

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-782		7256	2	19	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Judiciary</i> 626 • <i>Judiciary</i> 653 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2809- 2821 • 3664- 3669 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3403

H-113

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

Friday, May 14, 1971

69

Amendment Schedule A. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Page 24, Calendar 899, Petition No. 2. House Bill 7256 - An Act Concerning Disclosure of Beneficiaries of Real Property Held in Trust. This is an unfavorable report of the House Committee on Judiciary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 87th.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY:

I move acceptance of the joint committee's unfavorable report and rejection of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question on acceptance of the joint committee's unfavorable report and rejection of the bill. Will you remark.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY:

The bill would provide and make mandatory in every instance, the disclosure on the land records of beneficiaries of, with respect to any property held by a person or corporation in trust. First of all, there are many trusts where it would be absolutely impossible at some given point in time to determine who the element distributes of that property may be. The determination depends upon the happening of future events and therefore be impossible in most cases to comply with this proposed law. There are many excellent legitimate business purposes served through the purchase of holding of land by a trustee, whether or not so

ad

Friday, May 14, 1971

70

ad

declared. I would point out, for instance the very successful building of a brand new city, Columbia. All the land for that development was purchased through nominees who are really trustees. Enactment of this type legislation would create a very real problem as to market ability of title of real estate held by a trustee. We have a very effect statute assuring the marketability, but if we have to put the names of all the beneficiaries, the question is going to rise as to whether or not all of them would have to be assembled and concur in any transaction by the trustee. I urge this House sustain the action of its committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 156th.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLER:

I rise to speak in favor of rejection of the committee's unfavorable report. The intent of this bill is simply to make it impossible to own real property by in effect hiding behind a trustee. I would like to emphasize that when real property is held in trust there is no way to compel the disclosure of the names of the persons for whom the trustee is acting. I would ask when the vote is taken, it be taken by roll call.

MR. SPEAKER:

Request for roll call vote. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The Chair is in doubt. All those in favor of the roll call, indicate by saying Aye. Opinion of the Chair, twenty percent in support of the motion for roll call to be taken.

Friday, May 14, 1971

71

Questions on acceptance on rejection. Will you remark further. Representative Costello.

REPRESENTATIVE COSTELLO:

I rise to speak in favor of the acceptance of the unfavorable report. I believe that this bill is much too broad for the purpose that it is really designed to accomplish.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on acceptance and rejection. Gentleman from the 47th.

REPRESENTATIVE DOOLEY:

I rise to support the unfavorable report of the judiciary committee. From a legal standpoint, this bill doesn't begin to reach the interest I think Mr. Miller is concerned with. First of all the entire law principle in agency in the state of Connecticut permits the use of an undisclosed principle to purchase and hold real estate which is not necessarily part of the trust. I would point out that trust agreements need not be written and that I can't see any way in which, when you have an oral trust relationship this particular statute could be enforced.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. Gentleman from the 156th.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLER:

I would just like to say I would be open to any amendments which might be offered if the favorable report were rejected today, so that we might take up some of these amendments.

MR. SPEAKER:

Friday, May 14, 1971

72

Will you remark further on rejection. Gentleman from the 157th.

ad

REPRESENTATIVE BINGHAM:

I rise in support of Representative Miller's proposition that we should reject the committee's unfavorable report. This has become a particular issue in the city of Stamford especially in reference to Planning and Zoning Commissions whereby people take property in trust for other people obtain zoning changes and thereafter the real owners of the property are known to the people of the city of Stamford.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 81st.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROZZELLA:

I rise in support of the committee's unfavorable report. I am very sympathetic, I think the problem that was pointed out by Representative Miller insofar as Stamford is concerned. I would submit that the bill before us is unenforceable as written, the reason being it refers to a corporation who holds property as a trustee. Now, really a corporation holds property and we all know there are stockholders.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 155th.

REPRESENTATIVE EDWARDS:

I think in a way we are ducking the issue. The issue is whether there is a problem here and I am sure it is not just the city of Stamford that perhaps faces some of these things. I

Friday, May 14, 1971

73

ad

agree that as written, I don't think the bill does solve what Representative Miller and others are looking for.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Papandrea.

REPRESENTATIVE PAPANDREA:

Through you, a question either to Representative Healey. Would there be objection to an amendment limiting the scope of the bill to applications for either variances or for changes of zone which would be applicable to all 169 towns.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would you care to respond. Gentleman from the 87th.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY:

If the bill had been phrased originally along the lines which have been indicated I think it would have received completely different treatment from the Judiciary Committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question on acceptance of the joint committee's unfavorable report and rejection of the bill. Will you remark further. Gentleman from the 160th.

