17, 1971

139.

deputy SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. The lady from the 128th.

MRS. PEARSON: (128th)

Mr. Speaker, a question through you to the proponent of the bill. As I read the bill, am I correct in assuming that as the legislation is now on the books, a municipality would have the right to have a referendum whether or not they want to set up a transit district and if that is so, then this bill removes the referendum?

MR. TACINELLI: (108th)

Mr. Speaker, through you, in answer to the question, this bill removes the responsibility from the electors and places it on the shoulders of the legislative body.

MR. SPEAKER:

The lady from the 128th.

MRS. PEARSON: (128th)

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I object to the bill. I realize that the idea of the transit districts is in our statutes and this is something that is O.K. if it was under a referendum, but I do object to the idea of removing a referendum from the people of the State of Connecticut and I would object on removing a referendum on any idea. I don't believe I would like to take away their right to decide and place it in the hands of a municipality. I would like to vote no against this bill and I don't think it is my function here to take away referendum rights.

roc

Monday, May 17, 1971

140.

roc

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. The gentleman from the 95th.

MR. SARASIN: (95th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill. I would do so representing three small towns operating under the town meeting and would point out that at least under the towns that I represent the legislative body, being the town meeting, the referendum is always possible, simply by filing a petition I believe twenty-fours before the date of a town meeting asking one of the questions coming before the meeting to be placed on the referendum. So I don't believe that the referendum procedure is being denied here. It is also my understanding that in many of the communities operating under a charter or with a board of alderman or whatever when that is the legislative body that there are mechanics available to take a question from that legislative body and place it on a referendum for the entire electorate. I would support this legislation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. The gentleman from the 92nd.

MR. MAHANEY: (92nd)

I perhaps should point out to Rep. Pearson why the feeling or consensus of opinion is, especially in the large cities, that this bill is good legislation. There is no desire here to curtail the public's right or the citizen's right to determine

Monday, May 17, 1971

141.

matters on referendum although this bill does as has been answered by Rep. Tacinelli, remove the present requirement that this subject matter be put on a referendum in the event the town decides or the legislative body of a town decides that they want to get into a transportation authority. What precipitates this legislation is that, as most of us know, the present time our public transportation systems are in a rather shaky condition. We've had, recently in Waterbury, a serious threat by the local bus company, individual operations, to not only curtail service but there is a very, very real possibility that we may lose the service entirely. Now what happens in a situation like that is if you have to proceed under the present law and the municipality or a group of towns has to take over and provide this necessary public service is that you are bogged down with a delay in order to provide this necessary service and accomplish this because of necessity you must go through the process of a referendum. This present change in the law would expedite the process and still leave it with the legislative body to make a determination as to whether or not a transportation district was or was not a good idea and still have the further safeguard of leaving the approval or disapproval to the Commissioner. So I submit that in this day of fast-changing events as far as public transportation is concerned we can afford to forego a referendum in order to streamline the procedures for any town or city that finds itself with a loss of public transportation.

roc

Monday, May 17, 1971

142.

roc

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. The lady from the 128th.

MRS. PEARSON: (128th)

Mr. Speaker, speaking for the second time. I respect what the previous speaker had just said but no matter how you spell it you are taking away a referendum from the right of the people and I was asked this question last night at a meeting at which I was speaking. Are we getting more bills up there where local municipalities are having more rights and opportunities to have referendums and I commented "no". In fact, there was a bill before the legislature that would deny the rights of the people and take away the referendum and this was the bill that I was specifically referring to. I object to this bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Will you remark further on the bill. If not, the question is on acceptance and passage. All those in favor will indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. THE BILL IS PASSED.

The gentleman from the 16th

MR. HANNON: (16th)

Mr. Speaker, prior to moving on I wonder if we might return to Cal. 897, in an effort to dispose of business today, and ask for reconsideration on my motion to Pass, Retaining that item, the amendment offered by the gentleman from the 122nd, Mr. Stevens, is acceptable on this side of the aisle and for this reason I would like to continue with this particular

H-116

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 9
3878-4343**

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

168.

THE CLERK:

Page 30. Cal. 913, Sub. for H.B. 6161 from the Committee on Transportation.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Reinhold from the 171st.

MR. REINHOLD: (171st)

Mr. Speaker, I now have a copy of Senate Amendment A to bill 6161. The changes are rather minor. I would be happy to review them if anyone cares to have me do so.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. The gentleman can outline the amendment.

MR. REINHOLD: (171st)

I move adoption of Senate Amendment A. These changes are rather minor. It removes in line 16 the word municipality and inserts two or three other words which do not change the meaning at all. It does delete line 17 and makes a few changes in lines 19 and 21. Actually the intent of the bill is not changed materially and I still say that it is a good bill, it is timely and recommend its approval.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of Senate Amendment A. Will you remark further. The gentleman from the 165th.

MR. COLLINS: (165th)

Mr. Speaker, will the Clerk please read the amendment for those of us that don't have a copy the explanation was not

roc

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

169.

very satisfactory.

roc

THE SPEAKER:

Clerk will please read Senate Amendment Schedule A.

THE CLERK:

The bill as amended appears in the file as File 1391. Senate Amendment A reads as follows: In line 16 after the word municipality, insert "for his information and records; delete the words and said commission shall approve. Delete line 17. In line 18, insert a bracket before the word if and delete the bracket before the word the, delete the balance of said line. In line 19, delete the words authorized by such vote and delete the bracket after the word so vote. In line 21, insert a bracket after the word voting. In line 24, delete the words and subject to the. In line 25, delete the words approval of said commissioner,.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Provenzano of the 127th.

MR. PROVENZANO: (127th)

Mr. Speaker, I attempted to follow the amendment with file 1391 and I couldn't follow it.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Collins.

MR. COLLINS: (165th)

Mr. Speaker, I think you have to follow the amendment on the basis of File 945. I do think the amendment may be very significant, much more so than we have been lead to believe.

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

170.

It would appear to take the approval of the commissioner of transportation completely away and I am not so sure that it is a rather insignificant amendment.

roc

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman like to have this matter Passed, temporarily while we go through the other five items.

MR. COLLINS: (165th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would so move.

THE SPEAKER:

Without objection, so ordered.

The Clerk will return to the beginning of the Calendar and call those items which were Passed, temporarily.

The Clerk inquires as to whether or not the Committee of Conference has met and whether or not it is preped to report to the item on Page 31.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 403, H.B. 5375. AN ACT CONCERNING LIABILITY OF LIQUOR SELLERS FOR DAMAGE BY INTOXICATED PERSONS.

MR. PROVENZANO: (127th)

Mr. Speaker, we did find someone to consult with upstairs and I would move for the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman has moved the acceptance and passage. Would he care to deliver the report of the Committee of Conference.

H-117

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 10
4344-4830**

I urge passage of the bill as amended, Mr. Speaker. It would be very helpful keeping track of gifts to our educational institutions.

djh

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, the question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence. All those in favor will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

The next disagreeing action, Calendar No. 651, H.B. No. 9023, An Act Providing the Right to Witnesses to Have Counsel in Grand Jury Appearances, as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" and Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. PRETE (114th):

Mr. Speaker, may this matter be passed temporarily?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The matter will be passed temporarily.

THE CLERK:

Page 31, another Disagreeing Action, Calendar No. 913, substitute for H.B. No. 6161, An Act Concerning the Establishment of Transit Districts by Vote of the Legislative Bodies of Municipalities Subject to the Approval of the Commissioner of Transportation, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. REINHOLD (171st):

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

Wednesday, June 2, 1971

110

MR. REINHOLD (171st):

The Clerk has an amendment, Mr. Speaker, but with your permission I will speak to that amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman care for an opportunity to outline the amendment before moving its adoption?

MR. REINHOLD (171st):

Yes sir.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none, the gentleman from the 171st for the purpose of outlining Senate Amendment "A".

MR. REINHOLD (171st):

Senate Amendment "A", Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, was one regarding which I spoke yesterday and regarding which bluntly I goofed. The amendment came to me with very short notice. I did overlook the fact that it eliminated the approval and general supervision by the Commissioner of Transportation which I recognize as being a serious change. I, therefore, move the rejection of Senate Amendment "A".

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You've heard the outline of Senate "A" and the motion is for its rejection. Will you remark further on the motion to reject Senate "A"? Will you remark further on the motion to reject? If not all those--

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

Mr. Speaker, would I have an opportunity to speak on the bill if you reject the amendment?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Yes, you will. The motion before us is acceptance and passage...

djh

Wednesday, June 2, 1971

111

djh

motion. We have now proceeded to a reading of Senate "A" and a motion to reject Senate "A". If Senate "A" is, whether Senate "A" is rejected or not, there'll be an opportunity to remark further on acceptance and passage. On reflection, the Chair comments to the lady's inquiry is incorrect. If we are to reject Senate "A", we would then be in a posture of disagreement. The next action would be the appointment of a committee to compromise of three to resolve such disagreement. On reflection, the Chair would have to indicate to the lady from the 128th, if Senate "A" is rejected, there will be a committee of conference before any further consideration of the bill. Will you remark further on the motion to reject?

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

Yes. I would also like to urge rejection of the amendment and agree with the gentleman from the Transportation Committee. I believe this is a bad bill. I spoke against it without the amendment and with the amendment also, I still am opposed to the bill. I think that the committee of conference should meet and I would hope that they would reject the entire bill. This is a bad precedent that we are establishing here. The state has nibbled away at rights of our citizens and I feel this is another example of the erosion of our democratic rights, this type of a bill and with this type of an amendment. We have recently had a ruling from the Supreme Court regarding housing and it regarded referendums in housing and the court said provisions for referendum demonstrate devotion to democracy. With such a bill like this and with an amendment like this, I feel that in Connecticut we would be taking away people's rights. Referendums, I believe, are the foundation on which our democracy is constructed and we should continue to build that democracy and not to destroy it. And I feel that this amendment, and if this bill would

Wednesday, June 2, 1971

111

be doing this particular fact. I oppose the amendment and I oppose the bill and I would hope that the committee of disagreeing action would throw out the bill. Thank you.

djh

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the motion for rejection of Senate "A"? If not, all those in favor of rejection of Senate "A" will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Senate "A" is REJECTED. We now have a disagreeing action. The Chair would appoint a committee of compromise, the gentleman from the 171st, Rep. Reinhold, the gentleman from the 108th, Rep. Tacinelli, and the gentleman from the 150th, Rep. Frate.

MR. PRETE (114th):

Mr. Speaker, may we at this time take up three matters upon which there's agreement on both sides for reconsideration?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

MR. PRETE (114th):

Perhaps we can go on to another matter on the Calendar until we discuss it a little bit further. There seems to be a breakdown of communications.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On the motion to reconsider, the motion is to reconsider. We'll return to the call of the regular Calendar.

THE CLERK:

On page 30, from the committee on Judiciary, a Disagreeing Action, Calendar No. 651, H.B. No. 9023, An Act Providing the Right to Witnesses to Have Counsel in Grand Jury Appearances, as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" and Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

**S-81
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 6
2436-2873**

May 26, 1971

33

THE CLERK:

Page 8, Calendar 811, File 947, Favorable Report of the Committee on Banks and Regulated Activities on Sub. HB5780, An Act Clarifying the Purposes of the Electric Cooperative Act.

SENATOR MURPHY:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill makes available to the six municipal utility units in the State of Connecticut the provisions of the electric cooperative act so that they can join together as municipal utilities and enter into longrange contracts through the New England Power Compact. This bill in no way affects the areas that these municipal utilities will serve and it in no way affects the franchises of public utilities.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed, nay? The Ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 813, File 945, Favorable Report of the Committee on Transportation on Sub HB 6161, An Act concerning the Establishment of Transit Districts by Vote of the Legislative Bodies of Municipalities subject to the Approval of the Commissioner of Transportation. The Clerk has an amendment.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will the Clerk please read the amendment?

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Senator Mondani. In line 16 ~~after the word "municipality" insert "for his information and records" and~~

May 26 1971

delete the words "and said commissioner shall approve". In line 18 insert a bracket before the word "if" and delete the bracket before the word "the" and delete balance of said line. In line 19 delete the words "authorized by such vote " and delete the bracket after the word "to vote". In line 21 insert a bracket after the work "voting". In line 24 delete the words "and subject to the". In line 25 delete the words "approval of said commissioner".

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, the amendment deletes the power of the commissioner of transportation to reject such a transit district if it is approved by the legislative body. This amendment requires that the plan be forwarded to him for his information and records so that he can be advised of these plans. I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption of the amendment. Will you remark further? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed, nay? The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted and ruled technical. You may proceed with the bill as amended.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, with the amendment it now grants to the legislative body of the town the power to form a transit district, either itself or in concert with other districts.

THE CHAIR:

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

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 7, 1971

22

1252 , File 1478, H.B. 6538, An Act Concerning the Powers of the Commission on Aid to Higher Education.

Page 17, File 1256, File 1485, H.B. 6982 An Act Exempting the State and its Political Subdivisions from the Fair Trade Act.

1259, File 1454, Sub. H.B. 7596 An Act Concerning License Plates on Motorcycles.

Page 18, Cal. 1260, File 1488 Sub. H.B. 7712 An Act Concerning the Federal-Aid Urban System of Highways.

Page 19, Cal. 1268, File 1447, Sub. H.B. 9165 An Act Concerning Administrative Appeals.

Cal. 1270, File 1473, H.B. 9255, An Act Concerning Amending the Charter of Bacon Academy.

Page 21, Cal. 536, File 1195, Sub. S.B. 1679 An Act Concerning Claims Against the State.

Cal. 688, File 1008, Sub.S.B. 429, An Act Concerning the Retirement Salary of Certain Workmen's Compensation Commissioners.

Page 22, Cal. 705, File 1023, S.B. 1405 An Act Concerning the Creation of the Naugatuck Valley Industrial Development Distr.

Cal. 789, File 1122, Sub. S.B. 879 An Act Concerning Investigation of Rates of a Public Service Corporation By the Public Utilities Commission.

Cal. 813, File 1391, Sub. H.B. 6161 An Act Concerning the Establishment of Transit Districts by Vote of the Legislative Bodies of Municipalities Subject to the Approval of the Commissioner of Transportation.

Page 31, Cal. 881, File 1246, Sub. S.B. 0654 An Act Concerning the Authority of the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles to Make Regulations.

I believe thats it. I now move for suspension of the rules for consideration of all items that were not starred, or only single starred.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on suspension of the rules . Is there any objection? No objection. The rules are suspended. All the matters