



Legislative History for Connecticut Act

<u>HB2479</u>	(PA334)	<u>1959</u>
<u>Senate</u> : P. 2269-2270		(0)
<u>House</u> : P. 2315-2322, 2581-2599		(27)
<u>Judiciary</u> : P. 66-108		(43)
LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY		
72 Pages		

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

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2014

S - 33

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1959

VOL. 8, PART 5

MAY 11 - MAY 18

PAGES 1876 - 2402

328.2s

C76pr

s

Leg. Ref.

Vault 3

CONNECTICUT

FRIDAY

MAY 15, 1959.

called upon for such action by the local authorities.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor will signify by saying "aye", those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it. The bill is ordered passed. As amended.

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 965. File No. 417. House Bill No. 2479. An Act concerning Powers of the Civil Rights Commission. House Amendment Schedule "A" adopted May 7, 1959. Favorable report of the Committee on Judiciary and Governmental Functions.

SENATOR SCANLON:

Mr. President..

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 6th.

SENATOR SCANLON:

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

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the adoption of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

SENATOR SCANLON:

Mr. President, at the present time the Civil Rights Commission, when they declare that an unfair labor practice exists, can issue a (inaudible) and can go no further. This bill will allow them to take a firmative action ordering reinstatement and payment of back wages, etc. The bill was printed in the file

FRIDAY

MAY 15, 1959.

claim (inaudible) indicates that a complaint filed in connection with this section should be filed within six months. That was the House Amendment that should read 90 days.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not all those in favor will signify by saying "aye", those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it. The bill is ordered passed. As amended.

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 971. File No. 564. House Bill No. 3713. An Act concerning Interest on Delayed Payment of Teachers' Retirement Contributions. Favorable report of the Committee on Public Personnel.

SENATOR URBINATI:

Mr. President..

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 19th.

SENATOR URBINATI:

I move for 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. Will you remark?

SENATOR URBINATI:

This bill endeavors to control the cost of the accounting funds and number of accounts handled by the Teachers' Retirement Board. The towns and cities were never very prompt in sending in

H-44

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1959

VOL. 8
PART 6
2151-2580

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

LEFS
219

THE CLERK:

Matters STARRED FOR ACTION. TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1959

Calendar No. 358. File No. 417.

House Bill No. 2479. An Act concerning Powers of
the Civil Rights Commission.

Favorable report of the Committee on Judiciary
and Governmental Functions.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from Brookfield.

MR. PINNEY OF BROOKFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, I request that this Bill be passed,
retaining.

THE SPEAKER: This Bill will be passed, retaining. The gentleman
from New Britain.

MR. GOOGEL FROM NEW BRITAIN:

Might I inquire from the famous gentleman from
Brookfield as to his reasons for this request.

THE SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Brookfield care to answer the
gentleman from New Britain.

MR. PINNEY OF BROOKFIELD: I'll be delighted Mr. Speaker. This Bill and several
of the Bills which follow are matters of considerable contro-
versy. I think they should be taken up at a time when the
attendance is somewhat better than it is at this late hour.

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from New Britain.

MR. GOOGEL OF NEW BRITAIN:

We have been staying here all day and part of the night so that we can handle just these controversial matters and clean them up and we don't want to later on. You read in the newspapers about the fact that the Legislature is lagging in its work.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brookfield.

MR. PINNEY OF BROOKFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple request which is ordinarily honored. You leave me no alternative except to ask the Members on this side of the House to leave the floor and I will then question a quorum.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on the Acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Newington.

MR. SATTER OF NEWINGTON:

This Bill simply enlarges the power of the Civil Rights Commission, by giving it the power where there has been a finding of discrimination in employment to order the.....
I move the favorable passage of the Bill.

MR. Speaker, I am glad to see you here.

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

LFS
221

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on the Acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brookfield.

MR. PINNEY OF BROOKFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, as I have attempted to point out in asking that this Bill be passed, retaining, there are a number of people who have strenuous objection to this Bill. I think they should have an opportunity to be heard.

THE SPEAKER:

The question now is on the Acceptance....The gentleman from Brookfield.

MR. PINNEY OF BROOKFIELD:

I now question a quorum.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the tellers please take the count, and will the gentleman from Simsbury before he leaves take the count in Section 4. Will the sergeant at arms please close the doors. The gentleman from New Britain.

MR. GOOGEL OF NEW BRITAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman may proceed.

MR. GOOGEL OF NEW BRITAIN:

Mr. Speaker, most of us have put in a full day here,

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

LFS
222

and up until the point of time that the distinguished gentleman from Brookfield asked that this Bill be passed because there were some people who were interested in it, we had as good an attendance, if not better, than a great number of days that we passed on controversial measures, and it was because of his suggestion that the Members of his Party left so that there wouldn't be any quorum and the business of the State of Connecticut, in so far as our Legislative activities are concerned, has to go by the board, so to speak. And I say to you Mr. Speaker that I don't want to hear any criticism from the Members of the other Party, nor perhaps from the members of the Press, or the Radio or Television, and the public at large, in so far as it affects the Democratic Party, because we are here to do business, and the only reason we are prevented from carrying out our business is because of the dilatory tactics engaged in by the Members of the other Party.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norwalk.

THE GENTLEMAN FROM NORWALK:

Mr. Speaker, this is a fine accolade. No question at all but what these people on that side of the House are justified in clapping because they are all sitting there, and that's where they should be perhaps because they have been told to be there. I want to remind you and the distinguished gentleman across the way, that it is now almost eight-fifteen.

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

THE SPEAKER:

Will the tellers please take the count. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Windsor.

MR. LAWRENCE OF EAST WINDSOR:

May I ask from you sir what represents the Hall of the House and are the Representatives up in the Gallery part of the attendance here?

THE SPEAKER:

It is the opinion of the Chair that Members of the House of Representatives must be in the Hall of the House in their Chairs to constitute a quorum. The gentleman from New Britain.

MR. GOOGEL OF NEW BRITAIN:

Mr. Speaker, may the vote be announced by sections so that for the record the people of the State of Connecticut will know who are here to transact their business and who have gone away.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Hartford.

THE GENTLEMAN FROM HARTFORD: MR. JOHNSON:

Mr. Speaker, I think it should go on record and I would like to be at least on record saying the Republican Party walked out on a civil rights bill. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from Brookfield.

LFS
223

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

LFS
224

MR. PINNEY OF BROOKFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, so that the record can be absolutely straight, I'll be perfectly happy to have this vote taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

Is there any objection. The vote will be taken by roll call if there is no objection. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hartford.

MR. BURNS OF NEW HARTFORD:

Mr. Speaker, being a fellow that was born in a foreign country, in the great country of Canada, I thought I would never see anything like this. The Republican Party to take a walk out on such an issue as this. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the tellers please announce to the Clerk the result of the vote. A roll call is to be taken in the Hall of the House. Will all Members in the State Capitol not in their Chairs, in the Gallery, please return to their Chairs immediately for a roll call that will be held in two minutes. Now the question is on a quorum, and if you vote 'yes', you are present. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Britain.

MR. GOOGEL OF NEW BRITAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of this Assembly to Section 42 of the House Rules which reads as follows:

THE SPEAKER:

If you vote 'yes' you are present. See every body

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

IFS
25

'Every Member present when the question is put by the Speaker shall vote unless excused by the House, and no Member shall absent himself from the House without leave, unless there is a quorum without his presence'.

THE SPEAKER:

MR. WOODS: Are you ready for the vote. The gentleman from Fairfield.

MR. MURRAY OF FAIRFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, as you know I have paired off with a Republican from the other side in the vain hope that I was able to get a ride home to Fairfield, but I find that that could not be accomplished. However, may I be counted in the quorum. That is a question I put to you Mr. Speaker and ask for a ruling on that question.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from Brookfield have any objection to the gentleman from Fairfield being recorded as present.

MR. PINNEY OF BROOKFIELD:

I think that the gentleman should be recorded as present.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair will now lock the machine.

MR. MURRAY OF FAIRFIELD:

May I vote on the roll call Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

If you vote 'yes' you are present. Has everybody

Tuesday, May 5, 1959

LFS
226

voted as they desire to vote. Have all those who claim the right to vote voted. Have you voted as you desire. The Chair will now lock the machine. A quorum is lacking. The House stands adjourned. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Britain.

MR. GOOGEL OF NEW BRITAIN:

In view of the fact that it's been indicated that there is not a quorum in the House, due to the fact that the Members on the other side left the Hall of the House at the request of the Minority Leader, I have no choice but to move for adjournment until tomorrow at eleven A.M.

THE SPEAKER:

The question now is on adjournment until tomorrow at eleven A.M. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The House stands adjourned.

H-45

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1959

Vol. 8
PART 12
2581-2996

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
178

THE SPEAKER:

Table for the Calendar.

The gentleman from New Britain.

MR. GOOGEL OF NEW BRITAIN:

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that we commence our deliberations this evening with those matters that have been starred for action for Thursday, May 7th, 1959, on page 28. I understand there's no objections.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from Brookfield have any objections?

MR. PINNEY OF BROOKFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, I have no objections. I would ask, however, that in the next ten or fifteen minutes if there is someone who is absent who is interested in a bill that it be passed just temporarily--not retaining, but until that person gets here.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair will now turn the gavel over to the gentleman from New Haven. (Joseph M. Rourke of New Haven)

THE CLERK:

Calendar page 28, starred for action Thursday, May 7th. Calendar No. 358. File No. 417. House Bill No. 2479. An Act concerning Powers of the Civil Rights Commission. Favorable report of the committee on Judiciary and Governmental Functions.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from Newington.

MR. SATTER OF NEWINGTON:

I move the acceptance of the committee's favorable report

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
179

and the passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

MR. SATTER OF NEWINGTON:

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, this bill is a bill which amends the Fair Employment Practices Act of our state. As you know, the Fair Employment Practices Act prohibits discrimination in employment by reason of race, religion, color or national origin. As I have said previously, the general procedure in the enforcement of the Fair Employment Practices Act is under the general control of the Civil Rights Commission. First, there must be a complaint filed and then an investigation, and if after an investigation a reasonable grounds for discrimination is found, there is a hearing. At that hearing the respondent is entitled to a full right to answer, to appear by counsel, and to present his own witnesses. After that hearing, the Civil Rights Commission can make or not make a finding on discrimination. Under our present law, having made a finding of discrimination it has no further power than to order a cease and desist of that discrimination.

This bill grants to the Civil Rights Commission the additional powers to require that the respondent, the defendant in that discriminatory proceedings shall be required to take such further affirmative action, included but not being limited to hiring or reinstating the employee with or without back pay or restoration in membership in any respondent labor organization, as in the judgment of the tribunal will effectuate the purposes of this

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
180

chapter.

These powers which are being asked for the Civil Rights Commission are very typical of the powers which are granted to Civil Rights Commissions throughout our country. They exist in the following states: Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New Mexico, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, California, Colorado and Ohio. The state of Ohio is interesting because they just passed a Fair Employment Practices Act in which they adopted these specific affirmative powers for their Civil Rights Commission. Moreover, this power which is being asked for the Civil Rights Commission is entirely comparable to power which is granted in analogic situations.

For example, the Connecticut Labor Relations Board has the power where it is found that an unfair labor practice has been committed to require that the employer shall not only reinstate the employee, but also grant him back pay.

In our Merit System, where a State Employee has been unjustifiably discharged, likewise, if the Personnel Appeal Board finds that that discharge was unjustified, the Personnel Appeal Board can require the reinstatement of the employee with back pay.

Most recently, in bringing this thing down to this assembly in its actions just this past week, this assembly just this week passed a law which would provide that where a member of this assembly had been discriminated against and been discharged from his job by reason of taking the high office of this legislature that the employer could be required to reinstate the employee to his full status and to pay him wages withheld or diminished retro-

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
181

active to the date of the violation. This, I repeat, we did this week.