REPRESENTATIVE CONNORS:

I would like to speak in favor of Mr. Miller's bill. I think Mr. Miller has a good bill, I think the bill should be passed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 16th.

REPRESENTATIVE HANNON:

I think Representative Papandrea has spoken to the very

Friday, May 14, 1971

74

ad

heart of the issue and I'm reliably told by those who brought the bill out unfavorably that they would look with favor upon an amendment to be put on the bill if it was rejected which would limit those areas to zoning board of appeals appearances and zoning appearances with particular regards to changes and subdivision application. And for that reason, I shall vote to reject the unfavorable report so that we will have an opportunity to apply that amendment to the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 87th.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY:

May I have the permission of the House to address the body for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection on the part of any individual member the gentleman from the 87th speaking for the third time on his motion. Being no objection, the gentleman from the 87th.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY:

In view of the developments, we have had a quick caucus, the Judiciary Committee would be perfectly agreeable to the consideration of a bill along the lines which have been discussed. That is, fair full complete disclosure before such things as board zoning, appeals zoning commissions. It is my understanding of the legislative situation where we now stand that the only way that this could be accomplished would be by rejection of the committee's report. So that the bill itself before us, so that a proper amend-

Friday, May 14, 1971

75

ment could be offered. In view of the statements that have been made as to the intent to offer such an amendment and withdraw from a shotgun approach which is the thing that caused the committee so much concern, we withdraw our objection to the weak exit of the unfavorable report.

MR. SPEAKER:

In virtue of the remarks by the gentleman who made the main motion, would the gentleman from the 156th care to withdraw his motion for a roll call vote.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLER:

Point of clarification. If my ears did not do me an injustice, did I just hear the gentleman reporting the bill now say that the Judiciary Committee had now withdrawn its unfavorable report?

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman from the 87th care to respond. The impression the Chair had was contrary, was not the Chair's impression that the withdrawal of the main motion had been made. That was not the case, that was not the Chair's impression of the situation. However the gentleman from the 87th was now urging the members to vote against his own motion so that the matter could be referred to Legislative Commissioner's Office and return to this chamber for further amendment. Such amendments not being available under the limitation in our rules at this time. Is the chair's impression correct.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY:

Through you, you have correctly stated my position sir. I

Friday, May 14, 1971

76

don't feel that we have the power to withdraw the unfavorable report.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 156th.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLER:

May I have permission to speak for a third time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection. Hearing none.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLER:

I would like to say that an amendment which would limit this to planning commissions, zoning commissions and the like, would be acceptable to me and in light of what has developed here, I wish to withdraw my motion for a roll call vote.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion for a roll call vote has been withdrawn. The motion before us is for acceptance and rejection. Acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and rejection of the bill. The gentleman who advanced the motion, placed the motion before us is urged the members to vote against that motion. Will you remark further on the motion. Gentleman from the 130th.

REPRESENTATIVE SULLIVAN:

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I rise to urge acceptance of the unfavorable report and I am particularly disturbed as an individual member that committee, to hear a discussion about an amendment as this point on a subject that would be the initial step towards zoning regulations for 169

ad

Friday, May 14, 1971

77

ad

towns as enacted by this General Assembly. It seems to me that if we are going to get into something along those lines, that this is a matter that should have been taken up when there was time for a public hearing and there was time for consideration before the final date for reporting bills out. I urge acceptance of the unfavorable report of the committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. Gentleman of the 98th.

REPRESENTATIVE DI MEO:

I would like to speak in favor of accepting the unfavorable report. The discussion has generated basically around the position of whether the property owners should be made known when a zone change is being proposed or an application for the board of appeals. Any commission or board who grants a variance or a zone change on the fact of who owns it, I contend as not being properly, it makes absolutely no difference as far as I am concerned, as to who owns the property.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 94th.

REPRESENTATIVE AVCOLLIE:

I would like to agree whole heartedly with the previous speaker and suggest that this body will do an injustice to our legislative process. I would like to point out that if this matter had come before the legislature as is now suggested, it would not have been before the Judiciary Committee but before the Committee on General Law. And I don't think we should

Friday, May 14, 1971

78

subject the House at this state in this session to attack which would have been properly before a committee on general law. I think that the statutes as they are presently constituted give zoning and planning commissions and zoning boards of appeals complete right to provide for disclosure of principles when applications are made. I would support the unfavorable report.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 165th.

REPRESENTATIVE COLLINS:

I want to agree wholeheartedly with the position as stated by the last three speakers. I think this is sufficient enough importance to ask for a roll call and would so move sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

There has been a further request for a roll call vote by the gentleman of the 165th. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. Opinion of the Chair sufficient number in support. Roll call vote will be called in the Hall of the House. Gentleman from the 95th.

