

HB 8799

PA 740

1971

Transportation

705, 769, 781

3

House

4966

1

Senate

3403

1

5

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

TRANSPORTATION

**PART 3
675-968**

1971

THURSDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 8, 1971

in this state, that should have never been killed because of the grand curves and your interchanges, it isn't just in Connecticut, it's in every state in the union my friends, every State in the union has the same pattern, and I was watching in the State of New England that would show them that we are so far advanced in technology that would incorporate our equipment that we have, which is the ultimate, but we're not taking advantage of it. And it happens to be Julius Cesaer's idea, and his idea my friends, is to build roads one way. This is the right concept. Not only do you eliminate head on collisions, and headlight glare, but it'll be that you can move traffic by having the traffic flow. In order to drive defensively you have to pass the other vehicles that are on the highway. Until you know each individuals capability and how to handle a vehicle, you have to overtake them. It's like being an expertee as a chess player. It's the same thing precisely. And I'm opposed to this bill and I hope you Gentlemen will think this over, and I personally would like to give you a tour and especially on some of our old roads that we would like to travel on, through Stafford Springs, which they haven't even changed yet. Route 32, I can show you abuttments where they haven't had even reflectors, show you where 10 or 12 people have been killed. Five persons on just last week on 84, a woman got killed because she went in between the guard rail. This could be prevented my friends, if we have creativity in our Engineering Departments, to prevent some of these accidents that could happen even though each of us are not infallible, that we can make mistakes. Why not prevent some of these accidents, and flow the traffic, and advance the speed limits instead of decreasing them down to a minumim of 50 miles an hour. And I want to say thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Sir. Any other opposition?

Mr. McBride: Gentlemen, Philip McBride, past President of the New England Joint Legislative Council, A. T. U. Our organization would like to go on record was opposing this bill. And I personally would like to concur with the othersspeakers against this legislation. Thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Sir. Anyone else wish to speak.

Mr. Prairie: We have received quite a bit of relief from these practices. New contracts are being offered to the dealers, their contracts they are actually selling agreements which protect the manufacturer and they are recognizing most of these problems that we feel within the next year or so we will be giving relief from most of these problems. For that reason I suspect that many of our dealers did not come up here today they don't feel that strongly about it, but nevertheless we would like to refer you to H.B. 8799 which will be heard on Monday, which does provide for license for manufacturers that do business in the State. And I think that this step probably should be taken. This thing has no control over them whatever, and there are cases out, which come up, which will be very helpful if they were licensed the same as our dealers are. Thank you very much.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you. Anyone else wish to speak in favor of the bill?
Anyone opposed?

44
mr

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 12, 1971

Chairman Mondani: Anyone else in opposition? The hearing is closed. The next bill, H. B. 5150 AN ACT CONCERNING A MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURER'S OR DEALER'S BOND: DISREGARD OF A WARRANT OR GUARANTEE; RE-GROOVED OR RECUT TIRES. Anyone in support of this measure? Anyone in opposition?

Mr. Richard Meek: We, of the Automotive Trade Asst., oppose this, as we did H. B. 6319, which your Committee heard Thursday. This bill would require a bond of a \$100,000 of each manufacturer and \$15,000 of each licensed dealer in the state. I repeat; again, you cannot buy insurance for this type of bond. You must put up the total amount in cash, of any such bond. I do not see why one particular industry should be signaled out in this manner. We therefore, ask that you turn down this measure. Thank you.

Mr. Edward Carroll: The Department of M. V. would like to go on record as being opposed to 5150. Thank you.

Mr. Robert Burns: The New England Mobile Home Asst., would like to go on record as being opposed to the bill, because of the unfair economic position it would put in posting a cash bond. However, I would like to make reference to one bill, that you are going to hear later this morning; which is 8799. H. B. 5150, says that every manufacturer transferring a new or used motor vehicle to a dealer will be subject to this bond. H. B. 8799 defines a manufacturer as one who "assembles 25 or more". So, the first 24 would be exempt. And, what you would have is a situation creating - if this bill should pass - defining a manufacturer of where they could work 24 units and get around the bonding law. So, it would be a waste of time.

Chairman Mondani: Anyone else in opposition? The hearing is closed. H. B. 5151 AN ACT CONCERNING THE USE OF SCHOOL BUSES BY THE PUBLIC. In favor?

Mrs. A. J. Pfeiff: I am from Branford, and I am speaking in favor of bill 5151, may I point out that this bill provides "instant transportation", as opposed to private investment. The school buses are available, have all the essential necessities, such as safety features, proper mechanical inspection, proper licensing, and I think, insurance for this purpose. All of the publications which I have been able to acquire have been directed at private enterprise and possible subsidization through state and federal funds. By using existing facilities which can be made available through the passage of this bill is one of its unique features. Funding of any sort would be readily acceptable. This bill would also appeal to the ecologists and environmental advocates since it will cut down on air pollution through the use of less cars. It should appeal to merchants because it will bring traffic to the stores and lessen the need for parking area. In some areas this may be a stop-gap measure until such time as a new transportation system can be adopted. There are many sections of the state where there is no means of public transportation and the Senior Citizens are clamoring for a means of getting to the stores, doctors, etc. And this will supplement mass transportation, buses, trains and taxis in the larger cities. Last, but not least,

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 12, 1981

Mr. Hawkins(continued): city population. In fact, the population counts released by the Bureau of Census, showed only 500 difference in people between Bridgeport and Hartford. And, I think that it is ironic that we had to take a trip to New York State, to find the roads to Bridgeport on any sign of this type. This sign directs you from the New York Turnpike to the city of Bridgeport. But no where in the state of Connecticut is there anything similar to this. We think the recent expressed interest in the cooperate relocations in New York, in Fairfield County and into Bridgeport in recent months, has pointed up the need for this negligence to be rectified very quickly. We would like to see that sign to Bridgeport, somewhere in the state of Connecticut; directly travelers to our area, from the Merritt Parkway or Conn. Turnpike. It is very fitting that a Representative from our area, from the smaller town of Trumbull; saw the need for this and has introduced a bill to this effect. I urge passage of this bill. Thank you.