Now, I see no reason whatever why a man who has been discriminated against by reason of his race, religion or national origin should have less rights than the union member who is discharged under the State Labor Relations Board to the state employee who is discharged and ordered back by the Personnel Appeal Board or to a legislator in this legislature.

Moreover, I want to emphasize that the order of the Civil Rights Commission is not self-operative. The respondent is entitled to an appeal to the Superior Court, and that appeal can be de novo. In other words, he can try the case completely over again, and in that appeal he is entitled likewise to be represented by counsel, to bring his own witnesses in to cross-examine, and all of the rights of due process. So that then you have a situation where there is a hearing before the Civil Rights Commission and a finding of discrimination, a second hearing before the Superior Court and again a finding of discrimination, and when all that has been gone through I see no reason why the respondent should not be required to reinstate the employee with or without back pay.

This bill, as we all know, has a history. I, for one, am willing to forget that history and debate this bill on its merits. I believe that all of us can be uplifted by the noble purpose of this bill which, as we all know, is to create an effective machinery in this state for the elimination of discrimination in employment.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly, I sincerely and I heartfully

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
182

urge the passage of this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? The gentleman from Westbrook.

MR. SCHLOSSBACH OF WESTBROOK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill. As background, I would like to say that I have been a member of the Civil Rights subcommittee which has had this particular bill for the last three sessions. I would also like to state, Mr. Speaker, that I was the member in 1953 who even though I was a hotel operator introduced and successfully passed in this House into law the public accommodations bill, and in the '55 and '57 tried earnestly to have two bills that we passed in this session also passed at that time, so I believe that my background is one that indicates that I have been in favor of the anti-discrimination bills over a period of years. However, I cannot in good conscience go along with this particular bill, and for the following reasons.

First, I do not believe that there is any real necessity for this bill. I would like to read from the statement that was given to me by a member of the commission which I believe will indicate to this body that there is no need for this bill. This statement indicates that over a period of years there have been 800 complaints made of which but two were found necessary to go to a hearing---2 out of 800---one of which was a hearing which involved the reinstatement of a person who claimed to have been discriminated against by a union. The other a claim that had been instituted by an individual who alleged that he had been discriminated against by his employer. The reinstatement of the union employee was made.

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
183

The other claim that was made was denied, so out of 800 cases--- or rather 800 complaints---only 2 had to go to a hearing. And why is that, Mr. Speaker? The answer is that in the law as it stands today that our commission, and you heard it extolled to the sky just the other day at which time you heard me stand here before this body and go on record as approving those two bills, that commission which has done such an excellent job in this state indicated that there was no real necessity for this bill. They do make a very thorough investigation. They bring the parties before them. They settle their own differences without the necessity of this particular bill.

And I might say to this body through you, Mr. Speaker, that I spoke to the members of this commission--at least two members--and one indicated to me that he felt that while there was no real necessity for this bill that he would be willing to go along with whatever the committee wanted to do about it. Also, I would like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that this is another of those bills which did not come in before the subcommittee of which I was a member. The two other bills were brought in, but this one--for some unknown reason--was not.

Now, let's get to the bill itself. What does this bill do? In my opinion, when the gentleman from Farmington in the two bills that we heard not too long ago raised the objection to the bills-- he called one of them the "big stick", and I believe that I corrected him at that time. This is the "big stick" bill. This is the bill that had been killed not once, but three times in the House and in the committee. This is the "big stick" bill. And why do

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
184

I call it that? I call it that because there is absolutely nothing that can't be done under the present law that this bill will do.

This is a bill that will attack the small businessman. Why? Because as you know, and you know so well, Mr. Speaker, that under present labor law practices this particular section is part of the union negotiations and is taken care of in the larger employee-employer relationships by negotiations, so that when they sit down before a bargaining group and negotiate this is one of the things that they take care of in the larger groups. But in the small groups, in the small employer groups, for those who have but few employees from one to five to ten there is no such bargaining as you so well know, sir. And what happens? If you will read the bill, you will note that it not only provides in the original bill for a actual complaint of discrimination but even for a threat of discrimination. So the small businessman who is threatened with a possibility of having to go to court--- and I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the rest of the members of this general assembly---you know how long a case can draw out in the courts! You know that there is the right of appeal under this bill. You know there can be a year or more for a small businessman to be threatened, and I mean it when I say threatened, with a possibility of having to pay not one man, but two men for one particular job--- so he weighs the situation and he says, "Well, I might as well keep this man." Is it good? Is it good to have ⁱⁿ a small organization an individual working for a man when the individual isn't sure whether he is going to be prejudiced by some act, whether the

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
185

efforts on the part of both himself and the employer to try to get rid of each other?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is not a good bill. If it was I wouldn't be here speaking against it.

Now, let's go into another phase of it. The purpose of this bill is indicated. It is to give an individual who fears that he is being discriminated against, or who is discriminated against, the right to go into the commission and file a complaint. If you will look at the last section of this bill which reads as follows: "Any complaint filed pursuant to this section must be so filed within six months after the alleged act of discrimination." Six months can elapse after an alleged act of discrimination and then an individual can bring the action that is asked for in this bill. I say to you that if a person can wait six months before he can bring an action or a complaint before this commission, it certainly should have been time enough for him to have told his employer, given him the opportunity to have studied the problem, gotten some honest and sincere advice, but to wait six months and then bring a complaint before this commission in my opinion is really much too unreasonable to make this a good bill.

In the report of the commission which I hold here it was indicated that they did not ask that there be any type of fine because they felt that they could settle their own problems. There is no criminal penalty at this time, and the commission, as it says here, "The commission is not recommending this penalty but does wish to emphasize without penalty provision that there can be no enforcement of this act." I agree with that. I agree

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
186

with that. I believe that if the people who want this bill were honestly and sincerely convinced that this was a problem that should be taken care of by some act, some affirmative act, then I say let them put a penalty in it because I would be the first one to stand up and cry that if there has been any type of discrimination then, and only then, should a person be fined for so discriminating. I am in accord with that. I am willing to agree at this time, Mr. Speaker, for an amendment to that effect, and I have it in my pocket.

I have no reason to desire that anyone should discriminate against anyone for race or creed or color, but I can't for the life of me understand why anyone should need this bill -- because what does it do? It allows a commission not only to cause reinstatement in a labor union or to allow the reinstatement of a person to have his job, but it allows this together with back pay. Now, if they were really sincere in their belief that this was necessary, why the six months period? Why don't they provide for a notice to the employer and immediate action so that he would not be prejudiced by any action that might be taken, or if he has made a mistake--honest or dishonest--that he could be taken care of in a very short time? The answer is that this bill has as its real purpose the fact that they would like to put the small businessman in a bad position, in the position where he would be fearful of arguing with an employee or ordering whether or not he has been wrong. He would be forced, he would be forced under this bill, Mr. Speaker, to accept the worst side of it and say, "Well, I'll keep this man and I'll try to get rid of him some other way."

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
187

And that is not good--that is not good for business. That is not good for the employer and that is not good for the employee, and for that reason, and for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I say this bill is a bad one and we should not pass it.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? The gentleman from Bloomfield.

MR. WAGNER OF BLOOMFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, I had honestly not intended to comment on this bill here this evening because I thought it was a rather straight-forward bill. The entire bill consists of about three sentences, and if you all look at the bill, File 417 at the bottom of page 2, the entire bill is in this italicized type. I think everyone here can read it for themselves and judge for themselves whether the gentleman from Westbrook has accurately represented what this bill proposes to do.

The commission now has the power to order employers to cease and desist from discriminatory practices. This bill would give them the power in addition to the power to order an employer to desist from a discriminatory practice in addition to require such respondent to take such affirmative action, including, but not limited to, hiring or reinstatement of employees, with or without back pay or restoration to membership in any respondent labor organization, as in the judgment of that tribunal shall best affect the purposes of this chapter. Now, why is this necessary? It's necessary by the question which the gentleman from Westbrook proposed. He proposed a fine. The only trouble is that a fine does not help the employee who has been discriminated against.

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
188

That's the answer to the question. This is the argument which was proposed in front of the Judiciary Committee by the people proposing the bill.

Let me also correct some of the, I think, factual...misfactual impressions which were cast here by the gentleman from Westbrook. Just let me take one moment to tell you this---that appearing in favor of this bill was the Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission, the eminent Dr. Friedman, whom the gentleman from Westbrook has quoted on many occasions as typifying the high type of leadership or the high, noble type of leadership which constitutes this commission. Now, it just so happens, Mr. Speaker, that out of the testimony which the chairman of the Civil Rights Commission gave before our committee I would estimate that ninety per cent of that testimony was spent on this bill---not the other two bills which were previously passed this session.

I will close, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out to the rest of the House here that approximately sixty-five witnesses appeared or signed up in favor of this bill at the hearing. Opposed was only one witness, an apologetic witness, if you please, a representative of the Connecticut Association of Manufacturers, and his sole point against the bill was, "Well, this might hurt some employer"....and he was worried about that. This was the only opposition to that bill by any party that I have seen up until this time. Those are the facts which I thought the members of this House should have before they vote on this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
189

Will you remark further? The gentleman from Washington.

MR. QUINLAN OF WASHINGTON:

Mr. Speaker, I like to look at realities at times. I'm an employer of people, and I look at these problems sometimes as they might apply in my own business. I also like to look at things--- I might draw an analogy here. In the last generation or two, let's look at the way we have handled our marital problems. When we have found incompatibility between two married couples, it has been the trend in every state in the union not to force people to live together...to allow them to separate. I might say that this is a similar situation. You are forcing two incompatible people you might say---call them people---to be rejoined. I do not object to the back pay feature of this bill, but I do object to the fact that this bill could be used to force an employer to take back an employee perhaps where the alleged discrimination was very shady-- perhaps the alleged discrimination was not altogether on the part of the employer. Perhaps it would cause such a friction within a small organization, as has been brought out by the gentleman from Westbrook, that I think this is rather a dangerous type bill to pass. I do not think it faces the realities. I urge its defeat.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? The gentleman from New Britain.

MR. GOOGEL OF NEW BRITAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring out one little point that might be very, very interesting to the members of this great House of Representatives. The distinguished gentleman from Westbrook

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
190

placed much stress upon the fact that any complaint filed pursuant to this section must be filed within six months after the alleged act of discrimination. He would lead us to believe that this is something new, that this is something that has been added to this bill, and I want to say to him that this particular provision has been on the statute books for over ten years---and you yourself, sir, and I refer to the gentleman from Westbrook, the distinguished gentleman, claim that he's been a member of this assembly for four terms, and not once during those four terms did he do anything about amending this particular section of the act providing for a six months time within which to make a complaint---and it's been on the statute books for at least ten years. So I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that his argument in that respect, of course, must be judged accordingly.

THE SPEAKER: Will you remark further? The gentleman from Hartford.

MR. JOHNSON OF HARTFORD: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I am completely surprised at the/pseudo attitude of the gentleman from Westbrook on this particular legislation, and I am therefore forced to move that when this vote be taken it be taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER: The question is that when the vote is taken that it be taken by roll call. All those in favor say aye, opposed no. The ayes have it. A roll call has been ordered.

The gentleman from New Hartford.

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
191

MR. EDDY OF NEW HARTFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question through you, if I may, of the gentleman from Newington who reported this bill, prompted not by any peculiar knowledge in this field but rather by the language which in line 62 says, "...and further requiring such respondent to take such affirmative action, including, but not limited to"... these things we've been discussing..." as in the judgment of the tribunal will effectuate the purposes of this chapter." I wonder if, through you, sir, the gentleman from Newington would enlighten me as to what other action, such affirmative action within the meaning of this language is contemplated that the commission might take.

MR. SATTER OF NEWINGTON:

Mr. Speaker, through you, responding to the gentleman from New Hartford that such further action might mean where a man has been taken off one job and put on another job to ask to be returned to the first job for which he was taken off, or such similar action which within the general employment area cannot be specifically stated in a general statute of this nature.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? The gentleman from Manchester.

MR. BARRY OF MANCHESTER:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. The provision as set out that amends the existing law will at last put some teeth into this bill, into the law as it now reads. I cannot understand any objection on the part of anyone to a provision

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
192

that would permit a wronged individual employee to be reinstated in his job and to be compensated for the period of time which he lost at work as a result of the act of discrimination. There is no room for discrimination in this state, and any effort by this legislature to correct the conditions in employment should be encouraged. I urge the passage of this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from Westbrook.

MR. SCHLOSSBACH OF WESTBROOK:

Mr. Speaker, there has been some suggestion that we might possibly compromise this bill. Certainly, I feel that if there is to be a compromise I personally am willing to go along with it. But I want to make one statement clear to the gentleman from Hartford that my objection to this bill is not pseudo. I think the statement that was made is based on nothing more than something that came off of the top of his head!

I have been very much interested in this particular problem and I resent any allegation that my interest in this bill is other than to see that everyone gets a fair deal. So, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk read the amendment?

THE CLERK:

Amendment Schedule "A".

In line 73, bracket "six months" and insert "90 days."

MR. SCHLOSSBACH OF WESTBROOK:

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

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
193

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? The gentleman from Newington.

MR. SATTER OF NEWINGTON:

Mr. Speaker, speaking just on the amendment. I am willing to accept that amendment for purposes of this bill. I will speak on the bill as amended, but for the purposes of the amendment, I will accept it in the spirit in which it's been offered.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from Brookfield.

MR. PINNEY OF BROOKFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, the amendment is offered because, I think, the gentleman from Westbrook raises a genuine point in connection with the time in which a complaint may be filed. The time was not important really in the bill as it was originally cast prior to the proposed change in it. The commission could only issue a cease and desist order. Now, under the proposed change in the bill, of course, it can reinstate and require the payment of back pay. If the period for filing the complaint is allowed to be too long, a substantial amount of back pay can build up, and it seems intelligent to narrow that period for filing down as much as possible. That's the reason for the amendment. I am very happy that the other side of the House has seen fit to accept it, and I think it's a sensible change in the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? The question is on the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". All those in favor say aye, opposed no. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
194

The gentleman from Hartford.

MR. JOHNSON OF HARTFORD:

Mr. Speaker, because of the kind indulgence of both sides of the House, I would like at this time to withdraw the move to have this by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

Unless there is objection, the vote will not be by roll call.

The gentleman from Brookfield.

MR. PINNEY OF BROOKFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, I assume this needs to get the Legislative Commissioner's approval, but I'm willing to waive the reprinting and we can take the thing up in due course.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from New Britain.

MR. GOOGEL OF NEW BRITAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished minority leader in waiving the approval on this side of the House, so it won't be necessary to have the approval of the Legislative Commissioner's office.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from Newington.

MR. SATTER OF NEWINGTON:

Just speaking on the bill as amended. I just want to say one thing. The gentleman from Westbrook has given the impression that the commission was not in favor of this particular amendment. He is not speaking entirely accurately. He is reading from pre-

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
195

cisely the same piece of paper which I have, and he has not read the paragraph which reads: "The commission feels that in order to carry out the basic purpose of this law, that is to afford relief to persons discriminated against in employment because of their race, color, etc., the hearing tribunal needs the authority for affirmative action provided by this bill."

~~THE SPEAKER:~~ This bill is a good bill. This is a bill in line with the other bills which we have passed, and I am certain that by reason of the recent accepted compromise that we shall pass it, and we will pass it to our great glory. I urge the passage of the bill as amended.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? The gentleman from Westbrook.

MR. SCHLOSSBACH OF WESTBROOK:

Mr. Speaker, as usual the gentleman from Newington has a very short memory. I don't want to get into an argument in regard to this bill because I have agreed to the amendment, but I want to refer the gentleman from Newington to the telephone conversation we had with the director of the Civil Rights Commission.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from Newington.

MR. SATTER OF NEWINGTON:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to that insinuation by the gentleman from Westbrook. I did have a conversation with the Executive Secretary of the Civil Rights Commission, and he urged me to bring this bill on the floor and to fight for it--and that

Thursday, May 7, 1959

FPD
196

is precisely what, of course, we have done.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor say aye, opposed no. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 369. File No. 393. Substitute for House Bill No. 2485. An Act concerning Emergency Use of Civil Defense Forces. Favorable report of the Committee on Judiciary and Governmental Functions.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from New Canaan.

MR. FINCH OF NEW CANAAN:

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

THE SPEAKER:

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

MR. FINCH OF NEW CANAAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment. I hasten to add it's a noncontroversial amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will read the amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A".

In line 16, strike out "a" and insert "the".

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

JUDICIARY AND
GOVERNMENTAL
FUNCTIONS

PART 1
1-443

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

1959

JUDICIARY AND GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 5, 1959

Senator Scanlon, presiding

Members present: Senators: Scanlon, Pickett, Cady
Representatives: Googel, Barry, Carrozzella, Hammer,
Katz, Lyddy, Mills, Morelli, Purtill, Satter,
Shea, Schlossbach, Marsters, Dudley, Shulansky,
Finch

Sen. Scanlon: Because, apparently, most people here are interested more in the Civil Rights bills than the others, we will start our hearing with the House Bills, starting with H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION and go on through the Civil Rights measures. Now, any Legislators who are present can come forward and offer what they have before the general public.

Rep. Samuel S. Googel, New Britain: Mr. Chairman, I am a Representative from the City of New Britain and am the Democratic House Leader. I merely want to publicly go on record as being in favor of H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, both of them are practically identical, H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2763 (Rep. Satter) PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS, and I want the Committee to know that the Democratic leadership in this Assembly is in favor of these measures.

Sen. Scanlon: Thank you. Are there any other Legislators that wish to be heard?

Rep. Wallace, Simsbury: Mr. Chairman, I am the Assistant Minority Leader. I would like to point out to the Committee that H. B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT is one that is included in the Republican platform of 1958. That platform is still the platform on which the Republican Party operates and I should like to point up the reading of that platform which said that the Republican Party favored legislation to broaden the coverage of the Public Accommodations Act to include commercial housing involving five or more units whether such units be for sale or for rent. This is what H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. SATTER) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMODATIONS ACT does and we are very much in favor of it. I should

2
61
62

Rep. Wallace continues: also like to point out that there is an identical bill which I am sorry has not been presented today, Senator Mariani, the Republican Minority Leader in the Senate, which stands for the same purpose and if possible I should like to have my remarks applied to that when it is presented. Thank you.

Rep. Wilfred X. Johnson, Hartford: Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say that I would like to go on record as favoring the following bills, H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H. B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, H.B. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT.

Rep. Satter, Newington: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, Fellow Committee Members and Fellow Legislators, I would like to rise particularly to speak in reference to H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT of which I am the very proud sponsor. This bill as you know would enlarge the Public Accommodations Act so as to cover any housing accommodations offered for sale or rent by any person who owns or controls five or more housing accommodations. What it would do would be to bring within the public accommodations law premises or housing developments in which five or more units were involved. It would be an extremely important extension of our Public Accommodations law. In so doing, it would seem to me it would do at least three important things. The first and most important thing it would do to relate itself to one of the important sociological problems of the whole Northern part of our Country. I think it can be fairly said that one of the most crucial sociological problems of the North is segregation in private housing. The containment, particularly of large Negro populations in a small area of our Northern cities. This is a situation which exists in Connecticut and it is a situation that exists frequently in the North and the sociological consequences of this fact are economic destitution, unsanitary dwellings resulting in a public health problem, the higher incidents of crime or juvenile delinquency and most important of all, a lowering of human dignity. Another aspect of this problem is moral. One of the sharpest pangs of the moral conscience of the North is segregation in private housing because it so glaringly reveals the disparity between our lofty protestations and our inadequate performance. Now, what is the nature of this segregation? It is important to make a very important distinction between segregation as it exists in private housing and as it exists in other forms in the South. Segregation in schools in the South is a State policy foisted upon the people by the State. It is a public

Rep. Satter continues: policy. The segregation which we are talking about here is not a State public policy. There is no State law, far from it, in the State which sanctions and which approves segregation. But there is unfortunately a practice which does it. It is no accident that we have been building housing developments in our Connecticut, certainly since 1946 and in which it has been almost impossible for negroes to purchase homes in these developments. This has been a systematic exclusion of negroes particularly from these housing developments and it is toward this particular problem that this law is directed. Now, it may be that landlords have certain property rights and we may give to them certain rights to sell their property or rent their property to whomever they please. They may not for example have children in apartment homes. They may require certain financial standards. But the one standard which we are saying to the landlords by this bill or to the housing developers is they shall not exclude people because of their race, religion or creed. And what is the public interest? The public interest is that the social consequences of a persistent pattern of segregation in private housing has been economic destitution, has been public health problems, has been a higher incidence of crime and we as the legislature have the right to direct ourselves to that particular problem and try to solve it. The third aspect of it is political. Both political parties have vowed in their political campaigns that they would pass such a bill. The Democratic Majority Leader, Rep. Googel, has said that this is the policy of the Democratic party and this bill is an administration bill. The Republican Minority Leader has said likewise. This is a very significant fact. It means that this time the political parties will not fail in their promise. This time, they will fulfill it and in so doing, in passing a bill of this nature, we will contribute toward this important sociological problem. We will square ourselves with our own moral conscience and we will fulfill our political promises. To do this in this session, we will have wrought something of which we can all be proud and I have every confidence that we will do it.

Rep. Robert P. Howard, Plainville; I would like to register in favor of H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION as well as other bills pertaining to the same subject, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT and H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION.

Rep. Howard continues: This is good legislation and I think it will help tremendously in the fight to end discrimination because of race, color and creed. I urge the Committee to adopt these bills.

Rep. Schlossbach, Westbrook: Mr. Chairman, may I just add another word? I am very happy to see this bill come in here at this time in view of the fact that there is a culmination of years of hard work on the part of the group who I feel should be heard and perhaps should have been heard long before this. However, it is perhaps ultimate of something that happened back in 1952 and 1953 when I had the pleasure of being the Chairman of the sub committee on Public Accommodations and I believe that was the first step toward what is perhaps going to happen in this session. I am very happy to see an improvement. Thank you.

Sen. Scanlon: Are there any other Legislators?

Mayor Samuel Tedesco, Bridgeport: Senator, may I just break in here? I have another hearing.

Sen. Scanlon: Certainly.

Mayor Samuel Tedesco: I would like to register in favor of H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT and H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION. For years, we have had at least one of these bills before the Legislature and it happens that the bills are just not passed. I would strongly urge the passage of at least these two because I am familiar with these. H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT as you know is a needed law especially in our large cities and concerns the housing accommodations offered for sale or rent. The other one grants the affirmative powers to the person on Civil Rights and I strongly urge the passage of these two bills. Thank you very much.

Sen. Wallace Barnes, 5th District: Mr. Chairman, there are many people waiting to be heard and I will take no more time than to indicate that I am in favor of H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H.B. No. 2470 (REP. GOOGEL) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION and H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, the bills which have been previously referred to. Thank you.

Sen. Scanlon: Any other Legislators? Before I turn this over to the public, I would first like to ask Mr. Snow if he wishes to be heard this morning?

Mr. W. Snow: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Judiciary Committee, last summer I was appointed Chairman of a Committee to look over this whole question of housing and the response was uncommonly in favor of it, to my great surprise. People felt that this same thing should be applied to housing should be applied to a company or corporation using a bus and allowing everybody of different races to ride on a bus or the same thing to a person having a grocery store and allowing every race to come into the grocery store. It is only extending that to the people who are doing housing, development housing. Now, the Chairman doesn't want repetition and I possibly could help out by telling you something about my home town which is probably true of your town. We had a psychiatric doctor who wanted to work in the insane hospital in Middletown and he couldn't find a house to live in. We almost had to give him up. He's a national psychiatrist. We almost had to lose him altogether but finally we got him a house down in Durham. We had a negro dentist in Middletown and we almost had to give him up because there was no place for him to live. This prejudice is a thing we have to overcome. My wife and I put on a laboratory experiment. Five hundred feet below my house, I sold a negro a home and people said you will never be able to sell any more of your land, they said you will never be able to sell your place on the hill, they said you have ruined our whole region and that was about ten or twelve years ago. Now, on that same street which is a dead end street, there are nine houses, behind the negro house is a development of forty houses and so the thing didn't work out the way people thought it was going to work out. That is, when they get acquainted with a good family, whether it belongs to one race or the other, he makes a good neighbor. These people have one girl who is a nurse in a child ward, another a teacher in public schools, a boy in the Army and a boy at Storrs at the University. Now, this whole thing is a matter of unnecessary prejudice which evaporates, which dissolves if we give it a chance. You cannot build a good State on racial prejudice. What we want in America is the dream of Jefferson, the dream of Emerson, the dream of Lincoln to come true, that all men are created equal. If we do that, I think that these bills which I wish you would consider favorably will help us in the State of Connecticut, the state of love to build a better state. Thank you very much.

Mr. Thomas Henry, Acting Executive Secretary Civil Rights Commission:
I would like to introduce Judge Irwin Friedman, our Chairman who wants to speak on H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS and H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION.

Judge Irwin Friedman, Fairfield: I would like to keep this as brief as possible, but my responsibility is probably a little larger than other people who are to address you. In the first place, our Commission is a creature of this Legislature, it is our job to carry out the responsibility that you have outlined for us in statute. In order for this Committee to properly evaluate the bills here today, it seems to me that I ought to give you some information on what the Commission has done. In the first place, the Commission is regarded all over the Country as one of the outstanding Commissions. We are ten members of the Commission who serve without pay. Many of these people are professionals in their own right, such people as Elmo Roper, the Research Analyst, who is the Deputy Chairman of the Commission. We have a representative of each of the great Faiths, Msgr. Griffin, Rabbi Silverman, and Dr. Beach from New Haven. Dr. Carter Marshall of the medical staff of Yale, Dr. Jackson out of Hartford and other men who are in sociology and social anthropology and so the Commission itself, in addition to the fifteen member staff does with all humility an outstanding job. It is therefore entitled, it seems to me, to the support of this Committee because we are in effect carrying out your meaning. To indicate to you that what I am saying is not just lip service, I have in my hand five studies, research studies, that are the product of this Commission. These are pamphlets, studies that have been done by our Commission that are used all over the Country. Colleges and Universities all over the Country have sought for these studies. We have made them available. The members of the Commission have even put their own money into the work of the Commission and now I'm not talking about hundreds, but thousands of dollars have come from members of the Commission themselves. We've gotten help from the various funds, charitable funds, in order to be able to produce copies of these studies which have achieved national importance at the present time. We've had some eight hundred hearings, eight hundred cases I should say, during the history of this Commission. Of the eight hundred cases, four have gone to hearings, three have gone to court. So you can see that what has been done here is a job that has been unsung and unheard. All of this work has been done quietly, privately and without any fanfare. In other words, by your direction in your statute you have told us we must do this job without publicity, without subjecting either the employer, the employee, the union or anyone involved, any person who offers public accommodation, all of these people are to be kept in a position where they are not exposed to criticism by reason of publicity and we have followed that injunction to the letter. We have done

Judge Irwin Friedman continues: everything possible on a very limited budget to do a very big and important job. This is not the place to discuss the budgets so I won't mention it except to say that we need authority to carry out the work that you have given us to do. If you don't give us this authority, you thereby cut our throats, in legal effect, because we can go through the motions but can't perform. We can't enforce our decrees which you have authorized us to make and what I am talking about is simply this. We need some kind of teeth in the law. Beyond telling the person that he must cease and desist from firing a man, reinstating them, upgrading, whatever may be involved in his employment - a complainant comes to the Commission and tells us that he has been discharged by reason of discrimination, we take the complaint and our first job is to send an investigator out to make an effort to conciliate and to educate and to resolve it with no problem at all by convincing the party involved that he ought to obey the law and if he is willing to regard the law as significant we pat him on the wrist gently and say, if you promise to be good in the future we're satisfied and we do this because we believe this is education. Now, when we come to the point of a violator who discriminates and he refuses to comply with the conciliation request, we then set up a hearing. The hearing tribunal consists of three people who are selected by the Chairman from a panel appointed by the Governor and this hearing tribunal hears the case the same way as you would any court case. The Attorney General represents the Commission. When the tribunal makes a decision they say to the respondent, you must cease and desist from firing this man and then the respondent has the right to go to court if he disagrees with that and then he has the right to go to the Supreme Court if he disagrees with the lower court. But, what happens to the man who has been fired. How about his family? How do they live to the day when one day justice will be done and he will be reinstated to his job? What shall he do in the interim? If he takes another job, then the cease and desist order doesn't mean anything because he's not available for employment. Our remedy or the remedy that we respectfully suggest is that you give the Commission authority to order reinstatement with or without back pay. Give the Commission teeth so that the law means something. We have a very strange situation existing today because the man who obeys the law, when we tell him he should not discriminate and he listens to us, he listens to you because this is your law that we administer. He goes along, obeys the law and no problem ensues. The man who flouts the law, who tells

Judge Irwin Friedman continues: the Legislature and the Commission, I don't pay any attention to your law, he can fire the man discriminatorily, I am not talking only of the violator, he can fire him and sit and wait for two years until the Supreme Court has passed on it, then what happens, he has to reinstate the man. He has to rehire him. Now this is an outrage to anyones sense of justice I'm sure. When he can flout the law, the action of this Legislature, the action of our Commission, the action of our Court, the violator is glorified and the man who obeys the law is ignored. I'm sure that this was never the intention of this Legislature when this law was created. And so, we urge you very strongly to give consideration to this particular law, because without it, we are powerless to carry out your mandate. I am now talking about a very small minority of people because as I indicated to you originally, of some eight hundred cases we have been able to settle all of them without even a hearing excepting for three or four. Now, this shows the kind of work the staff has done and therefore, they are entitled to the support of you who created us. Now, in respect to the right to initiate complaints in the field of public accommodations, we already have a right to initiate complaints in public housing and publicly assisted housing but we don't have the right to initiate complaints in places of public accommodation. Many people do not want to carry the cause. If a Jewish person or Porto Rican, an Italian, a Pole, a Negro is involved in a problem of housing accommodation, why should he be the goat and carry the ball for the State of Connecticut when the State isn't interested in permitting the Commission to do the work that was designated to us. And so, because he doesn't want to get involved in time, energy, effort and being the crusader, nothing occurs and the violator again is glorified. We ask that you consider in this bill giving us the right to initiate complaints in that field in the same way that we have in all other fields and in the same way that it's done in practically all the other States where the public accommodations law exists. Incidentally, if I may digress for just a minute, going back to the other bill, the business of affirmative authority, affirmative authority to do things for people who are discriminated against, this now exists in the State Labor Relations Law, as you undoubtedly know and this exists in every State law. Affirmative authority is granted to a Commission to carry out the job it is supposed to do. I could go on and tell a long story, but I know it's not my duty to do it, nor should I take the time of this Committee, but I ask you in all good conscience to give attention this time to these bills and to give it your support because, for the first time this matter is removed beyond politics. The

Judge Irwin Friedman continues: Republican party in its platform and the Democratic party in its platform have both made it very plain that they have a very strong desire to support Civil Rights Legislation. The fact that the Majority Leader of the Senate, Mr. Googel, I beg your pardon, of the House, the fact that these bills are being offered by the House Majority Leader supports what I have just told you, that the Administration undoubtedly favors these bills. The Republican Party having expressed itself - is it Representative or Senator Schlossbach?

Rep. Schlossbach: Representative.

Judge Irwin Friedman: You should be promoted because I heard your statement. I think this bespeaks the support of all people of good will, including politicians, for whom I have the greatest respect. Thank you.

Mr. Ralph Goglia, West Haven: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am here today as a member of the Commission on Civil Rights. The Commission supports and endorses H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT as being essential to the public welfare. In making its annual report to the Governor this year, the Commission stressed the seriousness of discrimination in housing and recommended that the Public Accommodations Act be amended to include any housing accommodations offered for sale or rent by any person who controls the sale or rental of five or more housing accommodations. Such legislation is urgently needed to protect the rights of minority groups and to secure decent, safe and sanitary housing. This proposed amendment logically brings under coverage the only category of business not now included under the provisions of the Public Accommodations Act. Recently the Research Division of the Commission completed a study on racial integration in private residential neighborhoods in Connecticut. It showed that Connecticut is still far removed from perfection in its treatment of non-white families and that the same element of suspicion, the same belief in stereotype that hampered the segregation in the South are also present here. The study points out that the frustrations faced by Negro families, who like other immigrant groups before them, attempted to move into better neighborhoods and better homes, whereas the succession of minority groups during this century have entered blighted areas at the lowest income level and then moved on to better neighborhoods, this process has not been possible for the Negro who must still suffer discriminatory roadblocks. Connecticut has traditionally espoused the principal of racial equality and has implemented this principal in a succession of Civil Rights laws covering

Mr. Ralph Goglia continues: public education, public and private employment, labor union membership, public accommodations and public housing. In view of present conditions, it is the responsibility of all of our citizens to give further implementation to this principal. We recognize that the proposed extension of the Public Accommodations Act is not the one and only answer to a very complicated problem. However, it will help create a favorable climate for better human relations in the area of housing. Through legislation, standards of behavior can be set, which may lead to changes of attitudes and improvement and opportunity and more equitable treatment for people previously at a disadvantage. A good illustration of this is found in the Fair Employment Practices Act. Experience has shown that the fears of opponents of this bill was baseless. Workers did not leave their jobs because of the employment of members of the minority groups. There have been no claims by employers that they are forced to hire unqualified workers. Very briefly, I would like to call to your attention the fact that a major population redistribution has taken place. The way that we are able to give leadership to problems developing from this sociological reality will have world wide significance. The population increase in Northern metropolitan areas is almost entirely non-white in the city and almost entirely white in the suburbs. The migrations to our central cities is largely a rural urban or a South North migration. For instance, the 1950 census on population shows that during the period 1940 to 1950 the percent increase in Hartford for the white population was 3.4 and it was 78.9 for the non-white group. This population movement can result in urban decay. Neighborhoods near the central part of the city are allowed to deteriorate. It becomes increasingly profitable to turn housing that is located there into multiple dwelling units or boarding houses. Rentals in deteriorating neighborhoods are often fantastically profitable. In metropolitan areas, four out of every five new post war homes were built in the suburbs. These and the new urban houses were generally closed to the Negro buyers. High rents, restricted housing areas, neighborhood and family deterioration combined to make it rather difficult to achieve the economic position that is required of one to be able to move out of the central core of the city if this is desired. However, in terms of the American ideal of equal opportunity for all is it possible for a member of a non-white family who has been able to acquire education and economic position equal to that of his white associates to move with freedom to any neighborhood that is available to his white counterpart? Housing is the only commodity whose purchase or rental is conditioned

Mr. Ralph Goglia continues: by the race, religion or national origin of the buyer. This pattern of residential exclusion is inconsistent with all other standards we have set. It exploits some of our citizens to the detriment of all. Thank you.

Rep. Googel: Thank you and might I respectfully suggest that those of you who are about to testify at this hearing, if you have statements, we would appreciate it if you would just give us a brief summary of what you have in your statement and leave the statement with our clerk because it would save considerable time and I assure you that any statements left with this Committee will receive our full attention.

Mrs. Gertrude F. Koskoff, Plainville: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I represent Mr. Snows State Committee for equal opportunity in housing. We wish to support all the bills requested by the State Commission on Civil Rights and we are particularly interested in H.B. NO. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT. Two years ago, when I represented Plainville at the Legislature, I introduced this very bill. Now, as you heard, H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT would amend the public accommodations act to include the selling and renting of five housing units or more. Now, the Public Accommodations Act makes it illegal to discriminate because of race, creed or color in the offering of good services and facilities to the public. Now, when a person is in the business of renting or selling houses, isn't he offering good services and facilities to the public and why therefore, should he be excluded from this bill anymore than a hotel-keeper, storekeeper and all the others who are included in this bill? I am afraid the only reason he is excluded is because of prejudice. In Connecticut the Negro, particularly is suffering acutely because of prejudice and discrimination in housing. He is permitted to live only in certain designated areas which are segregated and he pays exorbitant rents for miserable holes and there isn't a thing he can do about it because he has no other place to go. It is almost impossible to break down the barriers in neighborhoods. It doesn't make any difference whether or not people might be good neighbors, teachers, lawyers, doctors, people we should all be proud to have as neighbors are subjected to all kinds of indignities when they try to rent or buy outside the ghetto. It doesn't matter who they are. It doesn't matter how honorable or learned they might be, the color of their skin determines where

Mrs. Gertrude Koskoff continues: they may live. Now, when people have no choice of neighborhood and can only live in certain places, rent gouging, among other evils, flourishes. Greedy people have bought property unsuitable to live in for the sole purpose of rent gouging. Last Spring, I went on a tour of inspection with some members of the Hartford N.A.A.C.P. and we visited some houses in the North End. It made me sick. I still cringe at what I saw. We visited one apartment house that had just been sold and the rent had just been raised from \$70.00 to \$100.00 per month. The tenants had been notified that within another month or two the rent would again go up to \$125.00 per month. The plan I was told, this apartment house was on the fringe of the North End and the tenants were mostly white, but the plan I was told was to force the white tenants out and fill these apartment houses up with Negroes and Porto Ricans desperately in need of places to live and forced to pay as much as they were required. Now, I saw people living in places too terrible almost to describe, ceilings falling down, plaster falling off the walls, houses heated with oil stoves, no bathtubs, often just cold water, whole families crowded into rooms and they were paying for each room \$15.00 and \$20.00 per week. Now, perhaps, putting back rent controls will help, but it certainly won't help enough. It's like administering asperin for the pain caused by a tumor. Now, if we are to get at this basic problem we have to commit these people into other neighborhoods. These people are in a miserable and cruel trap and we need this law to open the door of that trap. Public housing helps a little, but public housing can't do this job alone. We need some wedge into private housing and we are not going to get this wedge without a law anymore than we would have made a wedge into employment without the F.E.T.C. law and just as the F.E.T.C. law has worked to the advantage of all concerned and not least of all to bring about better human relations, so will the law for equal housing. Now, I am sure we are all concerned about the terrible gap between what we preach and what we practice in this Country. We all deplore the Little Rock story but we should not forget that wherever there is segregated housing, segregated schools though not only in Little Rock but in Connecticut, in New Haven and Hartford, little children are forced to grow up in narrow little segregated worlds created by prejudice. It's time we took stock of our own Little Rock situation and unless we all do everything we can to clean our own house we have no right to criticize Little Rock. We are just as guilty as they are but we have been getting away with it without the publicity and that's the only difference. Now, I expect that this bill will

Mrs. Gertrude Koskoff continues: have a better fate than my bill two years ago. I am very happy to see that it was included in both platforms. I think this demonstrates tremendous interest in this bill from the people in this state. In closing, I would just like to say that the legal sections or the Committee for equal opportunity in housing is preparing a detailed brief covering all these legal aspects of this bill and this Committee will get copies of that brief very soon.

Rep. Hammer, Vernon: I have a question, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Koskoff, I read the final report of the Civil Rights Commission on private interracial neighborhoods and it sustained a suspicion that I have had for some time in regard to the responsibility of the realty profession in this State in regard to discrimination in private housing. Now, does this bill, H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT in its wording, anyone who otherwise controls the sale or rental of five or more housing accommodations, is that sufficiently specific to include and encompass Real Estate Agents so that the above could not be passed from a builder to a realtor?

Mrs. Koskoff: I believe so.

Sen. Norman Hewitt, 25th District: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I will just take your time for one moment. This is a public hearing and I don't feel that I, as a Legislator, ought to encroach on the public and their right to be heard. However, I would like to state that I have heard Mr. Friedman and the other speakers. I have nothing to add to the eloquence of Mr. Friedman except to say that no one that I know of personally is in a better position to speak on this bill than Mr. Friedman as Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission. I want you Gentlemen to know that I am most concerned, unqualifiedly concerned, with the passage of this bill. I would like to indicate my firm support for H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, and H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS. I trust you will give it your careful consideration. Thank you very much.

Sen. Scanlon: Thank you.

Rep. John Miscikoski, Torrington: I wish to go on record as favoring H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Rep. John Miscikoski continues: TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, H.B. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT and H.B. No. 2763 (Rep. Satter) PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS. Thank you very much.

Sen. Scanlon: Thank you.

Mr. John Clark, Councilman, Hartford: I should like to go on record as agreeing with and hoping that H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION will be passed by you. I recommend that it be passed by you. To the Chairman and to the Members of the General Assembly Committee on Judiciary, I am here this morning representing the City of Hartford in support of H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT. I have had the opportunity to speak to some of the Councilmen and particularly the Mayor this morning and we firmly believe that the passage of this bill will help to assure equal opportunity to all of our residents in the City of Hartford and in the State of Connecticut to live in decent, sanitary and healthful quarters, regardless of race, color, religion or ancestry, in order that peace, health, safety and the general welfare of all inhabitants may be protected and insured. I definitely feel that such a definition of public policy would adequately reflect the attitude of its Connecticut citizens. We are, and I am speaking for the City Council, and have been for some time, aware of the serious problem of discrimination in housing, both in the City of Hartford and the State of Connecticut. As a result, minority groups are unable, because of discrimination against their race or color to obtain housing accommodations except in limited areas in our State and this I'm sure we are not proud of. Through experience, we have found that the number of accommodations available in such areas is inadequate and too many of these owners, the landlords, have exploited the situation by the practice of rent gouging which we are still investigating in the City of Hartford. Anyone even vaguely familiar with minority group housing problems must realize that discrimination in housing is the keystone of all forms of discrimination. You discriminate in your housing and you automatically discriminate in your church, school, your social activities and that, Gentlemen, is the basis

Mr. John Clark continues: of all discrimination, housing. We believe that the passage of such a bill would be acclaimed by the majority of good solid citizens here in the State of Connecticut and would certainly be a giant step toward equal opportunity not only in the field of housing but toward affording complete opportunity to all in our Democratic way of life. Thank you.

Sen. Scanlon: Thank you.

Mrs. Margaret Driscoll, Connecticut State A.F.L. C.I.O. Council: We rise to support all of these bills before you today which would increase the power of the Civil Rights Commission, both as to the issuance of complaints and the exercising of permanent powers and further to support of H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMODATIONS ACT with regard to the sale or rental of private housing accomodations. Now, on the first group of bills, you have already heard the arguements which Mr. Friedman has given you and I think that they do not need repetition. There is just one point I would like to emphasize. We have experience with the affirmative powers under the Labor Relations Act and we know how they work. There is no question about not knowing how they would operate. It is pointed out to you that there are only three instances where in the past they might have been used. This, however, means that it is the violators, who we also pointed out who are getting the benefit of not having these affirmative powers in operation. Secondly, as far as the initiating of complaints is concerned, I had a personal experience which I thinks makes more of a point, if you can tell something that happened and make a concrete instance of it. A neighbor of mine, who was of a minority group had her grandchildren visiting her from the South. With them was a Negro maid. They were accustomed to going to our neighboring beach in Fairfield and to visit a certain bathhouse. They went, but the Negro maid was not allowed to go. The neighbor told me about it and I said why don't you make a complaint to the Civil Rights Commission and she said she didn't want to get involved. So I did. I couldn't give her name because she didn't want to get involved. The Civil Rights Commission made an investigation and reported about it to me. There was nothing they could do without the complaint except to find out whether it was true, and it was true. People said they never heard about the law and then they said, "how can we afford to abide by it if everybody else doesn't abide by it?" So, the reason for giving this power to the Civil Rights Commission is that without it, the people who are going to flout

Mrs. Margaret Driscoll continues: the law have an opportunity to flout it because some people do not want to take the responsibility of making a complaint. They feel somehow that it puts them in a position they don't want to be in. Now on the bill of the rental and sale of housing. Here today, I haven't yet heard the reason if there is any. You can't do this by legislation because you know you can't legislate power. I think it well to point out that there are a number of positive things you can legislate. One of them that you can legislate is against certain actions, certain expressions of what may have been in Town. Here is an action, an action of selling or renting a particular house. That can be legislated against or on. Certainly by providing this kind of legislation which in effect is an expression of public opinion, the policy of the State on this question of discrimination in housing, you are providing an atmosphere of approval in which people then can experience the contact with other people they have come to fear because they have not known. And so, you are able to dissipate these fears by dispelling ignorance and increasing knowledge. And then thirdly, what you are doing by this kind of legislation, what you can do as you have heard from previous speakers is to help eliminate in one way at least one source of slums because if you listened to what Mrs. Koskoff said, it isn't just the people in the minority groups who are in the slums, it's the people who are pushed out of the area into which the minority groups are given housing because they pay higher prices. They pay exhorbitant prices. These other groups have to find housing elsewhere and they in turn are put into a lower grade house, so that this problem spreads and you have a progressive deterioration of your housing and it has been pointed out particularly in your metropolitan areas. So, this is one way of getting at the problem of slums. Now, in this State where some of the cities, New Haven and Bridgeport and Hartford also are seeking to redevelop, this question of discrimination is a very real one, because how can you redevelop properly if you are just cutting down slums in one area to create them in another and that's what you do if you continue discrimination without stopping it by this kind of legislation. Now, finally, I think that this kind of legislation can help us in our world position because this is not only a piece of legislation here - you all saw in the New York papers that the same kind of thing is being discussed in New York, as a matter of fact, it was passed in New York and this kind of thing can spread and should spread. After all, we are in a world which is mostly non-white. How are we

Mrs. Margaret Driscoll continues: going to learn to live in that kind of world and be treated as equals ourselves if in our own domestic relations we fail to recognize the equality of all citizens. And so, this legislation will give us, it seems to me a way out in our approach to our goal of equal opportunity for all. Thank you.

Mr. G. Albert Hill, Director of Redevelopment, Middletown: I am here as an individual not as the Director of Redevelopment officially. There hasn't been time to get the judgement of the Redevelopment Agency on H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT since I learned of the hearing this morning. During the days of Governor Bowles administration when I was Highway Commissioner, we put the Atchison Drive through Governor Snows home town and mine, namely Middletown. At that time we had to displace a large number of Negro residents. The Highway Department strove valiantly to get housing for these people and finally with Governor Bowles approval we set up a group of tenants in the public parks simply to house these fellow citizens of ours be it noted for a short time. The first night the tents were up they were completely destroyed by a bombardment of bricks and there was a near riot over the situation. That near riot brought the thing so sharply to the attention of all civic minded groups in Middletown that these fine people were provided with homes. It can be done. In Middletown right now, we are engaged as Mrs. Driscoll pointed out the case of other communities, in a redevelopment project. We have a group of Negro families. By Federal law and all the dictates of humanity they must be housed in safe, sanitary, decent and adequate housing. It will be a great problem. H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT will help in two ways. It will make it necessary that persons who control the rental of five or more apartments do provide homes for Negroes who need them. But the thing that is in the back of my mind that hasn't been mentioned yet, it will strengthen the hand of those owners of such properties who would by their own consciences rent to Negroes provided they were not bedeviled and prosecuted by their own white neighbors. This then, will help not only those who are not inclined to be helpful but it will be a positive help to those who are inclined to be helpful. I just want to close with one remark if you will permit me I will do it. Connecticut should stand up and go forward. I am reminded of what has been said, Judge Friedman, my good friend said something about people saying one thing and doing another and about our criticizing the people of certain Southern States, but there is an old saying, "Don't do as I do, do as I say, meanwhile I follow at a great distance, crawling". Let Connecticut

Mr. G. Albert Hill continues: stand on its feet and go forward.

Mrs. Margaret Ardrey, Connecticut Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, Connecticut Valley Branch N.A.A.C.P., Plainville: We would like to go on record as supporting H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, H. B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2763 (Rep. Satter) PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS. First of all, however, I would like to make some brief statements, particularly on H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT. This bill is a culmination of the work that our Committee and several other organizations and individuals throughout this State started some five years ago. I have appeared here before this Committee, this is my third time and urge the housing legislation along the lines of moderate rental housing, the special State Commission to study conditions in housing in the State of Connecticut of highway displacement in the State of Connecticut to provide for the displacement of people by these projects and several other bills. However, this one bill that is before us today, the amendment to the public accommodations act is by far the greatest and should perhaps have been passed first because with this bill enacted into legislation I don't believe that we would have had the need for many of these other bills that we have worked on for the past six years. I don't like to take your time up with statistics. We usually have long lines of what is happening, numbers, increases in population and all the rest of it. That has been well covered. But there are some things, some few points that I would like to bring before you. Ordinarily I do stick to pure factual information but now, I believe that there comes a time when we should also look at the other side of the picture and that is the humanitarian side of the picture. First of all, the recommendation of the State Commission to study conditions in housing, and I have a copy here and it is available for the members of the Committee, and this was presented to the 1957 Legislature said as its third recommendation, Legislation that would prevent discrimination in the sale or rental of private housing should be seriously considered by the General Assembly and that was its recommendation. This was not enacted after many long months of this Commission going throughout the State, having hearings and getting

Mrs. Margaret Ardrey continues: the facts together. A most modest report was brought to the last General Assembly. That was the Commission. This was headed by our Senator Arthur Healey and that was the recommendation that was given. Then secondly, in each one of the party platforms there is listed this one particular bill. It is listed in the party platform. I, for one, believe in our two party system. I also believe in the tenets of Democracy and I have a deep faith in the people of Connecticut. I believe it is time for us to prove our integrity, that integrity is something that has long since been outmoded in many of our minds, we feel it is something that is mid Victorian, something that we don't need to think about, but integrity stands in any age, in any year, in any era, in any people, in any government and I think that the integrity of both of our parties here is at stake and I, for one, would like to say that our integrity was preserved, that we do not make campaign promises, that we make promises and that we make standards and that we preserve the integrity of our government and our administration. There's another point that was not brought out here, it's something that would like to be overlooked many times, the psychological effect that the ghetto has upon the person who lives in the ghetto, the psychological effect on the small child who is told that he is circumscribed, that he cannot move, by the man or the woman who is told that you cannot step beyond a certain boundry and that no matter how hard you strive you will always be in the same place, you will never go forward. This psychological effect on the minds of these people, upon the minds of anyone and it does not necessarily have to be a Negro, it wasn't always the Negro who was in the ghetto. There was a time when it was the Jew or any national origin who happened to be a little different than what we think they ought to be, but the psychological effect upon these people is something that just does not begin and end. It goes forward and extends itself and it covers like a blanket. You read your newspapers, read your police court cases, find out where the crux of your juvenile delinquency is, find out where the crux of your crime breeds, then you know what the ghetto can do to the mind. It reacts itself in violence, in antagonism and all the other things that are anti-social and anti-everything. And who pays? We all pay. We pay right through the nose. We pay dollars and cents, we pay in the shame that we feel because these things exist in our community. The last point that

Mrs. Margaret Ardrey continues: I would like to submit and it's a strong one, that in the hearts of many of us, we fear the unknown. This is natural. We fear the unknown. We're afraid of what the negro neighbor may be. We're afraid of what a different neighbor may be. We're afraid that our property values may go down, but we have several studies that show this is not true and this is one of the things that makes this not true. If a Negro or anyone else can afford to buy in a particular neighborhood, say it's a \$25,000. neighborhood, if he can buy that house there, you can well be sure that that man or that woman has a job comparable, he has a background comparable and he also may be just a little bit better than his neighbors because he has had to be a little bit better to get that \$25,000. house. We need not fear that which we do not know because when the time comes you will find that these people are just plain Americans and I urge the support in enactment into a law of these bills that we have placed before you.

Rep. Satter: May I just comment a minute, please? Usually the people hearing these, the judges are not allowed to applaud, but I can certainly speak for those of us sitting on this side, that that was one of the most moving expression of opinion on that subject that many of us have ever heard.

Sen. Scanlon: This is not an attempt to cut off any further testimony that may be available here, the Committee appreciates the fact that so many people are interested to come, but we do ask that future speakers will please contain themselves to new material and we don't want to go over and over the things that we have already heard from two or three speakers because we do have a lot of bills. We are not attempting to cut off anybody. Anybody that wants to can come up and speak, but please kindly direct your addresses to new fields, new points, those that have been covered I think the Committee well appreciates already.

Mr. Frank Starr, New Britain: I am the Executive Director of the Connecticut Jewish Community Relations Council, an organization that was formed in 1952 and is made up of the community councils of Hartford, Bridgeport, Waterbury, New Haven, New Britain, some thirteen Connecticut cities in all representing approximately 70,000 Jewish residents. Now, in addition to the local councils enumerated, the State chapters of the Anti-Defamation League, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the Jewish Labor Committee and State representatives from the Orthodox, the Conservative and Reform national bodies of Jewry make up the membership of the Connecticut Jewish Relations Council. I speak therefore in the name

Mr. Frank Starr continues: of these groups. Now, the purpose of our own council is set up as follows, to promote the understanding between groups of people of different religious, racial, economic, social and cultural backgrounds so that all may live in harmony and to the benefit of our community, our State and our Nation and further we desire to secure for all citizens the right to achieve full realization of equal opportunities accorded under our Democratic society. On January 29th last at the report at a State wide meeting of the Connecticut Jewish Community Relations Council, there was unanimous approval that we support the following bills, each of which in content and spirit, are in agreement with our objectives, and in keeping with the suggestion of the Chairman, I will not attempt to go into the purposefulness of some of our thinking but simply to indicate that the following bills are the bills we support and therefore hope that you will act favorably upon them, H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS and H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION. I respectfully submit that you act favorably in getting these bills out of Committee. Thank you.

Mr. Alfred Baker Lewis: I am a member of the National Board of N.A.A.C.P. and am appearing here also as Legislative Chairman of the Connecticut Branch of the N.A.A.C.P. Mr. Jackie Robinson who is also a member of the National Board and lives in Stamford, asked me to put him on record in favor of these bills. He was sorry he wasn't able to get here. He did not authorize me to say this, but I know him and he is a fine person from every possible point of view and he could not get housing in apartments and had to buy a lot and build a house himself in order to get one. I guess that is an illustration of a person who is tops from every point of view and yet suffered in the absence of legislation from this sort of thing. This is not the first piece of legislation which has been passed in exactly this way covering multiple housing units whether or not aided by public funds. There is in New York City precisely such a law and I have here a letter from the Director of the Commission on Inter Group Relations which has mentioned that law. I talked to him very briefly and he liked to emphasize the fact that this law since it applies to all multiple dwelling units,

Mr. Alfred Baker Lewis continues: takes away from the landlords who may feel that there is some competitive advantage for them in restricting their houses and takes away from them that feeling if they want to do the decent thing. In other words, it makes it possible to release the good will that a good many people have who are in this position to control housing. Mr. Frank Horn who is the Director wanted me to emphasize that. I have nothing new to add to what has been said, Members of the Legislature, and I thank you for your attention and I will file this with you.

Sen. Scanlon: I have been passed a note here that there are six other speakers representing statewide organizations who would still like to speak. Therefore, we hope all speeches will be very brief. I hope that nobody felt that my remarks intended to cut anybody off. I tried to make that clear. Anyone who wants to speak, may. I only ask and I ask again that we not be given the same testimony over and over that we have heard. Anyone here that wants to talk will be allowed to talk.

Mr. Edward Jackson, Chairman of the Executive Board of New England Regional Council N.A.A.C.P.: We were proud a few years ago to brag about Connecticut being a leader in Civil Rights legislation, but today the State of New York has taken the play away from us. The Regional is supporting H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT wholeheartedly. Connecticut is having growing pains, redevelopment and highway projects are springing up all over. Of course, the group that have the greatest difficulty in getting suitable housing is the non white group. To illustrate this, in my City of Middletown a few years ago, we had a very embarrassing situation where we tried to get suitable housing for eight families, just eight Negro families. They advertised in the local paper and over the local radio station, and they even went out knocking on doors, house by house, to get these people located. The end results were, two of the families were housed in a public housing project, two had to be housed in a place where they were paying extremely high rents weekly and the other four families moved out of Middletown. One had to move back to South Carolina. A redevelopment has now come to our Town. Presently we are involved with only a few numbers of Negro families, but later when we try to get housing there will be many headaches coming to the Town of Middletown. My good friend, Mr. Hill, I thought was going to elaborate more on this but he didn't and I am not going to take

Mr. Edward Jackson continues: your time because you understand the situation. Many families are forced to live on super highways without any hope of moving out into white areas, into decent neighborhoods because of discrimination in renting of apartments or buying a house. A local survey made recently by the N.A.A.C.P. branch, April, 1958, disclosed that on the East Side of our Town 60% to 80% have no central heating, 30% to 40% no bathtubs or showers and all were infested with roaches and rodents. Now, 59% of these people wanted suitable housing and were willing to pay \$85.00 or more a month and rent gougers in Middletown are making "hay". They are getting rich on the misfortune of these people. Some people have been forced to live doubled up, three families into four rooms paying as high as \$125.00 monthly. Sometimes when they get through paying rent, they haven't any money left to feed themselves. Now, this housing bill, if passed, would help out tremendously. These people cannot get public housing, some of them have started to get public housing and we only have 198 space units and 190 Federal units in Middletown, 388 all together. At the present time, there is a small waiting list of only 36. Now, if private housing were opened up, it would be the wishes of these people. I am quite sure that we want to brag again, not only in New England but in the United States. New York has taken our play away, but we will take it back again. The passing of this bill will be merely one more nail in the coffin of discrimination. Of course, we cannot legislate against prejudice. Gentlemen and Ladies, I am quite sure that we have your confidence and you have our confidence that this bill, H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT will be given a favorable reception. Five or seven years ago, I would not have made this statement, but today a new kind of appeal has been given you. I have here in my hand petitions of hundreds of names of a good cross section of the people in the various cities of our State. From my own Town, I have the name of a member of the bench and a member of the Police Force and we have a good cross section, housewives, doctors, lawyers and laymen. We have placed their confidence in this group that you will give a favorable reception to H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT. Also, we are in favor of H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, and H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION. Thank you, Gentlemen.

Sen. Scanlon: Would you leave those petitions here with the Clerk?

Rep. Dudley, Guilford: May I ask the gentleman a question? On the point of curiosity, I am somewhat familiar with the City of Middletown, being a neighbor to the South and as a point of interest, I was wondering if you could tell me, if this particular bill was enacted, approximately how many rental units would it open up? In other words, just specifically, with your local situation down there, approximately how many people would be affected by the enactment of this law and who would be under proper circumstances be applied to comply with this law.

Mr. Edward Jackson: I am quite sure that our problems in Middletown would be settled if this law was enacted. Most of the people are now on the waiting list of the public housing and the other people that are on the list to be relocated for redevelopment would be taken care of. As before was mentioned if this law was enacted, it would give the landlord something to fall back on and say that we have to abide by this law and we can do no different.

Rep. Dudley: Thank you.

Rev. W. M. Hall, Pastor, National Baptist Church, New Haven: Mr. Chairman, I am also the President of Ministerial Alliance in our City. In my Church, I represent upwards of 1700 people as their Pastor and I am voicing the sentiment of them. We are here today to give you our support in asking you, if it is humanly possible and we know that it is, for you to pass these bills. Particularly H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT and H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION and on through. We have had in our City an acute situation there. As you know, the redevelopment program is underway in our City and in that particular area that has been demolished, several of our families have had to move out and in trying to secure adequate living quarters, we encountered some difficulties. Now, may I say this briefly? I know that there are other people here who want to speak. In this particular location where they have demolished the houses, the people that once wouldn't move up and down those streets freely, so to speak, they have bought that particular part of the City and they are building factories and other buildings and those people who had to move out and give space to them, if they would move alongside of one of the merchants or one of the dignitaries, so to speak, they would definitely have a hard time in that particular area and at the same time, they have bought where they

Rev. W. M. Hall continues: used to live. Now, here is the thing that we are actually interested in. I don't see anything actually that I can add to your intelligence. I am sure that each one of you, as intelligent people, have a clear view of the existing circumstances and situation in our State. I represent part of the men here with us. I don't know whether or not all of them will have a chance or an opportunity to speak, but as their spokesman, may I say to you in all humility and in the spirit of God, if it is possible for you, as Legislators, to pass these bills for the sake and welfare of the underprivileged people. I need not go into the nationalities or denominations. You are aware of those things and I am sure that you are because each person that has spoke here today has spoke about them. Not that they have enlightened your intelligence, because you are familiar with them, but to give you the understanding that we are interested in the passing of these bills, H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS also granting the Civil Service Commission affirmative power, particularly this bill, and H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMODATIONS ACT, equal opportunity in housing and that's badly needed. I am in a position to know because of the six or seven hundred people in that particular area that is being redeveloped had to move out and try to secure adequate dwelling quarters and they had a hard time and some of them haven't as yet been placed. Thank you, Brethern.

Rep. Lyddy, Bridgeport: Mr. Chairman, May I interupt for a moment? If you will excuse me, I would like to ask a question of Judge Friedman which may clear up some possible misapprehension on the part of the people who are here and I am sure of the Members of the Committee. Judge Friedman, would you please? On H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, suggested changes referring to housing accommodations, this question was asked I think before by one of my fellow Representatives of Mrs. Koskoff, but I wanted to make it clear in my mind at least, does this suggested change apply to any person who owns a one family, two family or three family house?

Judge Friedman: Well, Representative Lyddy, I talked with Mrs. Koskoff since you talked with me and Mrs. Koskoff quite naturally assumed that this included the one family house or the Real Estate Agent involved. It was not our intention nor do I think that the bill as it is designed now covers anybody except a man who is legally in the business of selling and renting houses and if you have a one family house, a two family house, a three family house or a

Judge Irwin Friedman continues: four family house, under this bill you are not covered. This is to protect the picture of the man limited who has a small operation as distinguished from the man who is in the business of selling and renting houses.

Rep. Lyddy: Then this does not apply to a Real Estate Agent, who as such, who may have five or more different houses to sell. This only applies, does it not, to an individual, a Real Estate Agent, who is the rental agent or the owner or in control of the rental of a single accommodation which within its confines may have five rooms, five apartments, or five housing units for rental not any Real Estate Agent who has five or more different houses to sell.

Judge Friedman: That's true, but I ought to say this in passing that the Real Estate Agent is covered under the Public Accommodations Act. In other words, he's in a position where he may not accept a discriminatory listing and so he has already been covered and the Real Estate group has been notified of this situation and they are publicly content with it. We have had lawyers communicate with the Commission in behalf of Real Estate Agents and everybody seems to be satisfied with that ruling of the Commission, so that it is not our intention in any way to cover the Real Estate Agent by this proposed legislation.

Rep. Lyddy: Thank you, Judge Friedman.

Mrs. C. Louis Fincke, Darien: I am going to hand in my testimony, Mr. Chairman as you requested but I simply wanted to go on record because of the group which I represent. I am currently the member for Connecticut on the National Public Affairs Committee of the National Board of the Y.W.C.A. of the U.S.A. and I represent several Y.W. groups in Connecticut which are listed in the testimony. I wish to emphasize that the Y.W.C.A. is my reason for being here, representing that group. We are a womens Christian organization and we are dedicated to the more abundant life for all. We work wherever we find any discrimination and we have been directed to do so by our National Convention which met last year and which is binding more or less on some five hundred local associations. We are favoring H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) D.LINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT because we feel that discrimination, wherever it is found, must be fought by Christian people and I should simply like to make one point that the movement

Mrs. G. Louis Fincke continues: for racial equality has always relied heavily upon legislation. Education and good will are not enough.

Mrs. Eileen Lewis: I am speaking for the Religious Resources Committee of the National Urban League, to say one sentence. White women in this Country of ours have always been willing to share homes and neighborhoods with Negro servants and it's time we shared them with Negro neighbors.

Mr. L. Bright, Westport: I am speaking here on behalf of the Connecticut State Civil Rights Committee and also as Secretary of the Bridgeport Civil Rights Committee. These Committees are made up of civic leaders, religious leaders and others who are vitally interested in Civil Rights. I want to say that we strongly endorse H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, the bill that would affect housing but I am not going to say anything about it because I think so many eloquent statements have been made on it that anything I might say might be repetitious. I do want to bring out one point that has not been touched upon. Two years ago, our Committee urged the passage of this same legislation and I tried to find out why there was objection to giving the Commission the powers that it asked for in respect to the initiation of complaints in public accommodations cases. I was told that you cannot tell what a commission might do in the future. Well, maybe you cannot, but our Committee in dealing with the Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights when it was known originally as Commission on Intergroup Council, I think that was the name, it was changed just a few years ago, but they had the same powers and we find that the members of the Commission are fine upstanding citizens appointed by the Governor of this State. We heard Judge Friedman. I recall Rev. Dr. David Beach of New Haven and others and I know many of the members of the Commission. If for the last eight or ten years that our Committee has dealt with them, we have found them to be conservative as anything. You notice that on the housing bill they mention five housing units or more and not less. This is a step in the right direction. I hope you will take that into consideration so that if arguments are presented to you that the Commission should not be given these additional powers, I think that you can trust them on their record. Thank you.

Sen. Scanlon: Just one moment, please. I notice there are some people that have come since we started these hearings. I'll remind them that if they don't intend to speak, there are registration forms at the front here and at the rear

Sen. Scanlon continues: which they can sign either indicating their favor or disfavor for any of these bills.

Mr. William L. Bradley, Hartford: Mr. Chairman, I represent the Committee on Christian Social Action in the Congregational and Christian Churches of Connecticut and wish to support H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, H.B. No. 2763 (Rep Satter) PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION. Furthermore, in respect to H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, the Congregational Christian Churches of Connecticut have supported this bill at their annual meeting in October. The Middlesex Association of Congregational Christian Churches took similar action October 26th and the Social Action Board of the First Congregational Church in Granby took similar action last night. Thank you.

Senator J. Edward Caldwell, 23rd District, Bridgeport: I merely want to state publicly and for the record that I am highly in favor of H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS and H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION. I am particularly interested in H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT concerning the housing situation. This is a very real problem in my district and while I do not believe that this bill itself will answer all the problems, I think it is an excellent place to start. Thank you very much.

Mr. John Kenney: I am speaking for the Greater Hartford Community Council, representing some 120 public and voluntary health and welfare agencies in the greater Hartford area. We wish to go on record as wholeheartedly in support of H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT. A copy of our statement in support of the bill has I believe been sent to the members of this Committee. Thank you very much.

Mr. Harvey McArthur: I speak as the Chairman of the Greater Hartford Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union. On behalf of this organization, I would like to express our support for the five bills that have been under discussion this morning, but particularly for H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter)

Mr. Harvey McArthur continues: DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT and H.B. No. 2763 (Rep. Satter) PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS. In connection with these two bills I am also authorized by a letter which I have here to express the support of the State organization of the American Civil Liberties Union, that is the Connecticut Civil Liberties Union, by this letter from Mr. Ralph Brown who is the Chairman of that organization. If I may make one comment, I have a certain feeling of uneasiness as I listen to the presentations this morning. Everybody seems to be in favor of these bills and yet I know from past experience that it is possible that they may not pass. This must mean that there are those who oppose them but those who do not present their arguments publicly. I would like to suggest with all the humility possible that those who do not argue their case in public should not be listened to in private. Thank you.

Mr. Herman Lee: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee and I represent the more than 1200 members of the National Association of the City of Hartford and we too heartily endorse H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT and hope you will give it your blessing. The other bills which have been discussed, we go along with them and it is my prayer that you will give H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT your earnest consideration. Thank you.

Rev. Robert Forsberg, New Haven: Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen, I speak personally in favor of H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS and H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION and also officially on behalf of the New Haven Council of Churches Board of Directors and Social Relations Department, Connecticut Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., both of which groups have met within the last ten days to act officially on this bill H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT. I hope that you are also aware that not only Presbyterian and Congregationalists, but the Roman Catholic Bishops in session for the Country as well as Methodists and Episcopalian Bishops have formally this kind of action by our Society and that the President of the National Council of Churches in his message which

Rev. Robert Forsberg continues: will be released this Sunday for Race Relations Sunday asks, "What does the Lord require of us?" and in his reply points out very definitely that racial segregation is a sin and is especially sinful in the form of segregated housing which brings about the forms of segregated schools in the North and what is even more disturbing to me as a Minister is the segregated Church which is part of our guilt which I think that your action on this bill favorably and the action of the Legislature will help our Churches in their concern for a non-segregated church in a non segregated society. Let me also speak personally as a member of the Commission which brought forth this report two years ago under Senator Arthur Healey on which we spent several thousand dollars of Connecticut taxpayers money, let me urge that the recommendation in that Commission report be acted upon by the Legislature at this time. Thank you.

Mr. John Barber, New Haven: I represent the New Haven Branch of the N.A.A.C.P. and the Young Democratic Organization of the Yale University Law School. Undoubtedly, I will be about the youngest person to speak before you and I think that that is significant in the fact that it points out that the future of Connecticut generations is in your hands. I speak in favor of the bills under consideration today and I would like to say that each of us, individually, each of you as legislators and each of the people in this room represent a partial segment of the American dream. For if we but run down the list of the various minorities represented here we undoubtedly would see what my remarks denote. The Italians, Germans, the Jewish immigrants, the old American Cities of Beacon lights in the years past and today the American Negro and Porto Rican represents the immigrant of today. The immigrants of the past came to the American communities often to squalor and poverty, but the American dream opened for them and today they have the opportunity, the housing market and various other markets to realize their full potentialities. The future of Americas generations, the future of Connecticut citizens is in your hands.

Mr. Dave Holmes, Waterbury: I represent Scoville Local 1604 and Anti Discrimination Committee. I would like to dwell upon a point of the economic injustice imposed by these many discussions pertaining to realizing these problems exist in the realm of housing. I would like to go on record that we feel that E.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING

Mr. Dave Holmes continues: the COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT will tend to alleviate those situations in order that the Negro might have the same purchasing power dollarwise as any other individual in the State of Connecticut. Thank you, Gentlemen.

Mr. John Solo, Meriden: Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2470 (REP. GOOGEL) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION and H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION. About two years ago, Meriden suffered a big disaster, a lady and four children died in a fire on account of discrimination in housing. This Porto Rican lived in a single room. There are as many as eight living in a single room and they pay \$24.00 and \$25.00 per week. That is some of the discrimination that I bring to you fellows.