REPRESENTATIVE SARASIN:

I wish to rise to disagree with the Minority Leader and the gentleman from the 94th. I think, while I will probably be opposed to the bill under any circumstances, but what I think is more important here is that the gentleman from Stamford has circulated a petition to the members of this House and has obtained as least one more than half of those members for the purpose of bringing this question to the floor. For that purpose only, I

Friday, May 14, 1971

79

think he is entitled to full debate for that reason. I would urge the rejection of the unfavorable report and give him that opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 78th.

REPRESENTATIVE PAPANDREA:

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Minority Leader, Mr. Sarasin. I think he's got the essence of it. I think when an issue such as this has been petitioned out, when the issue has been narrowed down, when the committee itself through the man reporting the bill out has indicated a willingness to accept that procedure on behalf of the committee, I think the least we as a body can do is take cognizance of our true function here, but just to deliberate and consider what is the best interest of the people. I think exception to the comments that have been made that we have no business getting into this area. Anyone who studies zoning at all, knows that there is no power whatsoever in the area of planning and zoning, which is not the direct result of a state statute. We, as a general assembly created the local power to zone. I think the question here is one of substance, I think the man has petitioned it out, I think the committee has given its consent and I think we owe him a day where it can be deliberated and considered fully on its merit. I urge we reject the committee unfavorable and give this a full and fair hearing.

MR. SPEAKER:

ad

Friday, May 14, 1971

80

ad

Will you remark further. If not, the Chair will announce an immediate roll call. Gentleman from the 78th.

REPRESENTATIVE PAPANDREA:

While we wait, I think you would do all a service if you were to explain exact procedure of what would happen if one voted yes and what would happen if one voted no.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion before you is acceptance of the joint committee's unfavorable report and rejection of the bill. A yes vote would terminate and conclude any further consideration of this matter in this session. A no vote would in effect defeat the main motion, would reject the committee's recommendation of rejection and would result in the bill being transmitted to the legislative commissioner's office for examination. It would be returned here to this chamber where it would be treated as a favorable report and would be susceptible to amendment.

The machine will be open. Have all the members voted. The machine will be closed and the Clerk will take tally.

CLERK:

Total number voting 112

Necessary for acceptance of the unfavorable report and rejection of the bill 57

Yea 41 Nay 71

Absent and not voting 65

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is defeated, the bill is referred to legislative

Friday, May 14, 1971

81

commissioner's office for its consideration.

Gentleman from the 16th.

REPRESENTATIVE HANNON:

May we return to the top of page 24, Disagreeing Actions, Calendar 259. There has been some resolution of the problem and we passed it temporarily.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk please read Calendar 259.

CLERK:

Calendar 259, Substitute for House Bill 8614. An Act Concerning Closing Hours for Premises Serving Alcoholic Liquors. In your files, 971.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 127th.

REPRESENTATIVE PROVENZANO:

Now that we are unconfused, we will try to confuse you again. Senate Amendment Schedule A which we adopted -

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman care to make a motion.

REPRESENTATIVE PROVENZANO:

I thought we were carrying off from where we left off and that motion still carries as I understand it and adopted Senate Amendment Schedule A.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes we did, the matter was passed temporarily. The motion before the chamber was acceptance and passage as amended by

ad

H-115

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 8
3377-3877**

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

An amendment is currently being typed up in the Commissioner's Office and will be forthcoming shortly to be submitted by Rep. Avcollie. I would inquire of the Chair whether it would be appropriate to initiate debate at this point or to pass it temporarily.

THE SPEAKER:

I would suggest that it be passed temporarily until the amendment is in the possession of the Clerk.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

Fine, I so move.

THE SPEAKER:

The item will be passed temporarily.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the 59th for the purpose of making an announcement. Rep. Cohen, the Dean of the House.

MR. COHEN (59th):

Mr. Speaker, there will be a joint executive meeting of the Appropriations Committee at three o'clock in Room 310.

MR. REINHOLD (171st):

Mr. Speaker, a brief announcement. Yesterday's Bulletin and today's indicated a meeting of the Transportation Committee for a hearing tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. That timing has been changed from 10 a.m. until 12 noon.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will continue with the call of the Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 899, H.B. No. 7256, An Act Concerning Disclosure of Beneficiaries of Real Property Held in Trust.

djh

Tuesday, May 25, 1971

24

MR. MILLER (156th):

djh

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment. Will the Clerk please read the amendment?

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will the Clerk call House Amendment Schedule "A"?

THE CLERK:

House "A" offered by Rep. Miller of the 156th.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the members please give their attention to the Clerk?

THE CLERK:

Strike out everything after the enacting clause and insert the following in lieu thereof: "Any person who makes an application to a planning commission, zoning commission or zoning board of appeals pertaining to real property the record title to which is held by a trustee of an undisclosed trust shall file with said application a sworn statement disclosing the name of the equitable owner of such real property or the beneficiary of the trust."

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, may the record show that pursuant to Rule 18, I'm absenting myself during the consideration and vote on this bill?

(Mr. Ajello left the House)

THE SPEAKER:

Tomorrow's Journal will so indicate.

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Would you remark?

MR. MILLER (156th):

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is simply to allay some

Tuesday, May 25, 1971

25

of the fears expressed by members of this House during the last discussion of the bill in question. The amendment would simply restrict the purpose of the original bill by making it necessary to disclose the names of persons for whom a trustee was acting only in a situation where there was an application before a planning commission, a zoning commission or a zoning board of appeals. I think this amendment should make the bill itself acceptable to the House and I would strongly urge it's adoption.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The amendment is ADOPTED and ruled technical.

MR. MILLER (156th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark?

MR. MILLER (156th):

As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". The bill is intended, Mr. Speaker, to take care of a problem which has arisen in many of our towns and cities regarding beneficiaries of real property held in trust. If an applicant who is a trustee is compelled to disclose the name of the person or corporation for whom he is acting, those who are adjacent property owners and those citizens of a town who may wish to oppose or support an application for a variance will know whether or not a member of the board in question has a conflict of interest because he has an interest in the property. Certainly we don't think that planning and zoning decisions should be made on the basis

Tuesday, May 25, 1971

26

of who owns certain properties but I do think this bill will go far in cleaning up the whole area of planning and zoning regulations. Thank you.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended?

MR. EDWARDS (155th):

Mr. Speaker, referring back to the discussion we had before, I believe that this amendment now takes care of those objections that people have and I would like to support the bill as it now stands.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

MR. HARLOW (172nd):

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to excuse myself under Rule 18 from this vote if I may.

(Mr. Harlow left the House)

THE SPEAKER:

The record in tomorrow's Journal will so indicate.

Further remarks on the bill as amended?

MRS. CLARKE (158th):

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good bill. We have a great need for it in Stamford.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. DOOLEY (47th):

Mr. Speaker, I think the bill is totally unnecessary. Several towns in Connecticut have already by ordinance required those who appear before zoning commissions, zoning boards of appeal and planning commissions, require those people to disclose who any other party in interest may be and the only

answer to date that we've received as to why the people in Stamford can't do this is that they have some local difficulties. And I am opposed to we, here in the General Assembly, requiring 169 zoning commissions to enact this legislation. The basic purpose of the bill, it seems to me, is not only to disclose conflict of interests among the people who may serve on these commissions but also to indicate to the commission who the real party in interest in the property is. And as I said previously, this can easily be done by ordinance under the existing statute. I feel the bill is unnecessary.

MR. CASSIDENTO (106th):

Mr. Speaker, just to reiterate some of the sentiments of Rep. Dooley. I just don't see why this bill is necessary. Moreover, I think that if this bill were passed, the zoning boards, the planning commissions, would be put into a position whereby their motives for accepting or rejecting a proposal would be suspect and I just don't see any need for this in as much as each individual planning or zoning commission could write their own rules.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

MR. GUIDERA (162nd):

Mr. Speaker, I was originally opposed to the bill in its original form. I now stand in support of the bill. I believe that it does more than disclose conflict of interest. I think we're only all too well aware of the land deals that have occurred in New Jersey and some other states and I think a bill like this would disclose to zoning commissions and eventually to consumers just who's involved in subdividing the land and selling it, and for that reason, I would support this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended?

Tuesday, May 25, 1971

28

djh

MR. SHERER (159th):

Mr. Speaker, I am in wholehearted agreement with the bill. I support the bill in it's essence with the amendment. I feel that it does a job of protection. It protects the city from unscrupulous people who would wish to take advantage of city property that is out for bid and for sale and would also enhance position of the city so that it can and would help those who are out to protect again, as I said, the municipality and the city as a whole.

MR. BINGHAM (157th):

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support Rep. Miller's effort to pass this bill and the other representatives of the City of Stamford.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage as amended. All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bill as amended is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Page 6 of the Calendar, top of the page, Calendar No. 975, substitute for H.B. No. 5715.

MR. MAHANEY (92nd):

Mr. Speaker, with reference to Calendar No. 975, substitute for H.B. No. 5715, I now move that that matter be recommitted to the Committee on Judiciary.