Chairman O'Dea: Thank you. Anyone else in favor? Any opposition?
The hearing is closed on 8797.
Now H. B. 8799 - Anyone in favor?

Mr. Richard Meek: Connecticut Automotive Trades Association, we would like to go on record in support of this measure. Thursday, you heard a representative of the manufacturer kind of carve us up when we supported 7597, giving us some sort of bill of rights to correct the unequal rights between the dealer and the manufacturer - but we do think that at least the manufacturer of automobiles should be registered and licensed by the state of Connecticut. The reason for this is because of our problems with the warranty. They are made to the customer by the manufacturer and of course, are expected to carry it by the dealer. But, when problems arise, many times the manufacturer will not step up to the problem and we think that there are times when we are called into hearings at the M. V. Dept., as the dealers are on a regular basis; that the manufacturers should be required to come in, too, and defend their warrantees. There is a case now of extreme interest to us, because manufacturers refusing to make good under a waraanty; claiming abuse of the vehicle. I don't know if it was abused or not; but, the M. V. Dept., tends to say to the dealer "well, if they don't make good, you'd better". So, we think that they should be involved in this with us. And, I am not sure that this bill is quite strong enough to do this job. It simply changestthe definition of a manufacturer to include one doing business out of the state. And, I think that it probably should have to be toughen up a little bit; to give the Motor Vehicle Dept., at least some control over it. I might mention the bill the other day, that would - you talk about giving the dealer the right to sue the manufacturer - it is a meaningless right, because the cost of bringing suit against one of these manufacturers is so tremendous, that no dealer would consider doing it. So, a real short-cut would be to give the state some control over the manufacturer so that they could be called into the hearings, too. That is what we recommend. Thank you.

Chairman O'Dea: Thank you, Mr. Meek. Anyone else to comment? The hearing is closed on 8799.

H-118

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 11
4831-5162**

Saturday, June 5, 1971

16

ad

aisle, I move to suspension of the rules and passage of the one star consent items on Today's Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

MR. SARASIN:

Calendar no. 1390 - Substitute for House Bill 6714 - An Act Concerning the Investment and Management of State Funds. File 1626

Calendar no. 1399 - Substitute for House Bill 5627 - An Act Creating a Summary Proceeding for Uninsured Motorists. File 1616.

Calendar no. 1403 - Substitute for House Bill 685 - An Act Concerning Approval of Subdivision Plans. File 1609.

Calendar no. 1407 - Substitute for House Bill 6210 - An Act Concerning Interest. File 1627.

Calendar no. 1412 - Substitute for House Bill 5415 - An Act Concerning the Performance of Autopsies. File 1632.

Calendar no. 1413 - House Bill 5709 - An Act Concerning Acquisition of Land Adjacent to Highway for Agriculture and Natural Resources Purposes. File 1630.

Calendar no. 1417 - Substitute for House Bill 5049 - An Act Concerning the Assessment and Taxation of New Real Estate Construction. File 1628.

Calendar no. 1464 - Substitute for House Bill 8799 - An Act Concerning the Definition of Manufacturers Under the Motor Vehicle Statutes. File 1640.

Calendar no. 1466 - House Bill 9246 - An Act Granting a Right-of-way Across Property of the State Police Barracks in

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 74

File 1186; Cal. 643, House Bill 6904, File 1582; Cal. 1150, House Bill 7901
File 1342; Cal. 1192, House Bill 7148, File 1334; Cal. 1204, House Bill 7256
File 1393; Cal. 1214, House Bill 7014, File 1423; Cal. 1226, House Bill 8914
File 1073; Cal. 1257, House Bill 7048, File 1464; Cal. 1262, House Bill 8271
File 1474; Cal. 1267, House Bill 9020, File 1457; Cal. 1271, House Bill 5049
File 1628; Cal. 1272, House Bill 5415, File 1632; Cal. 1273, House Bill 5627
File 1616; Cal. 1274, House Bill 5709, File 1630; Cal. 1275, House Bill 5714
File 1575; Cal. 1276, House Bill 5834, File 1569; Cal. 1277, House Bill 5938
File 1585; Cal. 1278, House Bill 6210, File 1627; Cal. 1279, House Bill 6367
File 1565; Cal. 1280, House Bill 6561, File 1555; Cal. 1281, House Bill 6674
File 1586; Cal. 1285, House Bill 7077, File 1556; Cal. 1287, House Bill 8272
File 1566; Cal. 1289, House Bill 8578, File 1579; Cal. 1290, House Bill 8799
File 1640; Cal. 1293, House Bill 9246, File 1638; Cal. 1294, House Bill 9256
File 1637; Cal. 1295, House Bill 9001, File 737; Cal. 629, House Bill 7642
File 638; Cal. 721, House Bill 7802, File 1127; Cal. 755, House Bill 8761
File 773; Cal. 802, House Bill 8658, File 906; Cal. 964, House Bill 6197
File 1359; Cal. 975, House Bill 7609, File 876; Cal. 990, House Bill 8561
File 1172; Cal. 1041, House Bill 9196, File 1232.

Mr. President, I move for the adoption of all those bills, I move for suspension of the rules, first of all, for consideration of those which were not single starred or were not double starred rather.

THE CHAIR:

All those in favor of suspension of the rules indicate by saying, "aye"
All those opposed? Suspension is granted.

SENATOR CALDWELL: