

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB1199      PA 591      1975

Senate: P. 3232-3233      (2)

House: Consent 6/03      (1)

Regulated Activities 527-528      (2)

Finance 408      LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE  
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

---

58.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate  
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2015

S-111

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1975

VOL. 18

PART 7

3189-3690

Monday, June 2, 1975

39.

by the Committee on Public Health and Safety.

roc

THE PRESIDENT:

Will you remark on it, Senator?

SENATOR CIARLONE:

I will, Mr. President. This bill gives the commissioner of mental health the authority to redesignate the mental health service regions. It further provides for catchment (?) areas and councils within each area. It's a good bill and I move it to the Consent Calendar.

THE PRESIDENT:

Without objection, the matter is moved to the CONSENT CALENDAR.

THE PRESIDENT:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1124, File 1133. Favorable report joint standing committee on Finance. Substitute Senate Bill 1199, AN ACT CONCERNING ASSIGNMENT OF OR LIEN UPON HOSPITALIZATION OR MEDICAL INSURANCE PROCEEDS.

THE PRESIDENT:

Senator Beck.

SENATOR BECK: (29th)

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report.

THE PRESIDENT:

Will you remark on the bill, Senator?

Monday, June 2, 1975

40.

SENATOR BECK:

roc

Mr. President, this provides for assignment of lien upon hospitalization of the proceeds of medical insurance but the Committee on Finance did check to be sure that this lien can be removed after the cost of hospitalization is provided for and we now, therefore, move adoption of the legislation on the Consent Calendar.

THE PRESIDENT:

Without objection, the matter is ordered to the CONSENT CALENDAR.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1125, File 1136. This is favorable report joint standing committee on Transportation. Substitute Senate Bill 1671, AN ACT CONCERNING REEVALUATION OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION.

THE PRESIDENT:

Senator Amenta.

SENATOR AMENTA:

Mr. President, could that bill be Passed Retaining.

THE PRESIDENT:

Do you want to pass it temporarily?

SENATOR AMENTA:

Pass Retaining, please.

THE PRESIDENT:

Passed Retained.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1126, File 1138. Favorable report joint standing

H-170

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1975

VOL. 18  
PART 13  
6010-6572

Tuesday, June 3, 1975 3.

No. 1199, File No. 1133.

efr

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection on the part of any individual member on the matters within the purview of the motion being ordered to Consent? Hearing none, they are ordered to Consent.

CORNELIUS O'LEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would move for suspension of the rules for immediate consideration of the no-starred items on today's Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection to suspension for immediate consideration of Calendars 1425, 1425 at this time as Consent items? Hearing none, the rules are suspended.

CORNELIUS O'LEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance and passage of those items on today's Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on acceptance and passage of the matters on today's Consent Calendar, and all those in favor will indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. The matters are passed as Consent items.

THE CLERK:

Please turn to Page 1, Executive Nominations. On Page 1, Calendar 1421, H.J.R. 248, confirming the nomination of William Jones, of New Haven, to be a member of the Commission for Higher Education.

BRUCE L. MORRIS:

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**REGULATED  
ACTIVITIES  
PART 2  
429 - 851**

**1975**

99  
EMK  
Mr. Weiner:

Yes, I respectfully disagree with Mr. Hausman and even I think with some of the previous speakers that despite the - and this is not meant in any derogatory sense toward the Public Utility Commission, I think it is just a question of priorities, problems, staff. I for one, do not think it should be - nor does the Connecticut Conference of - .....nor does the Connecticut Cable Coalition feel that you can have it as a person - - the major issues of the Public Utilities Commission and that you really need a separate commission to concern itself with the regulation and development of cable television in Connecticut.

Now if the feeling is - we are not yet there, we have to study it, then the only issue that I would state in reference to 1077, if you cannot get a separate commission at this point and we must study it first, then so be it. I think as you have indicated Mr. Chairman, you are aware that there is another bill continuing 6708 which calls for the continuation of the existing commission. I personally would like the representation of your commission better than that represented by 1077 because the representation of that commission neglected in my opinion, community groups and municipalities. This of course, does not specific specifically who are represented on the commission as the other one did.

Representative Ritter:

I know it is in education....

Mr. Weiner:

It is up for a hearing on April - I can tell you specifically if you want - as I understand it, it is to be held at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 1st. That is in front of the Education Commission but what I am saying in effect is that -----if you do not see fit at this point of time, to create a separate commission to concern itself with cable television, then we would support 1077,

In reference to 1087, the major comment that I would like to say is that if its intent was to provide municipalities with a greater capability .....I don't like disagreeing with Mr. Hausman. It is tough running a city these days, Awfully tough and one of the toughest things in this state is finding the where withall to run the cities and one of the biggest problems - is the legislature is recognizing their problems, having problems giving assistance to the municipalities in helping them.

