

<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 71-709		1145	3	1	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Government, Administration &amp; Policy</i> 489-490</li> <li>• <i>Government, Administration &amp; Policy</i> 492</li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5568</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2880(<i>consent</i>)</li> </ul>

**H-120**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 13  
5555-6226**

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

14.

MBS

Officers Observe Dogs Attacking Deer, file 653.

Calendar No. 1578, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1022.  
An Act Concerning Appointment to Fill a Vacancy in Judicial  
Office, file 1602.

Calendar No. 1579, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1045.  
An Act Concerning Tax Payments Applicable to Oldest Obligation  
on Specific Property, file 1591

Calendar No. 1581, Senate Bill No. 1115, An Act Concerning  
Removal of Destruction of signs, file 1516.

Calendar No. 1582, Senate Bill No. 1145. An Act Requiring  
State Department Heads to File Bills Earlier, file 1538.

Calendar No. 1585, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1296,  
An Act Concerning the Penalty for Assaulting a Police Officer  
or Fireman, file 1511.

On page 4, Calendar No. 1591, Substitute for Senate Bill  
No. 1572, An Act Concerning Standardizing the Investment of  
State Civil List Funds, file 1506.

Calendar No. 1592, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1573.  
An Act Concerning State Referee Approval of Certain Negotiated  
Condemnations, file 1520.

Calendar No. 1595, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1625. An  
Act Concerning Exemption of Municipalities from Payment of  
Gasoline Tax for Governmental Purposes, file 1551.

On page 5, Calendar No. 1596, Senate Bill No. 1788, An  
Act Concerning Discharge of Sewage, Directly or Indirectly,

S-82  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1971

VOL. 14  
PART 7  
2874-3413

## THE CLERK:

The following bills were passed on a Consent Motion by Senator Caldwell with the approval of the Minority Leader;

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY: Substitute House Bill 8682. House Bill 5854. JUDICIARY: Substitute House Bill 7495. House Bill 5662; Substitute House Bill 851. GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY: Senate Bill 652; Senate Bill 1145; JUDICIARY Senate Bill 1788; Senate Bill 805; Substitute Senate Bill 1093; Substitute Senate Bill 868; Substitute Senate Bill 1441; BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES: Substitute Senate Bill 467; GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY: Senate Bill 1833; JUDICIARY Substitute Senate Bill 1296; TRANSPORTATION: Senate Bill 1115; Substitute Senate Bill 255; ELECTIONS: Substitute Senate Bill 508; JUDICIARY: Substitute Senate Bill 1022; Substitute Senate Bill 1543; TRANSPORTATION: Substitute Senate Bill 1807; JUDICIARY Substitute Senate Bill 550; substitute senate bill 823; JUDICIARY: Senate Bill 898. TRANSPORTATION Substitute Senate Bill 807; FINANCE: Substitute Senate Bill 1576; Senate Bill 1570; Substitute Senate Bill 1572; Substitute Senate Bill 1549; Substitute Senate Bill 1549; Substitute Senate Bill 1625; Substitute Senate Bill 1045; TRANSPORTATION: Substitute Senate Bill 815; EDUCATION: Substitute Senate Bill 1840; GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY: House Bill 6870; House Bill 9249; INSURANCE AND REAL ESTATE: House Bill 6995; GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY: House Bill 9242.

## THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection to the passage of the bills, as called by the Clerk? If not, Senator Fauliso, do you move the passage of all said bills?

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**GOVERNMENT  
ADMINISTRATION  
&  
POLICY**

**PART 2  
334-634**

**1971**

WEDNESDAY

APRIL 7, 1971

charges in open end Consumer Credit Plans, that is the revolving charge accounts in department stores and other retail establishments.

What this bill would do is two things; it would have the finance charge be applied to the outstanding unpaid balance at the end of any current billing cycle. Now, what they do now, is say, the billing cycle runs from February 14th to March 14th and if you get your bill February 14th, it doesn't make any difference how much you paid during that month, the finance charge is based on what your unpaid balance was at the beginning of the current cycle. In other words, it's applied on monies that you do not owe because you have paid part of it during the period. That's the first thing this does.

The other thing that is very very -- a manner of great importance to me and every other woman who deals with this type of thing, I hear it and hear it in the course of my legislative life -- the fact is that the stores do not give the customer a properly long enough time to pay that bill. I've had as little as nine days, because by the time their computer gets through with figuring the bill out and then for some reason they wait around for six or seven days before they mail that bill and by the time you get it and time you have to pay it and get your payment in -- sometimes you often have sixteen or seventeen days, I've had as little as nine.

Now, my bill would require that they gave you a proper thirty days which is the traditional way of doing business, I believe, thirty days from the time their bill is mailed to the time the payment is mailed. These retailers will tell you that it's impossible to do this. The reason seems to be that it inconveniences their computers and I feel that they can work it out as well this way as will the shorter period.

Now, my second bill, S.B. 653, it's a companion bill, would set the percentage rate under this type of credit plan at 18%. That is what they use now. Now, I know there is a great deal of sentiment in this Legislature to put it down to 12%. I did quite a bit of research on this and I feel 18%, which they are using now, is reasonable and I put 18% in my bill anyway.

The other two bills -- this is a departure from our present system. This bill has to do with filing of Legislation with the Legislative Commissioner's Office. This is S.B. 1145.

It was worked up by the Legislative Commissioner, A. Lewis

GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

WEDNESDAY

APRIL 7, 1971

and myself and Commissioner Lewis actually drafted the bill with his own hands and he agrees with it very strongly.

We all know how the introduction of Legislation bunches up just before the deadline. Well, I was in there this year attending to some of my bills and a department head came in with a whole stack of complicated Legislation with two days before the deadline. He sat in there with one of the attorneys and it was two hours with her. Well this bill -

Rep. Neiditz: Senator, that comes out of the Legislative budget even though we're performing these services for the Executive Branch.

Sen. Hammer: Right, it does, that another thing --

Rep. Neiditz: The public gets upset that the bills aren't out, there is a clog jam on bills, it's because our bills aren't done and these departments have two years to do them.

Sen. Hammer: Maybe we should put a little addition on this bill but this bill calls for Legislative -- for the Executive Agency heads to bring in all their Legislation before January 15th in the odd numbered years and in the second session, before February 8th. But it goes further than that, it requires each department head who requires assistance in drafting that Legislation from the Legislative Commissioner's Office, to get in those bills before November 15th of each year. So that's quite a departure and I think it's a splendid idea. It will help us and if you want to think about the money that we pay, that's something else again.

I have one more, a little bill to speak of. It has to do with regulations, S.B.1261. It has to do with regulations of the Executive Agencies which come to the Regulations Review Committee which reviews these regulations during the interim period when the Legislature is not in Session. I just added, at the request of the Regulations Review Committee, that those things which cannot be done by the Executive Agencies, and shall include, they cannot prepare a regulation which constitutes a matter which was rejected by the General Assembly. Now this has happened any number of times.

Chairman Neiditz: There's another bill in on this, I think, Senator Hammer.

Sen. Hammer: Oh, there is.

Chairman Neiditz: Sponsored by yourself and all of the members of the Regulation Review Committee, I believe it's the same exact bill.

Sen. Hammer: Oh is it?

GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

WEDNESDAY

APRIL 7, 1971

label on it and could possibly interfere if they should, in large quantities with sales of the State of Connecticut General Obligation Bonds.

The third matter I'd like to speak on, I wasn't planning to but it was Mrs. Hammer's comments regarding S.B.1145, AN ACT REQUIRING STATE DEPARTMENT HEADS TO FILE BILLS EARLIER. This would be good except when you have situations of a change of Administration.

Chairman Neiditz: What we were concerned with is that perhaps most of us -- we're not thinking of the elected officials offices but the line departments who might use the services of their own Assistant Attorney Generals, draft bills earlier.

Sen. Gunther: Deputy Minority Leader, speaking for the Administration in favor of S.B.1601.

Gentlemen, I appear before you to encourage the passage of S.B.1601. The two basic functions of the Research Commission are to provide Research Grants for the various state departments and agencies and to create an environment, in Connecticut, attractive to the Research oriented industries.

Simply stated, Governor Meskill feels that the first function places the Commission in the position of being an unnecessary middleman.

If a state agency is in need of research money, it should be able to include such an item in its own budget and receive the funds directly without having to pass through the hands of yet another bureaucracy. In addition, the Governor sees the function of attracting Research Industries to Connecticut, just as easily accomplished by the State Development Commission.

Perhaps at another time, under different circumstances, the State of Connecticut could afford the luxury of an agency whose functions, to a great extent, overlap other departments but with the fiscal crisis we are facing today, it simply isn't fair to ask the taxpayers to belt-tighten without reciprocal sacrifices within the government.

Some of the Research Grants which have been awarded by the Commission in recent years include funding for a study of absconding habits of honey bees. Earthquakes in Connecticut and seventy thousand dollars for a behavioral genetic laboratory for which no formal report was required.