

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 148	PA 435	1957
Senate	2803-2818	(16)
House	2380-2396	(17)
Labor	2-32	(31)
		total: 64

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2013

S-25

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1957

VOL. 7
PART 5

MAY 20-MAY 24
2546-3223

MAY 22, 1957 55

amended by House Amendment Schedule "A", signify by saying AYE, opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 1329, File 949, Substitute for House Bill 148.

An Act concerning raising the minimum fair wage to One Dollar.

Favorable report, Committee on Labor.

THE CHAIR:

The president, presiding

THE CHAIR:

The Senator from the 29th.

SENATOR DESROSIERS:

Mr. President, I move for the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and the passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is upon the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and the passage of the bill.

SENATOR DESROSIERS:

Mr. President, in my remarks, I will not make a long speech. This bill has been in the newspapers for the last

fourteen weeks. Everyone in the Circle knows the contents of the bill. The only reason why we're holding the hotels and

restaurants to seventy-five cents is because they are some source that they provide employment for some workers, otherwise would have difficulties in obtaining jobs rather than be ruled out

MAY 22, 1957 56

of the opportunities. The certain type of restaurant established under the fair minimum wage by the Wage Board procedures, which already prevails in four other industries in Connecticut. Mr. President, the committee has worked hard on this particular bill. They are all in favor of this bill and I hope that it passes.

THE CHAIR: Will you remark further? The Senator from the 10th.

SENATOR HEALEY: Mr. President, the Clerk has an amendment.

THE CHAIR: The Clerk will read the amendment.

THE CLERK:

Amendment offered by Senator Healey of the 10th District.

In Section 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out from "or"; strike out lines 17 to 20 inclusive. In Section 3, lines 14 and 15, strike out from "except" to "taverns" inclusive, lines 20 and 28, strike out from "the" to "hour" inclusive.

THE CHAIR: The Senator from the 10th.

SENATOR HEALEY:

Mr. President, the passage of this bill, without the adoption of this amendment, would be a real step backward as far

MAY 22, 1957 57

as social and labor legislation in this State is concerned. I intend to vote for the bill even if the amendment is defeated because I feel that it is the best thing that may be gotten at this time. However, I certainly urge that the amendment be adopted. The purpose of the amendment is to include people to whom a real unemasculated minimum wage bill means something. The people who operate and live, if you will, and the economic periphery of our society.

If this amendment is not adopted, then the bill which is passed, would eliminate under its present language from the One Dollar minimum over twenty-eight thousand restaurant and hotel workers now covered under the minimum wage law, as well as excluding slightly over two thousand resort workers.

It seems that there isn't much question that people who are in this category and need the protection of a real minimum wage bill as much as, if not more than, the other people who are protected. Recently the labor department conducted a survey and found out that in our State, there's approximately seventy-six hundred people in hotels, restaurants and summer resorts who are now actually earning less than a dollar an hour. Now, once again, these are the people who really need the protection of a real minimum wage. If this amendment is not passed, and these people not included, what in effect and in substance you do is cut the

MAY 22, 1957 58

heart out of the minimum wage, as we know it. How can we take any honest pride in passing this bill without the amendment. Passing the bill without the amendment and including these people who really need the protection of the law not only is unrealistic, but denies a very basic human need, that is the security of a real minimum wage law.

Certainly, to defeat the amendment and pass the bill, is not any sort of position for us to take and hold out the bill without the amendment as being any progressive or humane type of legislation. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

SENATOR BORDEN: I can't put my finger on it, I wish I could.

There's nothing more that I can add to what the Senator from the 10th has already said, so therefore, I will not try to reiterate and waste our time. However, I do want to say this. I congratulate our Republican members for at last seeing a little bit of light. I recall two years ago, four years ago and six years ago when what a time we had. We begged and we pleaded to have a dollar minimum wage, but no, they told us they'd give us nothing if we did not take the seventy-five cents, so we took it. However, little by little, I think our Republican friends are coming to the way of the thinking of our Democrats. I think that a dollar an hour is little enough. It should be at least a dollar and a half an hour, and I honestly mean it, it isn't too

MAY 22, 1957 59

much money these days. What does a dollar and a half amount to, Sixty Dollars a week, so what, who can live on Sixty Dollars a week? But, at least you've raised it from seventy-five cents to a dollar, which is only twenty-five cents an hour, and at least you're becoming a little tiny bit more liberal. However, I deplore the fact that you have eliminated thousands and thousands of people from benefiting by your great magnanimous act of giving only one dollar an hour.

I don't know why, but they probably had a terrific lobby here, I don't know why. There's something that has been cooking here, what it is, I can't put my finger on, I wish I could. I would talk about it. You, at least, could have given them, those that you have eliminated, the seventy-five cents an hour, but no, I read in the paper and the papers say, O, they will give them at least seventy-five cents an hour, but they forgot to put a great big "maybe" at the end of the quotation. Maybe...and I can assure you they won't. They'll be getting fifty cents and forty cents and thirty cents as they are getting now, and that's what some of them are getting. So, therefore, I do say I will vote for this bill whether you people vote for the amendment or not, and I'm willing to stake my life that you won't vote for the amendment. Maybe a few here would deliberately vote for it so my life would be at stake, but that's all right. I'll take a gamble.

MAY 22, 1957 60

Therefore, as I say, I will vote for the bill but that amendment should pass. It won't, as everything else goes, but other days are coming.

THE CHAIR:

The Senator from the 6th.

SENATOR SCANLON:

Mr. President, before we vote on the amendment, I'd like to point out one thing to the members of the Circle, here. On Page 3, Section 5 of this bill, in the lines from 12 on down about four or five lines, you'll notice certain deductions that are allowed in certain instances from the minimum wage as it exists now and which will stand if the amendment is adopted or not, but if you will notice, they concern tips, wearing apparel, board, lodging, the things that these people who are going to be excepted from the wage and hour laws in particular are concerned with. These people now, supposedly, have a seventy-five cent minimum wage, but actually their employers are entitled to deduct from this minimum wage, tips - thirty-five cents an hour, allowances for wearing apparel and so forth, so that truly the minimum wage for a waitress or a waiter or the people in these very items that are now going to be excepted is probably around thirty cents. And even if the amendment is adopted, their true minimum wage will only be approximately fifty-five cents.

MAY 22, 1957 61

THE CHAIR: The Senator from the 29th.

SENATOR DESROSIERS: I would also like to mention that of the statements that

have been made already, about all these small peoples which are

not going to receive this money, they said a dollar and a half an hour, a dollar and a quarter an hour. Well, I'm one of those that's in that category. I didn't come to Hartford; I wasn't elected to come to Hartford to make big headlines, but I came to Hartford with one thing in my mind, that I would try and do the things that were right for the people of the State of Connecticut. Barring if they were Democrats, Republicans, Independents, it doesn't make any difference to me.

These same peoples which are not being taken care of as far as this bill is concerned automatically turns right back to your labor commissioner which he can readjust these wages and he has that prerogative. In all our labor bills, and I can assure you that they were studied and the problems were weighed in all directions so that we could come out with something fair for the people, for the laboring people. Let us not forget this, in all our labor bills, that we in the State of Connecticut can go up and down Main Street with our heads up in the air and say that we are the only State where the union and management has the highest

MAY 22, 1957 62

standard of the law. As you all know, this right to work bill that came up for study, it's been defeated. If it had gone through, what would have been the result? But we, as people, we, as laboring people, felt it was justified and I was one of the first ones to say that it wasn't going to be a good law. And that is why I stand before you this afternoon to say that I am honored and I am sincere when I say that I am here to fight for the working people.

THE CHAIR:

The Senator from the 7th.

SENATOR SNYDER:

I just have a few observations to make on this bill. I arise to oppose the amendment. I believe that the Senator from the 29th did not make the point that at the hearings on these bills, there was no representative from the hotels' employees up there trying to get them included in this bill. They had no representatives. Their unions wasn't...a lot of them are under unions and especially the larger hotels. They wasn't up there. And, of course, the remarks were made by the Senator in the 10th that a survey was made by the State Labor Department and there were so many thousand people that was earning less than seventy-five cents an hour at the present time.

Well, of course, we can take that with a grain of salt.

MAY 22, 1957 63

That means that they report to the Federal Government less than seventy-five cents an hour, but nobody knows how much they receive in tips. They're supposed to report 'em in their income tax but nobody actually knows.

In this amendment which has been submitted here, you'll notice on in Section 1, that it takes out the provision which takes in camps and resorts that are open not more than six months in the year. Well, if this amendment goes through, it means that every boy scout camp, every girl scout camp, all the YMCA camps, the Catholic Youth, 4-H; all of these camps have counsellors that they pay small remunerations to who stay in the cabins with the boys, and when are they on duty and when are they not on duty. They are on duty twenty-four hours a day, you might say. They live with the boys in these camps. For many years the camps were told that they did not come under the minimum wage law in this respect, but last December, several of these camps were notified that they did come under the minimum wage law, and it sort of put these camps....well, it's going to put them all out of business if they have to pay these young fellows who are counsellors, who will have numerous boys in their cabin and they are sort of counsellor over them. Most all you fellows know what these cabins are, these counsellors are.

And when they can work forty hours a week, and all over forty hours you have to pay them overtime and so forth, now,

MAY 22, 1957 64

what forty hours are they on duty? They live, they sleep, they eat, with the boys under them in these camps, and we have been told, I'm speaking from practical knowledge because I'm a trustee of a YMCA camp for the last twenty-eight years and we have a letter from the Labor Commissioner, last December, stating that our camp come under the present seventy-five cent minimum wage law, that he would not particularly go looking for violations, but if somebody made a complaint to him, that he would have to bring us up on the matter and make us pay back wages.

This amendment would rule all of them things out. I think that these summer camps that we have around here, they bring tremendous amount of people with money into the State during the year. We're paying money to the State Development Commission to get people to come through Connecticut, stop in Connecticut, visit Connecticut, visit our resorts. I believe it was in the paper here a short time ago that a survey was made by the State Development and the Labor and several other departments and they estimated that Sixty-Four Million Dollars was left by out-of-state people in Connecticut during the year of 1956.

All you got to do is look at New Hampshire and a few of them other states where they are urging people to come up there and spend their vacation. The summer camps and hotels and restaurants are not included in any of their minimum wage laws. I

MAY 22, 1957 65

hope, Mr. President, that this amendment is defeated and the bill is passed.

THE CHAIR: The people who send us here, who really need twenty-

The Senator from the 10th, are the people that really

SENATOR HEALEY: to make a classification as far as received of

Two things that occur to me now that I came to Hartford for, in the light of the remarks of the Senator from the 29th and the Senator from the 7th, are these, one, while I am interested in people coming from outside the State of Connecticut to spend tourist money here, I am more interested in taking care of the natives. I think the people that spend it here, not the visitors to the State of Connecticut, are more important as far as I'm concerned. Two, in 1955 when Senator Whalen from Bridgeport was Chairman of the Labor Committee, we fought very bitterly to get a decent minimum wage bill. In 1955, we were not successful as we had hoped, but in 1955 I found that I came here not to give money away to the insurance companies and we were successful in not doing it.

Once again, this year, I see no reason why on one hand we can give almost Two Million Dollars away to these insurance companies and not give twenty-five cents to a waiter or someone who works in a camp. I try to adopt a broad view of the thing, but I find it without the realm of reason to be more concerned

MAY 22, 1957 66

about the people who visit the State of Connecticut, than the people who send me here or the people who live here. And most important, the people who send us here, who really need twenty-five cents, small though it may be, are the people that really count if we have to make a classification as far as natives of this State are concerned.

The remark was made that no representative of the restaurant workers was at the hearing. I don't know if he spoke, I can't sign an affidavit to that effect, but I spoke to him in the hall and he indicated to me that he was going to speak. Perhaps, unlike the insurance companies who covered the galleries at all times, they were unable to be represented as completely as they should have been. I don't know. But, once again, it's more important to me in discussing the reason why we're here on the theme developed by the Senator from the 29th, that we help people who need twenty-five cents an hour and not people who don't need Two Million Dollars every year, but which we give to them.

Now, the report, one correction I would like to make and that is the survey that I indicated from the Labor Department stated that there are now seventy-six hundred people who work in hotels, restaurants and summer resorts who are earning less than One Dollar an hour, not seventy-five cents. Mr. President, once

MAY 22, 1957 67

again, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR: *...ing to some of living. ... could they leave three,*

... The Senator from the 2nd. ... before the hearing? ...

SENATOR BORDEN: *... ..*

The Senator from the 7th has expressed an old refrain, very, very old. I think I have argued this on numerous occasions and that is, he admonished the workers in the restaurants, in the camps, et cetera, et cetera, for not being here at the meeting. Well, I'll tell you why they weren't here, if they came here to the meeting, they would be losing seventy-five cents, or fifty cents or thirty cents an hour, and they couldn't afford to do that. Of course not. If this bill referred to any person who was making Five Dollars an hour, he'd be here because he could afford to be here, but the poor sucker who makes very, very little, of course, they're not here.

I will show you that there isn't a single committee hearing that we have ever held that referred to a person who was downtrodden whether that person came here. I remember the rent control bills. A great hullabaloo was made that the tenants did not appear before the committee, only the landlords appeared which is true, the landlords, of course, they could come here. They had their dinner and they had their cocktails and after that they came here and sat around for a couple of hours. Why not,

MAY 22, 1957 68

who stopped them, but the tenants, no, they were working in the factories trying to make a living. How could they leave three, four or five dollars to come here before the hearing? So, don't give me that argument.

Now, another thing that the Senator from the 7th said, millions of dollars are left here, in the camps, in the resorts. I'll tell you who leaves the millions of dollars, the people who go to these camps, the parents who send children and pay a hundred and fifty or two hundred dollars a week or a hundred dollars a week. That's where the millions come from. Are those millions left here by the fellow who picks up the town? Are those millions left here by the waiter? Are those millions left here by the fellow who sweeps the halls at night after they had their party? Oh, no, those fellows didn't leave the millions, no siree, those millions were left by the payee, by the guests, that's where those millions were left. So, if those millions were left, how many millions went to the State and how many millions were left in the coffers of the owners of these camps? Of the owners of these resorts? Sure, the owners of these resorts have these resorts and they have them six months a year. I notice by the paper, it's a six months a year business, sure, that's all they need is six months. They work six months and the other six months they go to Florida and they can't even spend the

MAY 22, 1957 69

money in Florida what they make, and come back and make more millions. So, that's a very fine argument. He put his foot in the pot that time, I can tell you that, right here and now. There isn't any question in my mind. Left millions, well, I wish that part of those millions were given to the employees and let them have some enjoyment, let them go to Florida for a little while. No, they work and how do they work? They work seven days a week in those camps, seven days a week in the resorts. Then, at the end of the summer, they have probably enough, maybe a fellow has enough to pay a third of his tuition in school or if he doesn't go to school, he has a few dollars and he gets himself another job. Now, that's the reason for that.

THE CHAIR: ~~SPEAKERS~~

Will you remark further? Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Are you ready for the question? The question is upon the adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Those in favor, say AYE, those opposed NO. In the opinion of the Chair, the "NO's" have it. The Amendment is lost. ~~of the Hall~~

~~REPLY~~ I think it's too late, Senator, but if you....if you press it, of course I'll put the vote again. Do you still doubt it? I'll put the vote again. The question is upon the adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Those in favor, say AYE, those opposed NO. In the opinion of the Chair, the "NO's" have

MAY 22, 1957 70

it. Is it doubted? Not being doubted, I'll declare the amendment, Senate Amendment Schedule "A" lost. The question now is on the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and the passage of the bill. Are there any further remarks? If not, those in favor, say AYE, opposed NO. I declare the report accepted; the bill passed.

THE CLERK: passed.

Cal. No. 1330, File 948, Substitute for House Bill 472.
An Act concerning membership of the Board of Mediation and Arbitration. Favorable report, Committee on Labor.

THE CHAIR: The Senator from the 29th.

SENATOR DESROSIERS:

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

THE CHAIR: The question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

SENATOR DESROSIERS: This bill simply clears the language in the statutes which defines the sources of which the Governor may appoint a member, a labor member to the Board of Mediation. In the old language, the independent union were not indicated as a possibil-

H-33

**CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1957**

**VOL. 7
PART 4
1826-2426**

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-37

amendment he drafted I move adoption of the bill as amended and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Question now is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage as amended. Will you remark further? If not, those in favor say "Aye" those opposed "No." The "Ayes" have it, the bill as amended is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1406, file 949. Substitute for House Bill No. 148. An Act concerning Raising the Minimum Fair Wage to One Dollar. Favorable report of the committee on Labor.

MRS MARSTERS (LITCHFIELD):

I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. MARSTERS (LITCHFIELD):

We have before us the proposed 1957 revision of our Connecticut minimum wage laws. The changes are neither startling nor subtle, but are, your committee feels, based on sound principles and in the best interests of all concerned. I ask that you bear in mind this one thought as we examine the bill in outline. While the minimum wage act is designed to protect employees especially those who work without benefit of a union contract, it must never be used as a restriction on business, particularly small business.

In order that we not become bogged down on a long disser-

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-38

tation on the details of the minimum wage act, I'm going to assume at this point that we all share at least my rudimentary knowledge of it and run quickly through the recommended changes as presented in Substitute House Bill 148. Afterwards, we can go into more details if anyone so desires.

As a starter, the bill does raise the overall minimum fair wage in the state from 75¢ to \$1.00. There are, however, certain new exceptions to and alterations of its application, which provided the material for your committee's discussions on the subject. To the existing exclusions from the entire act we have added employees of camps and resorts open no more than six months in the year.

Due to the nature and condition of employment in such places it has been found that to a large extent the minimum wage provisions are not needed and that the required record keeping tended to become a restrictive burden on the development of one of the state's real assets, the expansion of our potential as a vacation area.

To the existing exclusion and also added those persons who work at or for scientific, literary, or historical organizations either on a voluntary basis or under such terms that no true employer-employee relationship exists.

Next, we come to the question of hotels and restaurants. After considerable thought your committee concluded that ^{to} the special considerations involving mainly the employers' financial problems and the employees variable working hours and conditions the proper course would be to place both businesses under the

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-39

wage board procedure provided in our statutes. This procedure is currently in effect for four other Connecticut industries and is by far the major instrument of minimum wage enforcement in other states, so there is nothing unusual or radical about our proposal.

Thus for the time being hotel and restaurant employees would remain at the 75¢ level pending action by the wage board which can raise but not lower this figure. I firmly believe, despite definite objections from both the Labor Commissioner and employees representatives that this is a thoroughly equitable solution to a difficult problem.

Now, there follows three important but less controversial changes. For those industries now covered by decisions of wage boards we suggest advancing the minimum from 75¢ to \$1.00. For learners, apprentices, persons under 18 and other special cases in these same industries who, at the Labor Commissioner's discretion, may under present law be paid less than the minimum wage we propose a floor of not less than 75¢ per hour.

And finally to any person whose earning capacity is reduced by age, injury, physical or mental deficiency we recommend the Labor Commissioner be empowered to issue a temporary license authorizing for individual cases, payment of less than the minimum wage. This provision is particularly directed toward the availability of job opportunities during vacations for boys and girls of school age.

The concludes the actual changes which we propose in Sub. House Bill 148. Before ending my remarks, however, I want to mention publicly one problem in connection with the minimum wage

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-40

act which has not yet been satisfactorily resolved. It is the keeping of records as required by the State Labor Department. The burden on a small business without trained secretarial personnel is great, costly and to my mind unnecessary. As befits an agency specializing in records, the Labor Department was quite unsympathetic at first, but has recently agreed to work toward some degree of relief in this area between now and the next legislative session. If this report is not successful, it will be incumbent upon the 1959 Assembly to take corrective measures.

In conclusion most of your committee obviously thinks this to be a good and just bill. This opinion is substantiated to a considerable extent by the fact that Labor Commissioner and labor representatives who have spoken to me believe it too lenient while employers hold to just the opposite view. I wish my remarks could end with the statement that no expense to the state is involved, but such is not the case. To set up wage boards for the hotel and restaurant industries will cost about \$5,000. Nonetheless it is a good bill and I urge its passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark further? Gentleman from New Fairfield.

MR. BAGGS (NEW FAIRFIELD)

I concur heartily with this bill and go along 100%. I did want to make an observation, however. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the Legislature although I intend to vote for this bill, may I suggest that when we do that we keep our tongue in

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-41

cheek. But I know a great many people who will laugh in our face. Those are the jobless people who have been competing with 15¢ per hour labor whose products made in foreign countries have landed her, tax paid, duty paid, transportation paid, and still undersell our American made counterpart by at least 50%. Just how long can we keep our jobs with that kind of competition? In New England twelve large factories employing many thousands of persons and occupying millions of square feet of floor space have been liquidated in the last twelve months. Many of these people are too old to learn a new trade and are now on dole and living on your tax money. They are going to get a big kick out of our dollar wage boost, \$10. per hour would be just as meaningless. The industry which I was affiliated with consisted of 30 manufacturers; they made two/^{million}dozen knit gloves annually; each factory employed from 100 to 1000 persons. Last year, 1956, ? alone imported two million dozen, enough to wipe out a whole industry and one by the way which was 18th on the priority list of essential products - war products.

I don't want to be a prophet of gloom, but let's not be too smug in our present prosperity. Only last week in the papers that there were more business failures in the last twelve months than in any three like periods in our history. Isn't that cause for sober reflection? And you will remember that Ex-President Hoover and Secretary Humphries wants us ----- the question which might curl our hair. It is quite possible that in our next biennium I won't be around to urge this matter; for

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-42

that reason I submit most earnestly that you ladies and gentlemen here today give us your serious study and thought and let us fervently hope that in the intervening days to come we won't have cause to regret our failure to enact protective legislation in this 1957 session. Thank you for listening.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. POPE (FAIRFIELD):

I would like to compliment the Labor Committee on this bill. As many of you know this bill represents hours and study and work because the subject matter was a most difficult one in terms of equitable solution. This is the first of a series of bills, not all of which are on the calendar today, which constitutes the labor program of the 1957 session of the General Assembly. We are proud of our state, as one of the outstanding industrial states in the country; we are also proud of our labor laws as being as good as any in the country.

This bill establishes the dollar minimum wage in Connecticut with certain necessary exceptions, and puts our state firmly in the forefront in this field of legislation. I urge the passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? Gentleman from New Britain.

MR. GOOGEL (NEW BRITAIN):

I wish to offer an amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will read the amendment.

Friday, May 17, 1957

THE CLERK:

HV
B-43

Amendment offered by Mr. Googel of the town of New Britain to
Substitute for Senate Bill No. 148, file No. 949.

"In section 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out 'from or to year inclusive'!"

Strike out lines 17 to 20 inclusive.

In section 3, lines 14 and 15, strike out from "except" to cabins' inclusive.

In Section 3, lines 20 to 28, strike out from 'the to hour inclusive'.

It has been requested that the amendment be read once again.

(See above)

MR. GOOGEL (NEW BRITAIN):

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of the amendment. Will you remark?

MR. GOOGEL (NEW BRITAIN):

Mr. Speaker, might I commence my remarks, Sir, by saying that I believe this bill is very paradoxical in nature; in that while it takes a short step forward at the same time it takes a very long step backwards. If you will observe carefully the provisions of this bill as has been indicated by the Gentleman from Litchfield and also the Gentleman from Fairfield, it would exclude from the \$1. minimum, 28,200 restaurant and hotel workers, who are not covered under the minimum wage law; and also excludes from any protection of law the 2,100. resort workers in Connecticut. I might say that when the Gentleman from Litchfield talked about the so-called summer resort workers; those whose places of business are not open for more than six months, he gave as a reason the fact that the record keeping would be a burden.

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-44

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker that records do have to be kept, whether there under the Minimum Wage Law Requirements or not. They have to keep records, so I can't very well consider that objection as a valid and reasonable one, because certainly if those resort workers do not come under this minimum wage provisions that doesn't excuse their employers from keeping records on them. So that objection can be discarded completely.

Now, here's one more thought in connection with these resort workers - under this law they would not only fail to receive the new \$1. minimum wage rate, but could be cut to any figure even below 75¢ the present minimum wage rate. And some of these workers may be asked to work for no salary or no wage at all, but just to get along on the tips that they might received from patrons.

Now, it's inconceivable to me that certain businesses have to be subsidized by the sweat and the toil and the labor of employees in order for these employers to get along. Now employees in these proposed categories to be exempted are people who live on the very fringe of our prosperous society. They are not the so-called white collar class or have the better jobs; they just eke out a mere existence; they are the workers who most need protection, I submit, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with the Gentleman from Fairfield that Connecticut has good reason to be proud of its leadership and social legislation, but let us not take a backward step this time. Our citizens do not deserve a emaciated \$1. an hour minimum wage bill, and that's what we're doing if we pass this bill, without adopting the amendment which has been submitted.

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-45

Now, some of these people would perhaps argue on the other side of the question that employers should not hire people for less than 75¢ - or could not hire people for less than 75¢ or less than \$1. an hour; and thus there's not statutory requirement necessary. Well, of course, if we follow that type of reasoning we shouldn't have a minimum wage rate fixed in any category. Now, I might call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that a recent survey made by the state labor department disclosed that there are 7600 workers in hotels, restaurants and summer resorts that are presently earning less than \$1. per hour. These people, of course, would be excluded from the benefits of this bill, which are provided to other workers. These are the people who need the minimum wage law and its protection. If you exempt these workers from the \$1. minimum wage you have taken the heart out of our minimum wage law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's not make wheat of one class of employees and chaff out of another class. Let's treat them all alike, fairly and squarely, and with justice and equity to all. And, Mr. Speaker, I move you Sir, that when the vote is taken on this amendment it be by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call vote on the amendment. Those in favor say "Aye" those opposed "No." The Chair is in doubt. One-fifth of the members can request a roll call vote. Those in favor of a roll call vote please stand. Will the tellers kindly make the count? Is the doubt removed?

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-46
MR. GOOGEL (NEW BRITAIN):

I'll reserve my observation on removing the doubt. Will the tellers announce the vote.

THE SPEAKER:

The tellers cannot announce the vote unless I call for those who are against the roll call vote. Those who are against the roll call vote, please stand. Will the tellers make the Count?

The House will stand at ease.

The bill before the House is Substitute for House Bill No. 148, calendar No. 1406, file 949. The Gentleman from New Britain has offered an amendment, and he has requested a roll call vote on the adoption of the amendment. Perhaps the House would like to hear an explanation. If not, the Chair will put the question on a roll call. The Chair would like to be fair to those members who have recently filed into the chambers. If there is no objection I'll put the question, but if there is I'll hold off.

MR. GOOGEL (NEW BRITAIN):

I can briefly explain the purpose of the amendment. It's to include under the protection of the minimum wage law, the \$1.00 minimum hourly rate which is specified in this bill, hotel workers, restaurant workers, and resort workders. That is the purpose of the amendment. Presently they are excluded from the provisions of this bill and cannot get any benefits under the minimum wage.

MR. POPE (FAIRFIELD):

I don't want to delay it, but I thought I would explain that they are not excluded; they are under a wage order; in other

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-47

words the \$1. minimum wage law makes two exceptions that are pertinent here - one is for employees in the camp resort field, where their employment is for less than six months a year and they are total^{ly}/excluded; and secondly with regard to hotel and restaurant workers there is a provision for maintenance of the present 75¢ minimum pending the calling of wage boards to set special rates in accordance with the problem in that field of employment.

THE SPEAKER:

Now, the question is on a roll call vote. Those in favor of a roll call vote kindly say "Aye" those opposed "No." In the opinion of the Chair one-fifth of the members do not vote for a roll call vote.

MR. GOOGEL (NEW BRITAIN):

I doubt it, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

It's doubted. Those in favor kindly stand and will the tellers make the count.

Those opposed please stand until the tellers make the count.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will announce the vote.

THE CLERK:

Whole number voting	166
Necessary for roll call	34
Those voting Yea	20
Those voting Nay	146
Those absent and not voting	113

THE SPEAKER:

The motion is lost.

MR. ANDREWS (CHESHIRE):

Friday, May 17, 1957

Is it now proper to oppose the amendment?

THE SPEAKER:

It certainly is.

MR. ANDREWS (CHESHIRE):

It is with some trembling and temerity that I rise with my limited vocabulary to compete with the master from New Britain, the esteemed Minority Leader, Representative Googel. I wish that I had words, voice and intelligence to cope with this sort of opposition. I do not have them, and therefore, I have to resort to some simple facts.

Number 1, it is my impression that the purpose of public hearings is for the review and analysis, study and consideration of testimony. In this instance the majority members of the Labor Committee, and believe me this record has been played too many times, considered this evidence and testimony and felt that the resorts - summer resorts and camps definitely had a case. Also, as far as the hotels and restaurants are concerned, we were convinced that they too had a case. This was a decision that was not arrived at lightly, believe me. I cannot find it in my heart to blame the Gentleman from New Britain for his amendment, but I cannot conscientiously agree with the amendment. It is my honest, sincere conviction that the bill before us today, without the amendment, is a fair and equitable solution to a complicated problem.

I would call your attention to some figures that I have. First, the total work force in the state of Connecticut is over a million people. When we talk about the camps and resorts we are talking about somewhere in the neighborhood of twenty-seven hundred

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-49

people. I would also call your attention to the fact that camps and summer resorts certainly provide employment opportunities for young people out of school; possibly people who might not be hired for \$1. an hour; people, who in my humble opinion, should have a job opportunity; also in many cases can provided job opportunities for older people and handicapped people.

As far as the hotel are concerned it is a little unreasonable to take the position that we are excluding 27000 people, we are not excluding, 27,000 people; we are only asking that these 27,000 people wait to find out the decision of the wage board. If the wage board convinces the Labor Commissioner that the minimum wage for hotels and restaurants should be \$1. that's what it will be. We feel that this is a reasonable bill, as we have submitted it, and I strongly urge that this amendment be defeated.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment offered by the Gentleman from New Britain.

MR. MURRAY (DURHAM):

I am or have been a restaurant man, and in a restaurant you don't get anymore than you pay for, or anymore than you do anywhere else. If you've got a dishwasher that you're paying a \$1. an hour, you're going to get \$1. worth of dishwashing; and I certainly don't want to eat off a 75¢ dishwasher. I was on the Public Health and Safety committee, and we are concerned with the health of the people of the state of Connecticut, and they're not going to be too healthy on a 75¢ job when you can get it done for

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-50

\$1. If you can't do it for 75¢ get another nickel for the hamburger and pay the man to do the dishes right. The Health Department of the city of Middletown called me up; I never paid my help under \$1. - couldn't get anybody anyhow - and they wanted to come out to my restaurant and bring restaurant people out there and have me show them how I done my dishes, because there wasn't too much bacteria showed up on them when you ate off them; so I haven't been eating too many places that I wasn't sure the dishwasher wasn't getting paid for doing a good \$1. job on the dishes.

When it comes to resorts, I never see any resort people around here in the winter time; they all went south. Now, maybe they could stay up and shovel a little snow; add another 50¢ on to the room and board and pay the help a dollar. I don't know where they are going to get cheaper help, but if they're only going to pay \$1. why take advantage of a kid trying to work his way through school, just so they can go and lay on the beach all winter. I've got to stay up here all winter for \$600., what are they worrying about? I think we should have everybody make a buck an hour.

MR. MARSTERS (LITCHFIELD):

I'm uncertain at the moment as to whether the main objection as proposed by Mr. Googel's amendment is to the camps and resorts, exclusion, or to the hotels and restaurants being placed under wage boards. I assume it's the latter. There may be some doubts in the minds of some people here exactly what a wage board is and what it does. Now, I said in my opening remarks that wage boards are the main instrument for the enforcement of the minimum wage act in

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-51

various states throughout the country. To emphasize that, only four states including Connecticut have a statutory minimum wage law. Twenty others enforce such minimum wage provisions as there are with wage boards. A wage board is composed of nine members of not more than nine members; three from the employer; three from the employees and three from the general public. Its purpose is to study the prevailing conditions in a particular industry and arrive at a fair decision.

At the present time the laundry industry; the mercantile, that is retail, sales, cleaning and dyeing and hairdressing industries are so controlled in the state of Connecticut. I feel and the Labor committee felt that it was the most equitable settlement to place the hotel and restaurant industries under those same provisions.

MR. NOYES (FARMINGTON):

The Gentleman from Durham has an interesting proposition that you only get exactly what you pay for. I hardly think it's compelling because I trust that he will agree with me that the state of Connecticut gets a little more than \$600. out of us.

GENTLEMAN FROM SHEFFIELD:

I am sure that everybody in this House has deepest regret that we could not include the members of the General Assembly in this minimum wage law.

MR. D'AMICOL (BRIDGEPORT):

The hotels and resorts in my estimation right now don't need this \$1. minimum, because I believe that the mercantile stores

Friday, May 17, 1957

HV
B-52

need it more than the resort and hotels throughout the state, because I do know - friends of mine who work in resorts in the summer time and go to Florida for a vacation.

MR. POPE (FAIRFIELD):

I would like to oppose the amendment and not to repeat what has already been said. This is a problem we have been working with for about three months; we have endeavored to compromise the issues so that proper account is taken of all of the problems, and think the solution is indeed a fair one and represents a very commendable job on the part of the committee.

I hope that the amendment is defeated and the bill passed in its original form.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not the question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Gentleman from New Britain. Those in favor say "Aye" opposed "No." In the opinion of the Chair the Noes have it, the amendment is lost.

Question now is on the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of this bill. Will you remark further?

MR. GOOGEL (NEW BRITAIN):

I was really hoping that the amendment would be adopted. Of course I'm disappointed that it was not adopted. But, as I stated previously this bill does take a short step forward, although it slides back quite a long step. I will vote for the bill with a great deal of sorrow and disappointment that the amendment didn't make it a little more fair and equitable to a certain class of employees in our Connecticut economy.

Friday, May 17, 1957

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and the passage of this bill. Those in favor say "Aye" those opposed "No." The "Ayes" have it, the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Turn to page 21. Will the members kindly hold their seats until the next two matters are taken up?

Calendar No. 1454, Senate Joint Resolution No. 73. Resolution confirming the Nomination of Abraham S. Bordon to be a Judge of the Superior Court. Favorable report from the Committee on Judiciary and Governmental Functions.

MR. SCHWOLSKY (WEST HARTFORD):

Mr. Speaker, it is a particular pleasure to me to be called upon to speak in behalf of Abraham S. Bordon. He lives in West Hartford; he was born in 1891; attended the Hartford Public High School; went to Cornell University; graduated from Cornell University with an L.L.B. degree in 1914; he was admitted in 1915 to the Connecticut Bar; he was an alderman in Hartford from 1916 to 1920; he was Secretary to the Mayor from 1922 to 1924; he was associate judge of the Court of Common Pleas from 1931 to 1941; a judge of the Court of Common Pleas from 1941 to 1950; and he has served ably as a Judge of the Superior Court since March 10, 1950.

He has demonstrated beyond any doubt his consummate ability as a jurist; he has been through his patience and consideration had the highest respect, love and admiration of attorneys and

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

LABOR
— — — — —
PART 1
PAGES 1 - 366

**CONN.
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
1957**

Senators and the Representatives speak first. Now, the reason we ask this is because many of the men who are elected to take care of your interests in this General Assembly have to go to other hearings at the same time on the same day. Now, unless there is a great deal of objections we feel that they can serve you better if you will bear with them and let all Senators and Representatives speak first on these bills. Is that alright with the group? I hear no dissent. I am going to assume it is, then. When you get up to speak will you please give your name to the Secretary and without further ado we will continue. I will turn this back to the Senate Chairman, Senate Desrosiers.

- S.B. No. 49 ✓ (Sen. Bundock) AMENDMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE LAW.
- S.B. No. ~~51~~ ✓ (Sen. Watson) RAISING THE MINIMUM FAIR WAGE TO ONE DOLLAR.
- S.B. No. 141 ✓ (Sen. Scanlon) MINIMUM WAGES - REGULATIONS.
- H.B. No. 137 ✓ (Rep. Eielson) THE MINIMUM WAGE.
- H.B. No. 141 ✓ (Rep. Perry) MINIMUM WAGES.
- H.B. No. 148 ✓ (Rep. Pope) RAISING THE MINIMUM FAIR WAGE TO ONE DOLLAR
- H.B. No. 320 ✓ (Rep. Arnold) INCREASING THE MINIMUM FAIR WAGE
- H.B. No. 340 ✓ (Rep. Eielson) INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE.
- H.B. No. 357 ✓ (Rep. Badolato) THE MINIMUM FAIR WAGE
- H.B. No. 359 ✓ (Rep. Arcand) INCREASING THE MINIMUM FAIR WAGE TO ONE DOLLAR PER HOUR.
- H.B. No. 563 ✓ (Rep. Googel) THE MINIMUM FAIR WAGE LAW
- H.B. No. 1037 ✓ (Rep. Badaloto) THE MINIMUM WAGE LAW
- H.B. No. 1038 ✓ (Reps. Swanson and Gilhuly) MINIMUM WAGE IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT.
- S.B. No. 725 ✓ (Sen. Scanlon) AN ACT CONCERNING MINIMUM WAGE
- S.B. No. 728 ✓ (Sen. Cooney) AN ACT CONCERNING AMENDMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE LAW
- H.B. 725 ✓ (Novaco) AN ACT INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE
- H.B. No. 1525 ✓ (Rep. Badaloto) AN ACT CONCERNING AMENDMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE LAW

SENATOR BORDEN: Gentlemen, I am Senator Borden. I have to attend another hearing. I would just like to say one or two words on H.B. 563 on Minimum Wage. I want to inform you Gentlemen that I am very greatly in favor of this bill. Two years ago I introduced a bill for, or it was partly signed by me for \$1.50 an hour and thought maybe we could settle on \$1.00, but I see that the Republican boys now have seen the light, and they probably will go along with \$1.00. Of course, I am heartily in favor of it. It took me six years, now it will be eight years to see the day that we give them at least \$1.00. I would suggest \$1.50. I know there is a bill coming up for \$1.25. I am going to be heartily in favor of the \$1.25 bill, and I hope to have something to say on the floor. Thank you very much for allowing me this opportunity at this time.

LABOR

JANUARY 31, 1957

3

SENATOR WATSON: I would like to speak in favor of S.B. No. 51 which I introduced. It brings the minimum wage to the same level as the Federal minimum wage. I think that is where we should have it. I would like to register in favor of the bill.

SENATOR SHANNON: I would like to speak in favor of H.B. 320, which was introduced by Mr. Arnold of Bridgeport. This bill provides that the minimum wage be increased to \$1.25 per hour. We, in Bridgeport, included this in our party platform in the last election, and we all campaigned on it very hard, and we are aware of the situation down in Bridgeport, and we feel that this is a fair and equitable hourly wage rate, and I don't see the other members of the Bridgeport delegation here, so on their behalf, Mr. Bundock is a member of the Committee, he is from Bridgeport, on their behalf, I would like to register approval of the Bridgeport Delegation as being in favor of this H.B.320. Thank you.

SENATOR HEALY: Gentlemen and ladies of the Labor Committee, I would like to address myself to H.B. 563, which is a bill for a minimum wage of \$1.00 an hour tied in with a so called escalatory provision, that if as and when the Federal Wage increased, then the bill empowers the Secretary of the State upon receipt of that information, to enter a proclamation adjusting upward the \$1.00 minimum wage if that should be the law so that it would conform with the Federal. This is a bill which I think has a realistic approach to wages today. It is something I think that has got to be taken into consideration, the maintaining of common standards of health, decency and security for our working people. I would like to comment very briefly on the fact that there are also before your Committee today several bills for \$1.25 an hour. If there is any real possibility of their passage, and should this Committee report those bills out favorably, I, as Democratic Minority Leader in the Senate, would be in the forefront leading the fight in an attempt to get them passed. However, I feel that, my honest opinion is, that, there is no possibility of the passage of that \$1.25 an hour bill. I am for it if it is possible but the realities of the situation lead me to indicate to your Committee that I urge your favorable reaction on House Bill 563. Thank you gentlemen.

Mr. ARNOLD: My name is Arnold. I am a Representative from Bridgeport. I would like to register in favor of H.B. 320. I think it is an absolute necessity that in this time and day that we increase the scale of our earnings so that everyone can ~~leave~~^{live} decently and enjoy the wonderful life of the people of the United States, and I am in favor of this bill.

MR. ZAMBO: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. I am a member of this Committee. I am not sitting up there. Just as a point of information, and for the record of this meeting, have you at all discussed the possibility with your constituents of actually passing the \$1.25 minimum wage?

LABOR

JANUARY 31, 1957

4

Do you know what the sentiments are among your constituents?
Just as a guide.

MR. ARNOLD: What do you mean by my "constituents"?

MR. ZAMBO: Your fellow members of the House. Have you talked about this at all?

MR. ARNOLD: This bill was introduced by me because it was considered part of the platform of the Republican Party of the City of Bridgeport, and I guess, speaking for the Republican Party for the City of Bridgeport, that they are in favor of this particular bill.

MR. ZAMBO. Just as an aid in deciding what to do with these bills, I was wondering. Do you think, then, that the sentiment is that \$1.25 might very well be accepted as a minimum wage?

MR. ARNOLD: I think it should be.

REP. AUSTIN (MERIDEN) I would like to go on record favoring H.B. 148 and 151, and in as much as the Federal Government has established \$1.00 an hour minimum wage I think we in the State of Connecticut should also establish the \$1.00 an hour minimum wage. Thank you.

REP. BADOLATO (NEW BRITAIN): I want to go on record in favor of H.B. 357, 1037, and 563, although I am in favor of a minimum of \$1.25 an hour if you can see your way through if the Committee can see their way through passing such a bill, I would be much in favor of it, but I certainly would be willing to compromise for \$1.00 an hour. I also want to register for the Introducer of H.B. 563, Representative GGoogel. He is tied up in one of the other Committees. He asked me to register him in favor of H.B. 563.

REP. GILHULY (WEST HAVEN) I am Representative Gilhuly of West Haven. I want the Committee to give consideration to H.B. 1038, pertaining to \$1.25 minimum wage, to establish a fair minimum wage to conform with the present day cost of living. To the Committee, as you will see me as a representative of West Haven, any questions you have pertaining to these increase in wages I will be glad to come in and talk pertaining to it. Thank you.

SEN. DESROSIERS: Are there any other Senators or Representatives who wish to speak? The first bill we shall hear will be bill 49. We shall hear those that are against the bill first. Anyone against this bill wish to speak? All right, those for the bill.

(It will be noticed further on in this transcript that it was decided that in as much as all these bills pertained to the same subject anyone who spoke would be speaking for or against the entire group of bills.)

MRS. MARGARET DRISCOLL, Connecticut C.I.O. Council "Mr. Chairman,

this bill, which is S.B. 49 provides for the establishment of a \$1.00 an hour minimum wage. It also provides for the payment of time and a half for overtime, but the way it is drawn, I drew it, and I drew it badly -- -- it should be time and a half times the employees regular rate of pay instead of "such wage as appears in the bill". However, I understand that the overtime is to be heard next week anyhow. I will first address myself to the \$1.00 minimum. I suppose in the interests of time it would be well to have my remarks on this bill refer to all the other bills which provide for a \$1.00 minimum.

SENATOR DESROSIERS: We would appreciate it very much.

MRS. DRISCOLL: I will say the same thing anyhow. I think that best ~~that~~ bill on the subject, is the one introduced by Rep. Googel, because that does provide for an escalator clause, which would permit the State law to go up whenever the Federal law went up, and I think that is the first reason why we should have a \$1.00 minimum wage in this State. That is because we now have a \$1.00 an hour minimum wage for inter-State industry. That means that people working in Connecticut in industry that happens to be inter-State now have a \$1.00 an hour wage minimum applied to them; whereas other people working in the same State in intra-State industry have only the 75¢ minimum wage applied to them with no reason or logic applied for it. The very same fact that there is this Federal Law means there has been a declaration by the Federal Government that such a minimum wage is both desirable and necessary, it really represents a minimum living wage. I might add that this Legislature in 1955, passed a resolution memorializing Congress, if you recall, to pass a minimum wage of at least \$1.00. That was passed by both the House and the Senate last time so there has been a declaration in the State of Connecticut by the Connecticut Legislature that a \$1.00 minimum wage is a proper minimum wage and one which we should consider to be a living decent standard of living. Now, obviously, since the 75¢ an hour wage was passed in Connecticut we all know the cost of living had gone up. Of course, when the 75¢ an hour passed it wasn't adequate at the time, so that while the cost of living has gone up I don't want you to say that we will measure it by the cost of living, which has been I think \$114. to \$118. or 4 points, so it is gone up period. There is right there a reason for changing the minimum wage, the increased cost of living. In addition to that, I suppose all of us know that to maintain a family at the income of 75¢ an hour on a 40 hour week is impossible under present day living standards. The United States Department of Labor in 1956 issued a report in which it indicated that \$4300. was the minimum necessary to maintain at a minimum standard of living a family of four, which is the average family. \$4300.00. This is, of course, less than half of that amount, so its only on the basis of paying a decent living wage to maintain a family the minimum here should be raised to

a minimum of at least \$1.00, and may I just point out, since I know this is a legislature now overwhelmingly controlled by just one party, that that Party had in its platform a pledge to make a reasonable adjustment in the living wage. That pledge, I understand, has recently been re-iterated by the Majority Leader in the House, Mr. Pope. I hope there can be no question but what no adjustment would be reasonable that didn't end up with at least \$1.00 an hour minimum wage. For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we hope you will report favorably a bill which will give us at least \$1.00 an hour minimum wage, and particularly the one which will enable us to be on a par with the Federal Government. Because certainly there is no reason why people in intra-State Industry should not have the same minimum as those in inter-State Industry.

MR. JAMES J. WHELAN: Bridgeport: I would like to appear in favor of bills B. 49, and in fact I will also make my remarks on all bills pertaining to minimum wages. Frankly, I appear in favor of Bill 49 because I believe it has the best opportunity of passing. I do think that the \$1.00 an hour minimum wage is too low to be set at the present time, and I would much more favor if it possibly could be, that the minimum wage in Connecticut be set at \$1.25. We all realize that at the present time the people that are effected by the minimum wage law are the people that are most in need of something. At the present time the State guarantees them \$30.00 a week. The \$1.00 wage will guarantee them \$40.00 a week. Now certainly you will agree that very few people can maintain a family on the basis of \$40.00 a week, and I think it would be in the wisdom of the Committee if they were able to arrive at the figure of \$1.25 an hour. I think the standards of living recognize that \$50.00 a week is certainly going to give no one a great deal of money to give out and go out and spend it on luxuries. For that reason I would favor, the \$1.25 an hour. I want to be realistic. I want to see that minimum wage law is adopted. At the session of the Legislature in 1955 to my mind it was a tragedy that the minimum wage law of \$1.00 was not adopted. It had been passed and was not adopted in the House. For two years over 30,000 people in this State have been penalized because the Legislature in 1955 did not carry out the actions which were agreed upon when the hearing was heard on the bill. It was then agreed by both Labor and Industry we should follow the pattern of the Federal Government. In fact, we first passed a bill memorializing the Federal Government to adopt such a bill, then when we came to adopt such a bill for Connecticut we backed down. I think it is tragic that such a thing occurs; for two years these people have been denied about \$1000. a person because of that law, and I would recommend the wisdom of the Committee that they immediately hold an Executive Session, that they adopt the minimum wage law at this time, and have it passed, and made effective on passage so that these people who need the money can get the immediate benefit of it. Thank you very much.

SENATOR SANDULA : Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record favoring H.B. No. 320, presented by Rep. Arnold, and I would like to urge the Committee to give serious consideration to \$1.25 minimum wage. I don't care to speak any longer because there are many speakers here who will speak on the minimum wage law, but I urge and recommend the \$1.25 minimum wage law. Thank you, gentlemen.

SENATOR DESROSIERS: Anyone else? -Ok. We will call the hearing closed on 49 and go to S.B.51. Would you rather speak on the entire bills or go from one to another. It is all on the same principle idea, so if you would rather speak on all the bills at one time, it is all on the same subject today, it would save a lot of time. Unless you want to go from one bill to the next.

MR. ROURKE: Mr. Chairman, they are all on the minimum wage. I think we ought to cover them all at the same time.

SENATOR DESROSIERS: All right. That is very agreeable with the Committee, I am sure, Mr. Rourke.

MR. ROURKE: Those in favor now?

SENATOR: Yes, Indeed.

MR. ROURKE: Mr. Chairman, and members of this Committee, My name is Joseph Rourke, I represent the Connecticut Federation of Labor, and I would like to place our Organization on record in supporting the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage. We realize full well that it is difficult to put into effect a wage that is higher than the Federal minimum; nevertheless, Our Organization supports the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage as a wage bill below which no worker should have to work. We realize very strongly that if we expect our State to be a leader in what wages should be paid, they really should make sure that the very minimum they receive would be that wage of \$1.25 an hour, which, of course, would only bring in \$50.00 a week, and that is before deductions. Now, I am sure you realize that we have some four wage orders that ^{cover} gave approximately 100,000 people. We have one on Laundries where women and minors receive time and a half after forty-four hours and men don't receive time and a half unless they work in what they call production, and this is certainly discriminatory against the men; cleaning and dying, women receive time and a half after forty-five hours, men receive no overtime; in Mercantile, of course, here women, minors and men all receive overtime after forty-four hours. Then you have the Beauty Shop with an audit that is certainly hard to understand and hard to figure out why there should be this difference in wages. Now, we think all the wage orders should be scrapped and it should be a flat minimum wage with time and a half after forty hours. Some of the exemptions granted under the regulations to executives, I am sure that you have probably read the story that was in the Newspaper recently where one Motel Owner in the New Haven area worked a clerk and referred to him as an executive and he worked ninety-three hours a week for \$50.00 a week, his wage figured

our was approximately 54¢ an hour, and he asked to be excluded from the Law on the basis that, of course, he was an Executive and the Labor Department processed the case, and I believe this man is now appealing the decision. I don't think it is necessary for me to go into the reasons why people need at least \$1.25 an hour minimum to get by on. I am fully aware of the fact that this Committee is competent to judge that, and I hope you will give serious consideration to the passage of this bill, and if we can help in any way to get you facts and figures we would be glad to work with you. Thank you very much.

MR. DANIEL GALLAGHER: Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the State CIO. We want to go on record in favor of increasing the minimum wage, and while the \$1.25 an hour is desirable we realize that the Federal minimum established at \$1.00 makes it somewhat difficult to attain the passage of the \$1.25 minimum wage. There is a bill I ~~introduced~~^{noticed} here No. H.B. 563, which provides for the increase to \$1.00, with a further provision that if the Federal wage hour becomes \$1.25, sixty days after passage of that bill, then the Secretary of State may indicate or cause to have indicated through some means of Legislation an increase in the minimum wage to equal the Federal minimum. I don't think there is any good in going into it in detail, the need for the higher increase in the present minimum wage. I merely point out to the Committee that such an increase, will increase the purchasing order of these people in the lower groups, and we, certainly in Connecticut, who lead the Nation in per capita income, should take the step, I believe, in leading in Legislation on the increase of the minimum wage, and I sincerely hope that the Committee will see fit to recommend the adoption of the higher minimum. Thank you.

LABOR COMMISSIONER RENATO E RICCIUTI: Mr. Chairman, I am Renato Ricciuti. I am the Commissioner of Labor. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee I would like just briefly, because wage orders have been mentioned here, to explain just what the wages are. I might say that the Committee can better understand what we are talking about if I explain. The minimum wage law was first passed in Connecticut in 1933, and the first wage order -- and a wage order is made by the Commissioner of Labor certifying that there are a substantial number of persons in a certain occupation that are receiving less than a fair wage. At that point he appoints a Committee of three people representing the Public, three people representing the employees and three people representing the Employer. Then the facts are placed before the wage board, and they make up their minds what they want to do and recommend to the Commissioner. The Commissioner can either take their recommendation or decide not to and recovene a new wage board. Now, the first wage order that went into effect and stayed in effect by this process was actually made in the laundry industry in 1938. I bring this up also because there are some bills, S.B. 141, was introduced by the Labor Department which would eliminate from the minimum wage regulations deductions which are now allowed in the law, some of them in the orders

in computing the minimum wage rate. Now, I don't want my remarks mis-construed. There was a lot of good come from the Wage Orders, and the previous Commissioners who used their powers under that particular function of the act to appoint Wage Boards and to get the minimum wage up in different categories, but at best it is a very unwieldy process and cumbersome. It is expensive and it does allow for a certain amount of bargaining back and forth, by which, as has been mentioned already, for instance, overtime is different in the Wage Orders. In the Beauty Parlor Order, for instance, there is not time and a half or anything like that, it is a stipulated 90¢ for each hour which you work overtime. Also, in the Mercantile Order, Auto mechanics, who spend 75% of their time working on cars are excluded from overtime. Now, I don't really understand why that happened. But I suppose that among the members of the Wage Board itself, there may have been some people who wanted to exclude auto mechanics and perhaps other provisions of the Order itself would not have passed unless these people had their way, and it seems to me, plenty of you people have had your cars fixed and you know that labor is always a good part of the bill, and I don't know the reason why auto mechanics ought to be excluded, but that's what happens when you have these Wage Orders, and again I want to say that they did accomplish a great deal of good, but I myself am in favor of a flat minimum across the Board without any of these deductions which are now allowed, for instance, and the regular minimum wage aside from the Orders, people who work in restaurants, waitresses, as long as they sign a statement that they are receiving at least 30¢ an hour in tips they actually don't get 75¢ an hour, they get 40¢, or 45¢, excuse me. Now, again, it seems to me, we all go into restaurants and if we feel that we ought to tip because we get good service there is no reason why, in some indirect way, that should go into somebody else's pocket. Now, aside from those particular points we are in favor of \$1.00 minimum wage in Connecticut because we feel that it has the best chance of passage, but I think I can guarantee that the Democratic Senators, if there is really a chance of passing the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage I think you will find that we will be for it too. Now, these people who will be effected by an increase in the minimum wage live at the very fringe of our kind of prosperous society here in Connecticut. When you realize that factory workers in Connecticut are now earning an average of \$86.00 a week and an hourly rate of about \$2.05, even without overtime that comes to about \$80.00 a week and a little less than \$2.00 an hour, these people who never get an increase, who maybe don't work in large plants but who work in intra-State occupations, who are getting 75¢ an hour they received their last wage increase, probably, when the Legislature increased the wage to 75¢. That has always been the pattern when the minimum wage is increased, then these people get increases,

\$1.00 and the minimum wage in Connecticut is then \$1.00 automatically by the process of the Secretary of the State.

JANUARY 31, 1957

10

LABOR

and they are the people nobody else fights for. It is either through a Wage Order or through the Legislature changing the minimum wage that an increase comes to these people, and you will find that these are the people that need it most, who can't afford the luxuries in life, but who are worried about their very subsistence, and if you figure that 40 hours at 75¢ an hour is \$30.00 a week I am sure you agree with me that that is not a living wage. We have recently made a survey in the Labor Department through a questionnaire around the State, recently completed, and we figure that there are 22,000 people, that is an approximate figure, in Connecticut, who are now getting less than \$1.00 an hour. That is about 18% of the total that we get to figure in the State that would be covered by this change. In other words the rest of the people in that figure do get more than \$1.00 an hour. Of the people who get between 70 and 79¢ an hour there is 7,109, 2,156 men, 3731 women and 1222 minors; between 80¢ and 89¢ an hour, 1,378 men 5,098 women and 1,273 minors; between 90 and \$1.00 the total is 6,791, 1,353 men, 4,265 women and 1173 minors. Altogether as I said, the total is 22, 387 people who don't get at least \$1.00 an hour. Now, just one other point, it is also possible under these Orders I spoke about to set a rate which is under 75¢ an hour as far as people who work in Department Stores, Mercantile Occupations for the first 1,000 hours, if you have had no experience, even if you are an adult and had no experience in the store you can be employed at 60¢ an hour for the first 1,000 hours. That is the first year, and that question, I think, pinpoints the reason why it should be far better if we got away from this system of Wage Orders. I don't say it should be scrapped entirely. If you pass the \$1.00 an hour minimum wage and there are areas where the Wage Board would find it necessary to order a wage of more than \$1.00 an hour then it certainly should be kept in that fashion and the Labor Department would cooperate as much as possible in that particular field. Again, with this large number of people, 22, 387, who don't get \$1.00 an hour and with the cost of living being what it is today I think that the Legislature certainly ought to pass the \$1.00 an hour minimum wage, and ought to eliminate in addition these deductions which are possible. Now, in addition to that S.B. 563 also provides for time and one half the regular rate after forty hours. I want to clear up a point here, I understood the overtime wasn't to be heard today. If that is true --

SENATOR DESROSIERS: That is next week.

MR. RICCIUTI: This bill happens to be on here, and of course the Labor Department is for the payment of time and one half to these Intra-State workers. I think that that is another thing that we should have. Now, that Bill 563 also provides that if Congress passes a bill of more than \$1.00 and the minimum wage in Connecticut is then \$1.00 automatically by the process of the Secretary of the State

JANUARY 31, 1957

11

LABOR

and the Governor issuing a Proclamation the State minimum wage will be raised to that level. I think that will eliminate the situation which occurred when in one session of the Legislature it was thought necessary to wait until Congress actually did raise the minimum wage, the Legislature didn't do it, and then, of course, in spite of the efforts to get it before the Legislature it was found that it wasn't germane to the main issue and it wasn't heard and it wasn't passed. If this particular provision of the escalator, which incidentally is Governor Ribicoff's own idea for trying to get over this particular problem, the rate of \$1.00 or whatever it is in Connecticut will automatically go up to the Federal minimum. I urge the interest of the Committee and the approval of the minimum wage to \$1.00 or more if it is possible and we can get an agreement on it, the elimination of the provisions which permit deductions for gratuities and other things, and the enactment of the time and one half for Intra-State workers and for the ~~other~~ escalator which would bring it automatically up to the Federal minimum. Thank you.

MR. ANDREWS: Commissioner, I would like to thank you and your Department on behalf of the Committee for the statistics which you have supplied us today. Will you ~~xxxxxxx~~ convey that to the people in your Department.

MR. RICCIUTI: Thank you. We will be glad to cooperate in any way we can. If any of the members of the Committee -- -- I don't want to keep talking here, although this is a very important problem in Connecticut, I had the foresight to keep the letters which came to me complaining about the 75¢ minimum wage, and I think it would be of great interest to the Committee if they would read some of these letters, because these people for the most part are not organized, they have no one else to turn to but the Legislature and the Labor Department, and we hear from them, and here is a stack of them I have gotten recently.

SENATOR BUNDOCK: Mr. Commissioner, may I ask a question? How many people do you say in the State of Connecticut receive less than \$1.00 an hour now. Do you have any statistic on that.

MR. RICCIUTI: Yes, well, 22, 387. That is in Intra-State. You see, the increase in the Federal minimum didn't effect many people in Connecticut because there are virtually no people in Connecticut who work in manufacturing which is covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Federal minimum wage. When it was increased to \$1.00 an hour there weren't very many people at all in Connecticut affected by it, because, in the main, people who work in Intra-State, not the people who work in Inter-State are covered by the State minimum. That is the reason for many of the letters we got, a great many people can't understand why they still get 75¢ an hour and there is a Federal minimum of \$1.00 an hour, and it is because the increase only covered those people covered by and working in Inter-State of under the Fair Labors Standard Act and didn't cover those people who worked in gas stations, restaurants, Department Stores, Bakery Shops, all kind of mercantile occupation, dry cleaning, laundry, beauty parlors, etc. That's where these people are.

LABOR

JANUARY 31, 1957

12

SENATOR BUNDOCK: Did I understand you to say that you wanted to do away with these Wage Orders completely?

MR. RICCIUTI: No, I think there is still a need, as a matter of fact, we didn't suggest that in this bill that we have.

SENATOR BUNDOCK: What bill is that: Is that S.B. 341.

MR. RICCIUTI: S.B. 141. You see it eliminates from the minimum wage regulation certain deductions and allowances now permitted in computing the wage, that is not in the Wage Order, that is right in the minimum wage law itself, and it mainly pertains to restaurants. I would be in favor of keeping the procedure, so that lets say the Legislature passed a bill of \$1.00 an hour and there was certain pressure in a certain part of Intra-State categories in the State to raise it to more than \$1.00, then we would convene, we would make a study and see whether or not those people were getting a minimum fair wage. Then you would use this process you are discussing.

SENATOR BUNDOCK: What about hardship cases?

MR. RICCIUTI: Well, we have a procedure for that, but we don't have too many of those. What do you mean "hardship cases?"

SENATOR BUNDOCK: Well, there are some cases where people are employed merely to give them something to do, and some can't in fact -- --

MR. RICCIUTI: We have very few cases of that, but I know the Federal Government does allow it, and we have handicapped people for instance, yes, we do have some. We make allowances for that.

SENATOR BUNDOCK: You would then allow a Wage Order?

MR. RICCIUTI: Oh yes, well, part of an Order.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: I have a question. In the case of the State minimum wage doesn't that go into effect without a Wage order?

MR. RICCIUTI: No, what happened was that these Wage Orders increased the minimum wage to more than what the figure was at the time, then the 75¢ figure was put into effect in 1951 and those orders which were not yet 75¢ were raised up to the 75¢ figure.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: Is there a Wage Order on every class of employment?

MR. RICCIUTI: No. There are only eight existing wage orders today. Beauty Parlors, Dry Cleaning, Laundry and Mercantile and male and female Orders for both so actually there are eight Orders, but there were several, however, contested in the Courts. For instance, the restaurant Order was contested in the Court and was not made effective because of a technicality and at the very beginning of the Wage Board procedure there were others, one in the pants industry, which was put into effect

LABOR

JANUARY 31, 1957

and then the industry suffered somewhat of a depression and the Wage Order was taken off the books after they appealed.

COMMITTEE MEMBER: What happened to people who were not in those classifications?

MR. RICCIUTI: They were covered by the regular minimum wage law affecting Intra-State, of course, 75¢ an hour. If they come under the Fair Labor Standards Act they get \$1.00 an hour.

MR. DANIEL HANNON, Press Workers Local , 2411, directly affiliated with the AFL, CIO. I am speaking in behalf of the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage bill. I think that the Senators from Bridgeport, Senator Shannon and Senator Sandula, who spoke in behalf of the \$1.25 minimum wage bill certainly realize what the 75¢ minimum and equity has created. I think they sincerely feel that the \$1.00 will not correct the inequity and that \$1.25 would do no more than eliminate the inequity today. As I understand it there are many hotel and restaurant employees who have had and who are having 30¢ taken out of every dollar for gratuities, which with a \$1.00 minimum wage and those gratuities continuing to be taken out plus withholding tax and social security would give those people less than the 75¢ minimum wage of the present time. I sincerely feel that a minimum of \$1.25 would do no more than correct the inequities that already exist. Thank you.

MR. EIELSON: (Trumbull) Mr. Chairman, I wish to register in favor of the \$1.00 an hour minimum. In the 1955 Session I was in favor of an increase and I feel now more than ever that the minimum should be \$1.00 per hour. We should have done this two years ago, and I believe also that the change should include, and apply to all Wage Orders in effect or adopted hereafter. Thank you.

REP. SWANSON: West Haven. Mr. Chairman, I am co-introducer of H.B. No. 1038. I would like to go on record as being in favor of the \$1.25 an hour minimum, I also recommend to the Committee to at least give some thought to the fact that the National Wage Law is based on the overall average of the 48 States taken together, and the \$1.25 increase for the State of Connecticut would actually reduce the difference economically between the average wage paid and the minimum.

MRS. JOHN MC CARTHY, WASHINGTON, CONN: Mr. Chairman and members of the Labor Committee I wish to go on record as supporting the minimum wage of \$1.00 an hour. I have spoken to the larger, more stable, year round employers in my town, and they recognize that it has been almost five years since they have paid less than \$1.00 an hour to their employees, but also they wish to stress the fact that they recognize that 75¢ an hour is not an adequate wage to pay to meet the cost of living of the present day, and I think that this Legislation which you are asked to pass upon is productive legislation, it is legislation which would prevent people from being unscrupulously treated who are

LABOR

JANUARY 31, 1957

sometimes part time or seasonal employees as far as my own area goes. Thank you.

FRANK ORLANDO, Representing Local 1010 UAW CIO, AVCO Local. We represent some 3500 people and I am sure all their feelings are the same as ours, even for the sake of humanity alone we should wage the minimum wage to at least \$1.25, and we don't see how a person could live on the 75¢ an hour even if he is a single man, let alone a family man, a single man alone even if he bought a suit on sale it would cost at least \$35.00 and a couple of pair of shoes, 5 shirts and a couple of pair of underwear a year would still run him about \$300.00 a year. Now, how could a family man support a family on 75¢ an hour unless he worked 15 or 16 hours a day. Even then he couldn't do it. It would benefit any town or city to have the workers in that town make a little more money, to spread the economy in the town. We are not taking into consideration when I mentioned the price of clothes and all that, transportation, taxes, church support, theatres and pleasures and Doctors bills not covered by insurance, so we would like strongly to go on record in support of this \$1.25 an hour minimum wage bill.

MR. JOHN J. EGAN: I am representing myself here today. I would like to call your attention to the fact that some of the bills that are written perhaps might leave to a question going to the Courts again. When the present law was written with the assistance of the Attorney General and perhaps four other Attorneys who were pretty able in Constitutional Legislature, when that bill was drafted we sent it to Legislature and it was passed. Some employers in the State of Connecticut wanted to test it out, and it was tested in our Courts and then went to the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut, and the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut held it constitutional, and held that the provisions where the Labor Commissioner could make regulations as being constitutional and not abusive of his authority. I suggest that whatever you do on the minimum wage legislation that you have in mind the fact that this law that we have upon the Statue Books has passed the text of the Constitution as far as the Supreme Court is concerned, and again that minimum wage legislation, and for several years I was Chairman, National Chairman of the Committee dealing with the question of minimum wage regulation for the various States throughout the entire Country and I knew the problems they had, and there are States today in this Country that are tied up in the Courts over minimum wage legislation. We had to go to the Court more than once here in the State of Connecticut, and I hope that the Committee will bear in mind that this present act has been held by our Supreme Court as being constitutional. Now then, there is a difference between regulations and orders. The Wage Order and a regulation of the Commissioner are two different things, and I think that the Commissioner knows and needs the power to make regulations. The Wage Orders probably are not much good at the present time, or

people that are in that lowest bracket and try to help

LABOR

JANUARY 31, 1957

they probably will not be used, but you never can tell when they will be used, or, if they are, the Commissioner ought to have power to set up a Wage Board. As for the \$1.00 an hour or the \$1.25 an hour I want to say from my survey there is but one State in the Country that has more than 75¢ an hour. That State has 90¢ an hour but the Commissioner has power to make Orders. Now then the Commissioner has the regulation and I think it is very essential, very important, for the first thousand hours, that boys and girls who are only fifteen years of age, have had no experience, we want to keep them in employment and that regulation was made so that he can issue an Order, He can change that rate any time he wants to by regulation. At the present time it is 50¢, ~~xxxxxxx~~ The people who pass minimum wage law from the day it was put upon the Statue Books here in Connecticut were the people who were employing minors in bowling alleys, Department Stores like the 5 & 10 or Kresge's, or such stores as that, and a number of corner grocery markets, all those people who are employing a number of minors, oppose the minimum wage Legislation, and I say to you today that I hope you take into consideration that the present law is constitutional. You can amend it but don't amend it in any way where it will have to go to the Courts again to be tested out and then denied so that those people will not get the minimum wage if you raise it to \$1.00 or \$1.25

- MR. JOHN FITSMAURICE, SEC'Y LOCAL 217, HOTEL AND RESTAURANT WORKERS: I am in favor the \$1.25 minimum an hour, but more specifically on S.B. 141 dealing with the people in the restaurant business. The standard work week is 48¢ an hour. At 75¢ an hour minimum it brings them a total of \$36.00. After deductions of social security, that is 84¢ brings them to \$35.16. After deductions also for gratuities which which is \$14.40 at 30¢ an hour it leaves them a net pay of \$20.76, which, in an hourly term is .432 an hour as an hourly wage. Thank you.
- REP. JOSEPH D'AMICOL, BRIDGEPORT: Mr. Chairman, I am a Representative from the fair city of Bridgeport which is an industrial City and has plenty of Department Stores. Being a salesman I get all the questions on different things of life, and one of the things that they talk about is the living scale, and I am in favor 100% for this minimum wage we are talking about today. Thank you.
- REP. MARGARET FARMER: DARIEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to register in favor of the \$1.00 minimum wage law.
- MR. SALVATOR JACARUSO: Local 1251, WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT: Mr. Chairman, I believe that we should raise the fair wage law to a reality so that the people in the lower bracket may have a better way of living. It also, in my own opinion, would give the people in the lower bracket more purchasing power. Down deep in my heart I feel that the \$1.25 is very badly needed but I happen to be in favor of H.B.563 because it stays in line with our Federal Government. I hope that this Committee will take into consideration the people that are in that lowest bracket and try to help

JANUARY 31, 1957

16

LABOR

these people to better themselves. Thank you.

MR. GEORGE SADEN, BRIDGEPORT: Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee, I should just like to say I think the State has reached the point where we should adopt the \$1.00 minimum and possibly a higher one deserves some consideration, keeping in mind the rights of those who are in small businesses and who may be seriously affected. Certainly there is no excuse for not adopting a \$1.00 an hour minimum wage at this time.

MR. ROURKE: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I don't mean to speak twice. I would like just to clarify one or two points. First was in regard to Senator Bundock's question about handicapped people or people similar to that. At the present time wages are being paid as low as 22¢ an hour to handicapped people in Connecticut, and I presume this is done within the law because I received a complaint about it. In fact one person said she worked three days and got \$1.60 for the three days.

SENATOR DESROSIERS: What type of employment was that?

MR. ROURKE: That was at the Rehabilitation Center in New Haven, and I believe these people, perhaps have been or are being rehabilitated, and I believe they were working on some metal work, it was a very simple job, and my opinion is that it is necessary to have some of these people in order to get work and to be rehabilitated to work for less than the minimum wage.

SENATOR DESROSIERS: Was this merchandise made for sale?

MR. ROURKE: Oh, yes, that's right, but I wanted to try to answer the question. It is permitted at the present time. Now, the other point I wanted to make whereas I stated I wanted Wage Orders eliminated, I want to make it clear if you want to keep Wage Boards and if they have the right to raise the wage above the minimum that is alright with me, because that is where the Federal Law operates. The Secretary of Labor issues Wage Orders above the \$1.00 an hour and they must be enforced in certain areas.

MR. CHARLES BACCEI: President of Local 1645 UAW CIO AFL and also President of the Industrial Union Council. I sat here and listened to Ricc speak. I was wondering myself, of these people getting 75¢ or under \$1.00 an hour, how many are covered by fringe benefits, sick benefits, insurances, stuff like that. If they get sick and don't have those kind of benefits if they are not getting at least \$1.00 an hour God knows \$1.00 isn't enough to cover them if they get sick, they can't put anything away, so I am strongly in favor of H.B.563 where it will allow the State of Connecticut to go along with the National pattern. I am trying to be a little realistic. I don't believe the National pattern is only \$1.00 we will get \$1.25 in Connecticut, although I

would like to see the State of Connecticut put first.
Thank you Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR DESROSIERS: Anyone else? If not we shall hear from those against these bills.

MR. WILLIAM J. TAMBURRI. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, I am executive Vice President of the Connecticut Hotel Assn. and chairman of its Legislation Committee. I wish to go on record for the Association as being opposed to all of these bills. I talked with your fellow members of the Committee and as we have a large turnout here today and I know they all want to be heard in order to save time I will submit in writing to you, Mr. Chairman, some of our reasons for this opposition but I would appreciate if you would hear some of our Association members and allied membership.

SENATOR DESROSIERS: We would like to hear from everyone here.

MR. JOHN SHEA: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I am from New Canaan, Connecticut. I own a forty-two year old Inn. I don't know much about appearing before Legislature Committees I never have, but I have been in the Hotel Business all my life, and have worked mostly in large Hotels, except that after the war I bought this Inn in New Canaan, Conn. I not only speak for small hotels, but we are to quite some extent residential. That means we are catering to people who have income reduced by inflation, happening all the time. We are not low priced, we are high priced, but they are hit just as hard. Business keeps going down for that kind of business. We don't deal entirely in that. We have summer people and we have people who stop as transients. There are quite a number of our employees who live on the premises. We only have seventeen employees, and those who live on the premises receive food and good food, and they wouldn't accept, frankly less than the same food our guests have, except perhaps they don't get the higher priced ones, all the while. They also have good rooms and it cost quite a little money to build rooms for them, and the State sets the amount which is so small, lets say the cost of the room in New Canaan is nothing less than \$10.00 a week, that is the minimum, and we get allowed \$4.00 a week. The price of food, if they were to eat out, cost at least twice as much. We don't get credit for the actual cost of the food or anywhere near it, and we are permitted deductions of gratuities, yes, and I was very much interested to hear the -- I think it is the Chairman of the Labor Committee -- speak about the employer receives the benefit of the lower wage because employees receive gratuities. Well, now, an employer receives gratuities in my opinion and experience mainly because it is an incentive to him. I don't hear any factories refusing to go into peace work. That is an incentive to their employment, so are tips to a waitress or a waiter and they do very well by them. They receive good food and have a good room and these are matters that are not mentioned by ~~him~~ a lot who have spoken before, and they should be considered, I believe. There are other things I could mention

JANUARY 31, 1957

LABOR

I am told I shouldn't take up much of your time, but I do hope you consider the small business men and consider that he also takes pretty good care of his employees and they don't need quite as much as some of these others when they have a good room, good food and good people to deal with, and these are benefits that are not all in Legislation or in other factories.

MR. Mac CHAMBERLIN OF LAKEVILLE. Mr. Chairman, my name is Mac Chamberlin. I want to talk for the resort people. We are mainly small individuals. I think our Legislatures are in the habit of hearing from the articulate, that means those who represent the big. I want to speak for the little man. My associates in this business are all pretty small fellows. We are cut down by the fact that we only operate part time I have a little hotel that operates twenty-one weeks a year. We have had a maximum, during July and August of twenty-four people on my payroll and myself. I always say I am good for ten. Because we are in the seasonal business we are a great deal like the farmer. If it rains you don't go away on a vacation. If it is cold you don't want to go somewhere to go for a swim. I bleed for the ski man if there is no snow. He has nothing but tremendous overhead. Now, because of the fact that we are only in business twenty-one weeks a year, except the boys who cut wood and ice in the wintertime and does his painting we have to go further afield for our employees. No one can live twenty-one weeks a year. They must eat fifty-two. I am in the food business. You can't stop eating. So therefore, we have to take the school children over sixteen, of course, the College boys and girls. Then we have to take the handicapped, the lame, the halt and the blind now working in the summer resort. We have a great number of people who would not be able to earn \$2.50 on the assembly line. They have a bad finger, a bad eye, they have asthma, they have many handicaps, but in our field, because it is a service industry seven days a week and almost twenty-four hours a day, we are forced to hire that kind of people, and we are a good source of supply for them. In addition we have to go afield for our help. We know that unless they have a winter job in the winter resort in Arizona or they work in the Colleges or the schools that they are not going to work for us because it is a supplementary occupation. Now, what do we feel if you raise the minimum wage, when somebody says 75¢ an hour. You say, well, of course, that is the law, but remember what this does. This is an elevator job. The man who is a little more skilled and has two hands and gets \$1.00 an hour, as soon as the handicapped gets \$1.00 an hour he comes and says to the boss, "Boss, I am worth 25¢ or 30¢ more than that lad", and because help in a seasonal place is hard to get you have to up him. What happens. So the boy gets \$1.25, \$1.50 and all along the line. I employ a house-wife. She's been with me many years. She's a waitress. I imagine her husband gets paid in retailing, say, \$1.00 or \$1.25. Suppose I am forced to go up. In addition to her salary she has very good food, when it comes to feeding in the hotels and restaurants I always say the guests get two eggs but the help gets four because they are in a limited

LABOR

JANUARY 31, 1957

occupation, if my waitress goes off to her husband and says "Bob, you are no longer a hero, I am making more money than you are" he is going to his Boss and we are going to have an up and up inflationary scale. Aren't our leaders on the National scale worried about inflation? Doesn't the dollar not buy what it did before? We feel that the 33 1/3% wage cost will cause the limping food operator and the resort and hotel man, I might say the small ones, cost them a 25% increase in general costs because wages will go up all across the board, and I think you gentlemen -- after all, I have voted many years, I consider it my American franchise, I think you are very well informed, I think you hear all the arguments of the Mr. Big. I know General Motors gets across to the Legislature very well but I don't think the little man, the inarticulate, ever gets a chance to get his side over to you. I want to tell you a story. Jim Smith owns a resort the same as mine. We were talking about the cost of running a resort and how prices are too high and he said to his Congressmen, "If you could see my financial statement you would know ~~it's~~ a 25% increase in cost would finish me". The Congressmen said "You do? You mean that? I don't believe it". He laid the statement on the table. There the Congressman was very well informed. He had heard that when you put more purchasing power into the hands of the people you have greater prosperity, he had been informed about inflation, but that is the story of one man who for the first time after many years gets his story across to the Legislature. What happens to the resort neighborhood and we are a resort neighborhood, and I invite you all to Lakeville in the summertime, and it is beautiful. Today you would slip around on the roads, we don't do business in the wintertime. We had a hotel up there who couldn't make both ends meet, it was finally torn down. We had a resort up there that became a childrens camp. Now, when these things come down, we sell less milk, we sell less meat, etc. from our farmers, and we have a great farming community up there. In fact, in the last two years five of our Inns and Hotels and three of our restaurants have changed hands, and it is interesting to see that almost every one of those owners has a secondary job. I heard of one fellow who had to go into Law to help keep the resort going. Another man went into Insurance. I know of these men. I asked one man to come down today. He says, "My goodness I got to paint my place over, I can't afford a painter. They all do carpentry work and try to keep the place fit mainly by their own labor. Think about how the place works for about twenty-one weeks in a year. I start to work a little before seven in the morning. At one o'clock I am still there closing the place up. I think, well I don't do too much in the wintertime, look around for business, do a little painting, move carpets, make out taxes, things like that -- they were to be mailed today, you know, it is the end of the quarter for those of you in business, the tax is due at midnight. I figured it all up on a forty hour basis. In one year I work eighteen months, so the poor boss doesn't have the open sesame to the pocketbook of

JANUARY 31, 1957

20

LABOR

everyone. That's what happens. And taxes. We have in Lakeville an extremely fine newspaper. They were talking about who was going to bear the tax burden of more schools. We need more schools. We have much more children in the town. It costs more to build schools today. They said, of course, the home owner can't pay more taxes, and unfortunately we don't have General Motors or American Brass or anything, we can't get it from Industry, we have a few little resorts etc, so the poor little restaurant man, the resort man, has to bear those taxes, and we have many retired people living in our neighborhood, school teachers, things of that type. Their incomes are predicated upon earnings during the twenties and thirties not 1957, so the tax problem is tough. As you know, we grow a great deal of beef and the milk used in this community. If everyone of our costs go up 25% the man from the big operation will tell you to use less beef and more as they say kidney stew, less milk and cream and butter and more of the milk solids and things like that. You skimp a little bit on the portions, you have to meet that 25% someplace. How are we going to pass along this cost you say, Out of business. Well the economic Professor will tell you the marginal man always goes out of business. We are not the marginal man. There's twenty million of us in America. If we weren't you wouldn't have the type of America you got. We have to pass the cost on. All costs are born ultimately by the consumer. Any rise in price you kick the housewife in the bread basket. Go to the super market and see that cost. I went around to a fellow in the laundry. I said to him, "Jo, I said, has anybody told you your shirts are too cheap, you ought to raise the price?" Jo said, "I don't dare raise the price. They are hollering they are too high now." I went to the little man who sells corn-flakes and things like that and I said to him "Horace, has anybody told you your prices are too low and you got to raise them?" He said, "My God, they are hollering prices are too high. I don't think I can raise prices. I know I think they are too high." Where am I going to pass the 25% on to. I would like to say one thing about bookkeeping. As you all know under bureaucracy we have a great deal of bookkeeping. I feel if every single Congressman, Senator and Legislator, etc. made out his own taxes and he sat up until two or three in the morning sometimes doing that as the little business man does he would demand a change. You fellows haven't the slightest idea how hard it is to do that and the bookkeeping that goes into this minimum wage. We keep a book of day sheets for every man, every day, every time he comes to work and every time he leaves, how much he gets in the way of wages, actual cash, how much he gets in food and the rest of those things. I figured it out it costs me one hour a day to do it. Remember the Boss starts work before seven and is still there at 1 A.M., that awful long, but he does one hour's worth of bookkeeping at the end of that

LABOR

day. We talk about a hardship case. Everytime I look at the price of that little Chevy or Ford, it costs too much, but the little man is never able to get up and demand what that thing is worth. He never says that hamburger is worth as much as what Schrafft gets. He is scared he will loose volume and go out of business. I look around, in my town, I see these little businessmen, I assume they must be hard pressed because he is working and always after the employees go home at night, the wife is working locally, he has two or three kids, I see they are working, I take the groceryman and I say how are you going to stand an increase in cost. He said I know, that simple I will stock the shelves, you know, at midnight. I will do the rest of the bookkeeping at two A.M. I think I have said enough on hardship. I want to tell you one last thing before I go. Living in a small town, and in Salisbury there are only 250 people in the town, in the summertime more, thank goodness, so you know everybody and every morning at the Post Office at 7:30 you can meet these fellows when you go for the first mail, and for years I met a man. I admired him very much. He is the kind of a man who made America great. He came to this Country and he started a little business of his own, and thank God for little businessmen, and he carried it on his back. He got opulent, made money, he took that business to a horse and carriage. He worked hard. He finally had a front room in his house. Then the house spread out to a fairly good size store, and every morning I saw him I used to kid him how wealthy he was. I knew he worked hard. One day a week he got up at four o'clock in the morning and went to the market in Hartford to get the meat and things that he sold that were not delivered by big trucks. I missed him for quite awhile and then I said to him "Where have you been, Pal?" He said, "I work too hard". I said "we all work hard in this business". Well he said I do the darn bookkeeping, I am up until midnight and all the rest of the stuff. Six months later he says I am a free man. I said "What do you mean". He said, "I sold out". Well, sometime later there was a hearing in the Labor Department and they are labrythian as you know and one of the Labor personalites said "Are you from Lakeville, I know all about it, there is a man up there I taught to do bookkeeping". I knew this fellow knew nothing about bookkeeping and all that stuff but he did have to make out reports, he spent a couple of hours every night on reports and taxes and all those things and he overworked himself, I always say the final story and I kept his obituary in my pocket for a long time, It told the story of Leo Rudman, who came to this country a poor boy. As Leo said, "I worked too hard on all my bookkeeping, etc." The little man has a tough hill

EDMUND M. CALURE: Mr. Chairman, I own the Shore Hem Club, a summer resort in Greenwich. Before going into the just one minute of your time that I will take, I would like to state that if someone should ask me at the present time if I were opposed to \$1.25 an hour minimum wage I would say no, I am for it, but I am opposed to this particular bill. I bought the

JANUARY 31, 1957

22

LABOR

Shore Hem Club at Greenwich at great expense. This Club didn't make any money for the past five years. It showed a payroll of some forty odd people amounting to between \$800 and \$900. a week. Now, if that bill were to become law, that would mean an increase about \$1200.00 a year for me and I have just mentioned that this Club didn't show any profit for the past four or five years, and it would mean I would not be able to open up this establishment. It has cost me some 2 and $\frac{1}{4}$ million dollars to get in there. I find myself in a very bad position if this bill were to go through. May I just point out one thing else. In our dining room on our menu we specify the amount of gratuity that is expected for the waiter. It states \$1.00 per person. Now assuming we pay that particular waiter \$20.00 a week, which is the sum they formerly get plus room and board, assuming that waiter waited for the sake of discussion on ten people a day that would mean \$70.00 a week gratuity plus the \$20.00 he would get from us and we give him room and board. That is as far as we can go. If we were to go any further we would probably forget about opening up and pack up bab and baggage and go.

- MR. RICCIUTI: Mr. Chairman, can I make one point without arguing with anybody. The bill we are sponsoring does not have anything to do with board and lodging. The only thing we seek to eliminate is the gratuities. They can continue to charge whatever the regulations call for for board, for food, for lodging. What we are trying to cut out is the tips. That's all. I want to make that clear.
- MR. CALORE: May I answer that, please, for one moment. I noticed that everybody who came up and spoke in favor of this particular bill came up and said, "I am for it, I represent such and such an Organization, and I am for it. The Commissioner of Labor here has quoted facts. He stated 22,000 people are underpaid in the State of Connecticut. I question that figure. I question it to this extent, because in one breath he says, and he makes it a point specifically, waitresses and waitors, and in the second breath he says, well it is nobodys business where that money goes to, it surely shouldn't go to the employer, they put it in their pocket, so for that reason he wants the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage law to be enacted.
- MR. PRIME WRIGHT: Ladies and gentlemen and Mr. Chairman of the Committee, I am from Washington and I am opposed to any raise of the minimum wage and the minimum wage scale in any manner. The reasons I have, there are several things. First, I have to acknowledge that Mr. Ricciuti has stated that perhaps there are and I will accept it as a fact, 23,000 people in the State who he calls the fringe people receiving less than \$1.00 an hour. I will acknowledge that as the number, but I would also like to state that in my opinion the people that are making less than \$1.00 an hour are the fringe labor pool, the people that in many cases are unskilled, untrained, possibly illiterate, and have no comprehension of business operations. I work, I am in the Labor Pool, but I am in the Labor Pool for myself. As several others, have stated,

LABOR

if you are in business for yourself, it doesn't start at 8 and end at 4, it can be a very long and tiresome operation. Mr. Ricciuti also stated that with the present cost of living these people, these fringe people earning less than \$1.00 an hour are finding it, if not impossible, very difficult to exist. Well, the way I figure the situation will go, that in the event these people receive an increase in pay their productivity isn't going to increase. The man that is doing very little now for 75¢ an hour will continue to do very little for the \$1.25 or the \$1.00 which ever it may be. You aren't increasing the productivity, you are putting an influx of money on the market, pushing prices up, and if the cost of living is too high for these people now it is going to be too high for these same people in the future. I am afraid also that the fact \$1.25 isn't a living wage, I feel that it is too high in that it will scale everyone above that. The fellow making \$1.50 now isn't going to be content with \$1.52 when he is at the present time making twice what some unskilled laborer is making. You move the unskilled man up within 25¢ and you are going to push the skilled man up proportionately. I think that when you speak of production, production in the Labor field they are not looking at both sides of it. You have to protect the small business man who is working on a fringe margin. Costs are high. Everything is against the small businessman today. If you start to knock his costs up it has to be pushed on to the people that his product is going to. Connecticut is unique in that it has the highest minimum wage in the area. The hotels and the resort areas are finding it very hard to stay competitive against such States as Maine and Vermont where you don't have the high minimum wage, the rates are reduced and people who are looking for bargain rates will be going out of the State if you push our prices higher by increasing the level, which is going to in turn to reflect in our final price, and which will push the people out of the State. Thank you.

MR. JOSEPH HACK: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Jo Hack, Westley Inn, Litchfield, Connecticut. I would like to put into other words what I think everyone has said here today, that this minimum wage law isn't doing anything even at the present time to give everyone a living wage, and I am definitely in favor of a living wage for everyone. Every man is entitled to a living wage, but there must be some other equitable way of seeing that they are paid that wage. In other words any increase in this minimum wage is not going to do it. One gentleman said that some people were getting an average of 22¢ an hour. How can that be if we are supposed to have a 75¢ minimum. So I would like to say in a few words as possible I think the only equitable thing to do is to find some other means rather than the minimum wage law of seeing that the people of the State of Connecticut get a proper living wage. Thank you.

JAMES ARLEVO: I truly am a small resort operator, Mr. Commissioner and members of the Committee. I would like very much in a

JANUARY 31, 1957

LABOR

24

few minutes to try and explain to you just how small some of us are and just how much we would be hurt by any change in the minimum wage law. I don't want to dwell on whether it should be \$1.00 or \$1.25. I don't have the facts the Labor Commission has. I don't have all the figures, on the subject, but having been in business almost twenty years I know just a little bit about my business. At the present time I would like to see legislated a thirty hour day so I can put in twenty-four hours to keep from staggering under the blow that we had received, and I particularly, in being engulfed by the developments of homes. No longer is my place a small resort hotel. I don't believe anyone here would dare to get up and have it made known that he would be against anyone earning less than \$1.00 an hour. Many facts have been cited. After having been cited some people have gotten up here and chosen to forget them. It is a fact that this State has the highest per capita income in the Union. It was beaten by Nevada, and I think that we did well to gain the position that we originally had. Nevada is a wasteland, Arkansas, Oklahoma and many of the Western States are wastelands. If the per capita income was increased it was increased because men of vision stepped into those wastelands and through development of resources that were there, be it in the ground or growing on the ground, or bringing in labor, established payrolls. Having established those payrolls the Legislatures in those prospective States were in a position to do some taxing. With taxation you get wealth, but remember, it is the businessman, and in the beginning the small man, that makes any community, any State, and as you know, made this Country. Who, here would have all of us believe that there is anyone who is truly producing on a thirty or forty hour a week. Who, here, would have anyone believe that anyone in this State is going home with less than \$1.00 an hour. Hasn't it already been established that there is a critical labor shortage in this State, and if this is so, and it is a fact, is it information that is known only to us? Isn't it clear that others are also aware of that. Need you go any further than the classified ads in the Newspapers to see the large ads taken for Industry, offering phenomenal wages. If these offers are being made why is it that individuals -- mind you, I should have made clear in the beginning that I am speaking as a service industry such as I have, a resort hotel, a ten weeks operation. Wouldn't it be apparent that these people would forsake these jobs that pay only 45¢ an hour and take the \$2.00 jobs? It follows that day follows night they know what the score is and they don't need anybody calling the signals. They are calling them to their advantage, as witness the fact, that a boss in a small place will hide his car because he takes pride in the fact that he is in business but he is ashamed of the shabby appearance of his car compared with the Pontiacs, De Sotos, Cadillacs, Chevy's the employees have. Gentlemen, those are the facts. I am not quoting without knowledge whereof I speak. I know whereof I speak, and I know too, gentlemen, that if these individuals should truly have at heart the interests of

those who are employed by service establishments, if they would take the trouble and seek out the so called abused service employees they would find the truth. I am sure that if these galleries were filled with service employees they would be beside themselves with laughter over the fact that anyone here would attempt to impress upon the minds of others that are here that there is anyone in the resort hotel or for that matter I will have to guess on this a commercial hotel, that is going home with less than 75¢ an hour, whether it be the waiter, the chambermaid, the bartender, the bellhop, the parking, attendant. Gentlemen, those are not the facts. All right, it might be asked how does this effect you. Just this. I employ only seven to the maximum of eleven employees. I am aware of the fact that if all the credits were taken an employee can be paid as little as 45¢ an hour. I am aware of the fact that if through the enactment of any of these bills there would be no exception made for the service employee, and lets say that the minimum was raised to \$1.00 an hour, I hope all you can see immediately that that represents 110% increase in my payroll or in the other resort operators payrolls, should he be paying as little as 45¢ an hour, which represents what he would be paying of the greatest amount. I can't speak for others, but I know I don't take all the credits. What happens in the beginning. I touched on the fact that the small business man creates wealth. We live in a magnificent State. No one can deny it. We have much to be proud of, and without boring you to tears we can take one little thing like the Merritt Parkway. How we glory in it and what we finally got. I saw fit ten years ago to term that a super highway at less profit, and have slowly sat back and watched others grow aware of it, because we did find money that in the past would have been spent here in this State. Having been spent in this State it would be taxed by the excise tax, you would have a sales tax, you would have all the other taxes we have, and it would create wealth, gentlemen, and in creating wealth, you have something you can tax, but if you fix it so through including service employees under any legislation that might pass you are forcing the small man out, I can draw just one picture and I would like to sit down. In my own particular case it represents 110% increase and it is more or less common knowledge there is one service employee for every two guests, in some it is three for every two guests, in mine it is one. It means I am paying an employee \$22. more per week. If that employee is supposed to take care of two guests immediately it cost me \$11.00 more per week. Gentlemen, I have to compete at my rates which are low \$46. to \$50. a week, with States surrounding me that have resort hotels, that aren't subject to this legislation as is proposed here, and because of that you look at your newspapers and you will find they offer fine accomodations, fresh dairy foods at \$35. to \$45. a week, and in Pennsylvania and upper New York

...of business they can't find a super, the margin is... and as I say is most competitive... what is as competitive today as the restaurant... and it is a service industry, and it would cost... in our prices and you are not going to get... The restaurants won't be open. You

State it starts below it, and figures in the New York Times will bear me out on this, at \$28.00. To get back to me, if I have to raise my rates \$10.00 more per week per person, gentlemen, I am out of business. Now, I don't want to burden you with my problem, there is no reason to reach for any handkerchiefs, but there is one thing you must bear in mind. Look before you leap. If it is your aim to devastate as you legislate, if it is your aim through that straw which you have before you to break the camels back and if it is your aim to get us small business men that are beset on all sides by problems that have been legislated, if it is your aim to lay us on the couches of the psychiatrists, full speed ahead.

MR. HERMAN GENLOT, SPEAKING FOR THE CONNECTICUT RESTAURANT ASSN. Mr. Chairman, and Members of this Committee I would like to call your attention to two facts. First, we are a service industry; secondly, we are in the food business, which today is the most competitive business that there is. We will first take the small independent restaurant operator. The small restaurant operator is opened the hours necessary to serve the Public. Now, he is in competition with Dept. Stores that are only open limited hours and have a restaurant principally just for their customers and their help as an accomodation, and operate mostly at a loss. Now, during the war years no matter how high wages were the small restaurant stayed open twenty-four hours a day. No war worker had to go without food during those days. We have no monopoly on anything, our business is mostly competitive, ~~that is~~ Among the smaller restaurants all the owners work longer hours than the employees themselves. A great many of our employees couldn't find work in industry, they couldn't pass the physical exam. We have a great number older men that work possibly at times for small wages and their meals, but they want something to do. They want to live independently, they don't want to live with the daughter-in-law, they don't want to live with the son-in-law, thats true with millionaires, thats why they keep going to business, they still like American Independence. Now, in the upper brackets of the high class industry, Inns, etc, the better hotels, I am not so sure that the waiters union will agree with Mr. Riccuiti, our Labor Commissioner, to do away with gratuities. Mr. Chairman, you come from down there. The waiters in one of your Inns, none of them make less than \$100. a week. I am sure they don't report \$100. a week to the Labor Department or on their income tax, and I am sure that they would like that protection, and I feel that we can go along and can operate under a Wage Order and we are always ready and willing to meet competition on wages in business as best we can, but the little business man finds himself in many of the restaurants today, the small restaurants today, if they were to open up again or go out of business they can't find a buyer, the margin isn't there, and as I say is most competitive. I don't know any business that is as competitive today as the restaurant business is now, and it is a service industry, and it would cause an increase in our prices and you are not going to get the services. The restaurants won't be open. You

must realize that today on Sunday how many ordinary restaurants can the working man go into, they close on Sundays. You have to go to some high class Inn or somewhere on the highway and everyone can't afford to pay those kind of prices for the average meal.