We have gone on record for a number of times and once again I refer to the Connecticut Cable Coalition and to the Connecticut Town and City Managers Association that if this bill in effect, is a way in which municipalities can get greater resources to help them develop cable television in this state, then it is a good bill. As a matter of fact, we would strongly support Bill 1199 which calls for - 1199 which goes in front of the Finance Committee which calls for remitting to the municipalities the 8% tax which is now - public service tax which is now levied against the cable television operators.

It is a long standing principle of government that you use revenues that are generated from the users should go back to help that particular industry. And as far as we are concerned, we strongly favor any means that will help provide the capability - an increased capability of municipalities to help develop it.

I think you know and we all know as well as I do that some cities have been generating additional resources and surely, they are going to have to find additional resources if we are going to develop something in this particular area.

Already we have color ban, I just know this roughly. Because I read a PUC report that there was a gross of a million dollars at least they are talking about a gross of a million dollars in the New London area and that is one of three viable systems right now. The other two being Valley Cable and Danbury Cable, all of which to my understanding have the same number of subscribers which means that we are generating under the 8%, at three million dollars, 8% of three million dollars.

And I think that part of that surely can go back to the communities to help them in developing a cable. So that 1087 is the means by which municipalities can by this mechanism be able to get resources to help them develop it, I think that it is in the interests of all of us who are interested in cable, both the operators, both you at the state level and the regulators, and the municipalities, to do anything you can to help the municipalities. Because surely the interest is there and I can tell you personally that the interest is there. There is a great desire. As I have said, several groups including the city managers are in favor of it.

Thank you very much.

Representative Ritter: Any questions. Will you be here on the 4th.

Mr. Weiner: Thank you, would be very happy to.

Representative Ritter: Does any one else wish to talk on cable TV. The last bills, 7494 and 7364.7719, 1080. Mr. Hausman.

Mr. Hausman: Mr. Chairman, Howard Hausman, PUC. Bill 1080 directs the Public Utilities Commission to study and make recommendations concerning the adequacy of service and rates of telephone companies in the state.

The fact is that starting March 31st, the Public Utilities Commission will be conducting a hearing on a rate request by the telephone company and the rate hearing includes all of the items as far as I can tell, that are called for in this bill. So I definitely don't see any necessity for this.

Representative Ritter: Any questions.

JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

FINANCE  
PART 2  
357 - 655

1975

COUNCILMAN CARBONE: (CONTD.): the profits, and the budget, which has been submitted to the legislature doesn't .. any of the municipalities. You are not preceiving the revenue yet on OTB and on high like the feather. So, there'd be no revenue lost to the state, but it would allow those communities, which want to provide the services to a gambling facility to share in the profits. And, so I think you ought to pass the bill and would request you do so.

Senate Bill 1199 is AN ACT CONCERNING THE TRANSFER OF STATE TAX REVENUES FROM COMMUNITY ANTENNA TELEVISION SYSTEMS TO MUNICIPALITIES. Connecticut was one of the few states which gave the franchise to cable T.V., okay, to its Public Utilities Authority. Most other states gave the franchise to local municipalities. And, in most other states the local municipalities are receiving revenue from cable T.V. In fact, cable T.V. is much further ahead in all the other states than it is in Connecticut. If you want to get cable T.V. off the ground, I think you ought to transfer the revenues from it from the State of Connecticut to the local municipalities. In addition, the state right now only collects \$90,000 from the cable T.V. operation in New London area, and I think that should be "grandfathered". The existing revenue should be "grandfathered" so the state doesn't lose any revenue. But, I think all additional revenue in the future on cable T.V. ought to go to municipality. It's another way to help out municipalities, if you don't want to raise the taxes yourself and give us further grants in aids.

House Bill 5008 calls for the distribution of federal revenue sharing funds received by state to alleviate the burden of local property tax payers. That bill follows the method in which the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Senate decided in federal revenue sharing monies were to be distributed. And, it follows the federal formula, which takes into consideration poverty, density and many other factors, and what we're asking the State of Connecticut to do is to take the federal revenue sharing money and put it where it is needed on the same basis on which the Congress originally appropriated and the President of the United States signed the law into the act into law.

Those are the bills in which I would respectfully request that the Committee report out. There's another bill which is 1321, which is a sales tax for non-profit housing organizations. I would recommend that you exempt non-profit housing from the state sales tax. Again, it's almost impossible to build non-profit housing now because the state has withdrawn its support for it and has limited it to 350 a unit. Maybe, if we can pull the sales tax off the cost of the construction, we might get some built. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to respond to them.

REPRESENTATIVE CLYNES: Thank you, Mr. Carbone. Any questions?

SENATOR CUTILLO: Mr. Carbone, is there any figure on that last bill you were talking about, 1321?