THE SPEAKER:

The motion is to recommit Calendar No. 975. Will you remark? Is there objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

I suggest that the Clerk skip the next Calendar item, 1002, since it also relates to the subject of the death penalty and we'll take it up when the other item is ready for consideration.

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:

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

JUDICIARY

**PART 2
393-688**

1971

We are happy to join in support of this Bill which would create a Probate District Court for Wethersfield, Newington and Rocky Hill. I could almost say ditto to what Representative Thornton just said but I would like to repeat that this appears to be a trend to bring the governmental functions closer to the people and much more easily acceptable to the people of a community and this is certainly a step in that direction.

It would be a great convenience, particularly to older people who find it difficult to get into Hartford and combat the parking problem and the traffic problem etc. It would also bring the judge closer to the people of the community and a more personal relationship and a smaller court jurisdiction would be established.

So if the Committee chooses to bring out a favorable report on this Bill, the people of Wethersfield would be very appreciative and welcome the convenience of such a Court within the boundaries of the Town itself. I have been informed that our Town Clerk has sent some material to the Committee on the number of people who would probably use the Court and I think that will be in your hands before long. Thank you, Sir, very much.

Sen. Jackson: Are there any other members of the General Assembly who would like to testify.

Rep. Miller: I am Representative Frederick Miller of the 156th District in Stamford. I would like to support H.B. #7256.

H.B. #7256 - AN ACT CONCERNING DISCLOSURE OF BENEFICIARIES OF REAL PROPERTY HELD IN TRUST.

There has been considerable support to this Bill and in my Community - Stamford, the Collision of Neighborhood Association - a confederation of local homeowner groups supports this Bill. Many of these people feel that it is not in the public interest to have a situation wherein effect commercial interest which wish to downzone established residential areas are able to in effect, hide behind trustees.

There has also been some support for this Bill from people interested in low income, middle income, non-profit housing and they feel they have had some difficulty in obtaining certain sites because the property was held by Trustees. Thank you.

Sen. Jackson: Thank you very much.

Rep. Guidera: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is George Guidera, I am a Representative from the 162nd Assembly District. I wish to speak in favor of 4 Bills today - H.B. #7336, 7337, 7341 and 7566. - Beginning with the last - H.B. #7566.

H.B. #7566 - AN ACT CONCERNING MEDICAL EVIDENCE OF INCAPACITY ON THE APPOINTMENT OF CONSERVATOR.

or hers assigned physician, psychiatrist, etc. That no mental patient's personal problems or records be discussed in any way or manner at or in large or small groups of rank and file employees nor before any group or groups of mental patients. I thank you.

Sen. Jackson: Thank you very much. Mr. Lynch to be followed by Attorney Glenn.

Mr. Lynch: My name is William J. Lynch, I am a Legislative Administrator Advisor for the Connecticut Department of Transportation and I have been asked to appear here today in support of H. B. #5714.

H. B. #5714 - AN ACT CONCERNING DISCLOSURE OF PROPERTY OF PERSONS AGAINST WHOM THE STATE HAS A CLAIM.

This Bill would permit other State Agencies having claims against debtors to utilize the facilities that are presently available in the matter of welfare actions under Section 17-303. This would tend to keep down the cost of recovering what are frequently small sums of money and would also expedite the litigation of those cases where it was necessary.

For this reason, the Department of Transportation supports this Bill. Thank you, Gentlemen.

Sen. Jackson: Mr. Glenn to be followed by Mr. Arafah.

Mr. Glenn: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is William E. Glenn, I am an Attorney appearing on behalf of the Connecticut Bankers Association. I will speak very briefly on 3 or 4 Bills. H. B. #7256 -

H. B. #7256 - AN ACT CONCERNING DISCLOSURE OF BENEFICIARIES OF REAL PROPERTY HELD IN TRUST.

In listening to Representative Miller, it seems that the purpose here is a ~~locatable~~ ^{locatable} one and I think, Mr. Chairman, you directed yourself to this question in West Hartford some years ago having to do with hiding the true interest through the use of trust or some other means. The only thing we can point out is that there are many, many trusts where there are corporate trustees having contingent on bona on determined beneficiaries and this would require a great deal of work just to file all the names even if we could determine them in all cases.

On H. B. #7485.

H. B. #7485 - AN ACT CONCERNING PROPERTY IN DECEDENT'S ESTATE.

Reducing the period before (as ^{escheat} Chief) to the State from 5 to 10 years, I think it is recognized that it is generally longer in other states and that many times banks and lawyers have been successful in locating lost heirs during a period of time of well in excess of five years and we would therefore hope that the Committee would not give this a reduction of time favorable consideration.