MR. JOSEPH EGAN: I am from Stamford, Connecticut, I would like to go on record as being in favor of referring this matter of wages to a minimum wage Board for each particular industry. It seems to me that it is both realistic and unfair to attempt to fix minimum wages throughout the State by a single minimum wage law which fails to take into consideration the differences which exist among the various industries of this State. I also feel that a minimum wage law, if general, fails to take into account the economic conditions which exist among the various Geographical Locations in the State. Certainly you wouldn't compare the economic conditions, the matter of wages, working conditions which exist in the large metropolitan centers with the small outlying areas in this State. Thank you.

MR. RICCUITI: Mr. Chairman, I want to bear in mind the Chairman said at the beginning of this meeting, but because the pros speak first and then the cons speak second sometime there is a limit to my patience to. First of all I am not against gratuities. What I am against is the gratuities going into the pocket of somebody else than the people who actually should get them and I want to make this other point. People who now come here before you and say we are for the Wage Orders are the same people who take us to Court when we promulgate a Wage Order, so it is the old business in a minimum wage before the Legislature and then lets have the Labor Department do it and then when the Labor Dept. does it they take us to Court and that has been done several times at the instance of some of the people who have spoken.

MR. NORTON: My name is Norton, I run a small Inn in western Connecticut. I employ eleven people. In the winter, we lose money, five months in the winter. I employ nineteen for the five months in the summer. I am not opposed to \$1.00 or \$1.25. All our people as others have indicated before me want to be realistic. I would like in the interests of fairness that we get a real look at the costs of the food and the shelter. That leaves only clothing for the necessities of life. If whatever is employed for this purpose will look at it realistically we will have met the goal and the objective which is talked about today. I can only speak about my little place. In a small area where we compete with Mass. which has lower standards and a section of New York State which has lower standards I am told I urge you, please, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, in the interests of realism, in the interests of fairness, take this thought into consideration.

LABOR

JANUARY 31, 1957

CALVIN STIMICK: My name is Calvin Stimick, New Preston. My brother and I operate a small grocery store. I am here representing 31~~00~~ business men of a population of a town of 2500 population, who wish to go on record opposing any minimum wage law.

DONALD DECKER: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is Donald Decker from Lakeville. I run a laundry, own and operate a laundry employing fifteen help. I want to tell you what this increase wage is going to mean to us. It is going to mean in the first place, our workmen's compensation is going to be increased \$119. a year, it is going to increase our unemployment compensation, one of those foolish bills I think that went through that doesn't help the employer it is for the employee, it seems to me there should be Legislation made where the employee should pay his unemployment compensation because they are going to benefit by it, not the employer, and I would like to say this, that we are small business men. Henry Ford was a small business man to start with. How did he get big. He didn't have somebody say you have to pay your help \$1.25, you have to pay this, you have to pay that, he paid what he thought they were worth. Just like some gentlemen here said there is a critical shortage of help in Connecticut. Why do we have the help we've got. They must be satisfied with their wages and the way we treat them. Why must somebody tell us we've got to pay more wages. Ok, so we are getting 10¢ a pair of socks now, 25¢ for a shirt or \$1.00 for a dress. Do you want to pay half again as much for having your clothes laundered and serviced. Who wants that. Nobody wants that. Why are we paying high prices that we are paying now. It is because Labor has demanded more wages than they had been getting before. I think it is time we ought to try to stop this inflation and try to get back where we should be. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAM REGAN: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee my name is William Regan. I operate a hotel in New London, Connecticut known as the Crocker House. As you know, down New London way we have Doll Chemical, Charles Pfiezzler, Electro-Dynamics, large organizations. In my own organization we have approximately fifty employees. Twenty-three of those employees have been there for five years or longer. I am sure that you know that we couldn't hire employees for less than \$1.00 an hour if it wasn't for the tip category. Not that I want to excite our Commissioner but when he refers to where the tips go you can be sure in our organization that tips go to the employees who earn it. I am sure that the labor Commissioner knows in going through his records where the minimum is \$1.00 an hour or 75¢ an hour there will still be letters and complaints when we reach that standard and people think they may be raised. You can look over the employees in my Organization, and I have a payroll of from \$85,000 to

JANUARY 31, 1957

29

LABOR

\$95,000 a year, not a small business, and I have offered to my tipped employees various other jobs in our Organization such as room clerk with a base minimum wage of \$48.00 a week and three meals, I have offered these waitresses in our Organization the job of Supervisor of Hostess and Cashier at \$50.00 a week. They tell me they can't afford to take that job. You can look to the Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States where they are now investigating the tips made by employees. The income in some of these places is phenomel. I don't say that in my place but I do believe these people are making a living wage. If we do increase the wage to \$1.00 an hour I know, you all know, we will have to pass this cost on to the consumer, so I would just like to have you consider that these people are making a living in an area that is one I believe of the most prosperous in the State as far as labor relations are concerned. I know the Labor Department investigates these complaints, I know that they try to be fair, and they have leaned over backwards to try to answer the complaints of these people, but I am sure that there may be some extenuating circumstances in some areas. You will find the business man today is trying, and he has to meet the labor market, and he is paying his employees the minimum wage. I would like to point out one thing that hasn't been mentioned here this afternoon. We in the service business have been able to take up the slack of this particular type of employee and that is the employee who is now being pensioned off by big industry and small industry alike. In Social Security you know that the amount of money received per month is a maximum of \$180. a month and it goes down to I believe \$50.00 a month minimum. Some of these people need extra money to make up the slack. A person now receiving 75¢ an hour can only work 5 hours a day to make the \$1200. to improve their income. If the minimum goes to \$1.00 an hour in this particular category of employees it will be inadvisable for people to take the jobs and they will be getting State aid and other aid now being carried on in business and getting unemployment insurance compensation being paid by the employee, as you know. I would also like to point out that in our own Organization we have fringe benefits, that we do give our employees health and accident insurance, on the 8th day the health and accident begins. This is a matter of record and can be checked. I want to thank you very much for your consideration.

MR. THOMAS QUINLAN Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, my name is Quinlan. I own and operate a small resort at Lake Waramaug, Litchfield County. I arise to oppose minimum wage laws. My position is not one of degree but one of principal. I feel very strongly that it is unjust and uneconomic, laws that just won't work in our free enterprise in the American System. I think our choice is either a socialized welfare State or to continue along as in support of free market economy which has made America

what it is today, and in support of my contentions I would like to read this little excerpt from the Supreme Court of the United States laid down thirty years ago.

The law takes into account the necessities of only one party to the contract. It ignores the necessities of the employer, by compelling him to pay not less than a certain sum, not only whether the employee is capable of earning it, but irrespective of the ability of his business to sustain the burden, generously as an alternative of going on at a loss ... It compels him to pay at least the sum fixed in any event, because the employee needs it, but requires no service of equivalent value from the employee. It therefore undertakes to solve but one-half of the problem. The other half is the establishment of a corresponding standard of efficiency, and this forms no part of the policy of legislation, although in practice the former half without the latter must lead to ultimate failure, in accordance with the inexorable law that no one can continue indefinitely to take out more than he puts in without ultimately exhausting the supply. The law is not confined to the great and powerful employers but embraces those whose bargaining power may be as weak as that of the employee. It takes no account of the period of stress and business depression, of crippling losses, which may leave the employer himself without adequate means of livelihood. To the extent that the sum fixed exceeds the fair value of the services rendered, it amounts to a compulsory exaction from the employer for the support of a partially indigent person, for whose condition there rests upon him no peculiar responsibility, and therefore, in effect arbitrarily shifts to his shoulders a burden which, if it belongs to anybody, belongs to society as a whole. ... It exacts from the employer an arbitrary payment for a purpose which has no relation to the value of the services rendered. ... the moral requirement implicit in every contract of employment namely, that the amount to be paid and the service to be rendered shall bear to each other some sort of just equivalence, is completely ignored.

My feeling is that the logic of this statement is as good today as it was thirty ddd years ago. I think you gentlemen should realize that this particular type of legislation is so important. It is my feeling that it is the most important piece of legislature coming before this House at this particular session. All I urge you to do is to reconsider all the comments here today and to re-read this particular statement I have made here today. It seems to put more or less the arguments we have been trying to get forth to you gentlemen. I looked long and hard for this particular statement, I spent many hours doing it, it is my firm conviction that it has more merit than perhaps some of us realize.

MR. RICHARD LOWE: I am from Lake Waramaug, New Preston.

JANUARY 31, 1957

31

LABOR

I have an Inn and I am also representing the Lake Warmaug Hotel Assn. We are a small group of Hotel operators on the Lake. I don't want to take up much of your time. It is indeed a pleasure to be able to come here and to meet you gentlemen and to express to you the feelings of the Hotel Assn. and of the service units. I have a wife and a small child. We have come out here to Connecticut, have a beautiful spot and are trying to make a living in a small hotel. We are doing alright, we are living, but if we have to go to \$1.00 to pay a blanket coverage of \$1.00 you are going to undo us. We put our lives earnings, our lives work into our project. We work from daylight until way late at night, and we enjoy it, this is our profession, our field, we like it, we hope to get bigger, get better, but we don't like to get killed before we get started. I would like to have you reconsider those proposals and study them well and to think of us who might be as has been said fringe operators. I can't see any difference whether you are a fringe operator or a big operation as long as you are in there trying and if you have to get help behind you to keep us going. Thank you very much.

MR. JOHN SHEA: I own the Homewood Inn. May I say one other word as long as the Labor Commissioner is here and did and I speak with a little experience as I think I said to you. It is about tips and gratuities. It has been tried many times. There are many hotel men who have said I wish we could get away from tips and from gratuities. It works in some remote places but in Connecticut they found out it didn't work out satisfactorily. In our Inn I have said we will try doing without gratuities if you want to but they are not willing to, they don't want it, and speaking from experience whether it is in France where they add 10% and all the Americans added to it, Longchamp's Restaurant had tips erased in New York, there failure had nothing to do with tips but they stopped them. It doesn't go into the employers pocket. What it does is let the employer have less employees because they do like peace work in the factory on the job. It is just the peace work by which the Public benefits. As somebody else said we get people living on one income, we also get married couples, the husband and wife work and they don't want to pay too much, we are not as high priced as a lot of places in our area, we are in a high priced area. They appreciate the fact that it doesn't cost quite as much. If you take those tips out and don't give the employer proper credit for it it is going to cause all those people a lot of money and the employer isn't the one who will benefit.

MR. RICCIUTI: I wonder if the Committee has this clear about the gratuities. I don't want to keep bringing it up. I think it ought to be left to the individual person whether or not they would give tips. I am not in favor of eminenting tips. I am in favor of the money going directly to the waitress and none of it being taken from the wage.

MR. SHEA: Thats the same thing.

LABOR

JANUARY 31, 1957

SENATOR DESROSIERS: Does anyone else wish to speak? If not we will call this meeting to a close.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Yes, Sir.

MR. WILSON: Speaking for Desrosiers and Seaman.

Representatives: Over, Brown, Dumas, Strada, Cook, Brinell, Vachon, Tyler, Gagnon, A. B. Desrosiers, J. J. Carpenter, Wilson, Levesque, A. J. Desrosiers, D'Amour.

SENATOR DESROSIERS: We said we would start on bills we intend to do this throughout the entire session. This afternoon the hearing will be conducted by our well able chairman from the House, Paul Amos.

MR. DESROSIERS: We perhaps have been able to do a little better job than we did last week in terms of dropping these bills, as the first bill which will be heard will be

S.B. 740 / S.B. 735 / S.B. 731

These should have been heard last week and were not heard. These latter two have to do with the raising of the minimum. S.B. 740 is a rather comprehensive bill, and I think if anyone wishes to speak in any of these three we will hear them at this time. Those in favor; pass over forward. Arrive before the other bills. All right, we will come back later to them. I am sure someone wants to speak. Let's go on to the next group. This will be after forty hours.

S.B. 737 / S.B. 736

S.B. 733 / S.B. 732

Anyone wishing to speak in favor of these bills.

S.B. 737 (Mr. Stelzer) Increasing the Minimum and Providing for Overtime Compensation Laws.

S.B. 736 (Mr. Stelzer) Amendment to Act Concerning Amendment of the Minimum Wage Law.

S.B. 735 (Mr. Stelzer) An Act concerning Amendment of the Minimum Wage Law.

S.B. 734 (Mr. Stelzer) Amendment of Minimum Wage Law.

S.B. 733 (Mr. Stelzer) Amendment of Minimum Wage Law.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, speaking in favor of S.B. 733 and S.B. 735 and S.B. 737, S.B. 734 and S.B. 736, I think I covered the ground, most of the ground, last week in the hearing. The people who would be affected by this change are largely unorganized workers, people who would get their wages or previous pay as a result of action by the Legislature or by a Wage Order. Now, there are presently eight Wage Orders, four in different categories, for both men and female workers, which provide for some part of overtime for Beauty Parlors, Laundries, Restaurant Establishments and Dry Cleaning Establishments.