Sen. Scanlon: Mr. Solo, may I interupt a moment so that this person doesn't leave. Alexander Carlson has lost his bankbook. Someone has picked it up here in the room. I'm sorry, Mr. Solo, I just didn't want them to leave.

Mr. John Solo: It happened that there were two kids, one Porto Rican and a white boy, both about seven years old. They were in the same school and because of discrimination, this kid doesn't want to sit down near the Porto Rican in school. It happened that the white boy one day got sick. This Porto Rican boy find out that the boy who used to discriminate against him was almost dying. He asked his father if he could go and see the boy, the white boy and when he went to his house and prayed for the one who was discriminating against him before. Thank God, that boy was saved, maybe because of the prayers of this Porto Rican. So, this shows how we Porto Ricans are. We don't discriminate against anybody and we would like to live in peace in this State of Connecticut. We are right now in this State close to 40,000 Porto Ricans. Thank you.

Mr. Hector Daida: I am here to represent the Spanish American Society. In many cases, as you already know, they have to pay quite high rents and many of those if they want to get an apartment, they have to fix it up and at the same time, they raise the rent. Now, sometimes, the police take some people and for some reason, right or not, they

Mr. Hector Daida continues: are put in jail and if some people try to help them, some policemen say they are not human beings Like I said before, many people have to take their money out of their pay to fix the apartments and I hope you can do something about it. Thank you very much.

Mr. H. Morales, Guilford: I represent the Latin American Civic Record, New Haven and the Porto Rican colony of New Haven and surrounding towns. We are around 2400 people and we live in that vicinity and I would like to give my support as well as my peoples support to H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Edward) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, H. B. No. 2763 (Rep. Satter) PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS and I would like to give a little point that happened in 1936 when I was a kid. One of the biggest American statesmen went to Porto Rico, if you are a Democrat you frankly are going to be very proud to hear about this statesman, if you are a Republican, you are an American so I think you would feel the same way. This was Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt and he said that civil rights, was the honor, the progress and the future of the American people because it was the principal of the American people and if that is the principle of the American people, Gentlemen, I think you will ask twice to pass and fight and see that these laws are approved in our Legislature so they will become tools that will become weapons for the Civil Rights Commission to attack the disease before the disease spreads more and more. So, talking in the name of my fellow men in New Haven surrounding towns, talking in the name of the Civil Rights Commission that is a great thing for us to have, I appeal to you Gentlemen not to look back and pass, fight and approve these laws and be sure that as a Democrat, I am going to vote for you and as a Republican, I will respect you. Thank you.

Mrs. Nelson Rostow, Hamden: I am representing the Human Relations Council of Greater New Haven. We support H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT and urge the legislature to pass this bill as you have given equal opportunity in employment and public accommodations. I have the example from the statement and I will turn it over to you.

Mr. James P. Green: I am the staff director of the Greater Hartford Housing Opportunities Program which is an effort by

Mr. James P. Green continues: community and religious leaders in the Greater Hartford area to help individual minority families find equal housing opportunities. Alphabetically the first name on our advisory board is Wilbert Allen, the last name, which is wellknown to all of you, Dr. Wilson will indicate the kind of people who are interested in the success of housing opportunities. We have in our brochure that I would like to leave with the Committee, three statements, one from James Fairfield English who is head of the Congregational Churches in Connecticut, another from Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman and a third from Archbishop Henry J. O'Brien of Hartford, and at the risk of being discriminatory, I should like to read one of those statements. It's from Archbishop Henry J. O'Brien and it reads, "No person should be deprived of purchasing or renting a dwelling because of race, color, creed or national origin. Discrimination in housing against any group of people is unchristian and unAmerican." Archbishop O'Brien continues, "The teaching of the Catholic Church on this issue is clear and definite. Pope Pius XII says "There remains no other way to salvation than that of repudiating definitely the pride of race and blood and to turn resolutely to that spirit of sincere brotherhood which is founded on the worship of the Divine Father of all." May I just say, that personally, I believe that if this bill, particularly H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT and also in support of H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION and H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS were to help one minority family move into one what we call all white neighborhood, I think that would be a tremendous contribution to our community. This would be one less neighborhood where their circle of friends and their relatives with people that are involved in a typical residential neighborhood who would no longer say that property values depreciate and that particularly a person of color is some kind of an odd person that they don't want to live beside. From our experience, may we point out that while I'm not willing to say that the Real Estate Dealer is any different from the banker or the mortgage lender or anyone else in the real estate industry in terms of guilt in the matter of segregated or discrimination in housing, I would like to point out that our experience shows that the actions of real estate dealers who are the first person you come in contact with if you are trying to buy a home, that their reaction, while it many times takes the form of subterfuge, in concealment, in deception is just as effective to the minority family

Mr. James Green continues: as if there were a law on the books of the State of Connecticut saying that minority families cannot buy. I think that H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) defining the coverage of the public accommodations act, in overcoming that and further that this bill makes it possible for honorable men in real estate industry, who are only trying to make a decent living, this bill would make it possible for them to work and earn money, Thank you very much.

Sen. Scanlon: Are you going to leave that brochure with us?

Mr. James Green: Yes.

Mr. Andrew J. Harris: I am the President of the New Britain branch of N.A.A.C.P. for the past five years and I can say that in New Britain we had two large moderate rental developments and it was with the fact that we did have a Commission in Hartford that they were integrated and a lot of our housing problems in New Britain have been taken care of because of the presence of such a body and as a result of laws that were passed in this Legislature, such as raising the income levels which kept a lot of minority families from being removed and I believe that with the passage of H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT and H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION that it won't necessarily mean that the next day we will have a Eutopia or that every problem will be erased but it will give moral fiber to those people that do want to do the right thing and rent houses to minority groups and it will also give political backbone to those who work hard to do it but are afraid of repercussions from either their friends or somebody in a political set up and all in all, in order to get rid of any problem, you first have to break out of the cocoon of old ideas and I believe that with the passage of these bills, by the people seeing these passed in the paper, there will be a lot of people who will read it and suddenly say, "well, the next time I find out that the person who called up for the house is Negro, well it says in the paper that the law is passed and I will give them a place to live" because in New Britain we are in the middle of beginning a redevelopment program and this will not take care of all the conditions that prevail in the area that they are tearing down. There are those who will not want to go back to the new development and there are some that right now want to move out, buy houses, and some want to rent houses and if these bills are passed

Mr. Andrew Harris continues; those that will be able to move out, buy and rent will be removed from that so that the problem will become smaller and smaller because the gates are opened for housing for everybody regardless of race, creed or color, the stretching out of medicine or salve of Democracy comes over everybody so that if enough laws are passed and people are in the right frame of mind, then by the time you get to the root of the trouble, the trouble might be well on the road to being finished. I again urge that the Legislature consider the bills that are up for reconsideration.

Mr. Robert Batchelder: Mr. Chairman, for three years, up until last year I was the Minister of the only Protestant Church in Middlefield, Connecticut just outside Middletown. I favor all these five bills and for the reasons you have heard so many times. There is one point that you might be interested in though and that is the state of our smaller and middle sized towns in the State which do not yet have what you would call the ghetto. We all know the problems that these ghettos cause in our larger cities, New York, Chicago and the larger cities in Connecticut. It seems to me that passing this law now will take down the barriers and open up housing opportunities for a town like Middletown would not have to face this problem of a tremendous concentrated ghetto which then produces the creeping slum. There are areas in Middletown of course where Negroes are more or less forced to live, but it's a matter of a pocket not a ghetto and I think that the passage of H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT now would help many of our smaller cities avoid this problem of the ghetto. Thank you.

Rev. John H. Miller, Waterbury: I stand here to endorse the fact that bills, H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS and H.B. No. 2763 (Rep. Satter) PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS are bills that I am personally interested in as well as representing for. I would like to add this word, not to tire you further, but the genius of our American Democracy has always reflected itself in the ability of its Legislators to do what they feel is reasonably right, irrespective of whether that right was popular or not. If we are to continue to grow in

Rev. John Miller continues: our State and if we are going to become progressively strong we must certainly, religiously, educationally, socially, economically and otherwise learn to contribute of our minds and our attentions and the enactment of our laws for the preservation of the rights and equalities of all people of our State regardless of race, color or religion. Thank you very much.

Mr. George Major: Mr. Chairman, Legislators, I represent the Wilson Civic Citizens Association. I live in Wilson, a part of Windsor and we advocate the fair, just and equal, protection and opportunity for all citizens under the laws regardless of race, religion or national origin. We would like to go on record as favoring all of these bills discussed and especially H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS. Thank you.

Mr. Otis Grier, Bridgeport: I represent the N.A.A.C.P. I also represent the I.U.E.C.L. union and they asked me to appear here. I don't want to go into details because I think the people of Southern Connecticut know the conditions that we went through in the '50's. I will be very happy if we get just one of these five bills because I know what you Gentlemen have to go through to get it through and if you can get just one bill through I will be very happy about that. I was up here before and the nearest that we ever got to the Eutopia in the State of Connecticut was at the time we caucused night after night with people on both sides of the aisle and backing Mrs. Koskoff's bill, almost heard around the world. It was one of the finest bills we ever got. We are getting close to that. I don't know that you Gentlemen will consider all five bills. I know you are going to have to debate it pro and con, but Gentlemen, in considering all these bills, did you ever once think as I had to go through with my own self. It was necessary for me to have a Caucasian to buy a home in his name and to resell it back to me in order for me to get it. This is facts. Now, I think that when we get these bills through, let's also try to get the Bankers Association to give Negroes and other minority groups mortgages. It's very important because if you pass a bill that says these colored people can live in this section or that section, well alright, he can live in that section and we'll just take a bank at random, say the Hartford National Bank says, well now, I don't know I got Judge so and so on this corner and Senator so and so living on this corner and I've got mortgages on five of the houses in that neighborhood and they say

Mr. Otis Grier continues: well, I'm sorry, but we can't let you have the mortgage. Now, that's one type of discrimination that nobody spoke of but we have. We did a pretty good job in Bridgeport. We had a lot of cooperation from different organizations. We did pretty good, but there is still room for improvement. When you take these things under consideration to pass these bills, take also into consideration the exploring of these conditions. That's all I have to say, Gentlemen. Thank you very much.

Mr. Roosevelt Powell, Sr., Torrington: Mr. Chairman, I represent the N.A.A.C.P. in Torrington. I know that you have listened to a lot of discrimination which you already know about our problem, but there is just one thing, I am in favor of all the bills, and there is one thing that I would like for all of you, such a nice looking bunch of gentlemen, to remember if you decide this, the whole thing can be decided very shortly. If you go home and read the Eighth Chapter of John, where Jesus said, "He without sin, cast the first stone" the bill will be passed.

Mr. William Durante, Torrington: I am quite sure that we all know the need for these bills and much has been said. All I am going to say is that I urge that you please consider the passing of these bills.

Mr. Galdino Velasco: We are a group of Porto Rican people that comes representing Stamford, Connecticut and have come to talk to you for better treatment in the community of this State, because we have been victims of arbitrary treatment anywhere we are, in our jobs or anywhere we stay, principally in living accommodations that are denied us. We cannot support this discrimination anymore for the Porto Rican and Spanish speaking people. We are in favor of these bills, H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT, H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard) AUTHORIZING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO ISSUE COMPLAINTS UPON ITS OWN MOTION, H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel) TO PERMIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INITIATE COMPLAINTS, H.B. No. 2763 (Rep. Satter) PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS. Will you please give respect for the right of others. Thank you.

Mr. Tom Petteway, Waterbury: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of this Judiciary Committee, I presume that I am bringing up the rear in that you are to go to lunch. I happen to be the President of the local branch of the N.A.A.C.P. of Waterbury and the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Public Welfare for the City of Waterbury. I say no more than that I appeared here for this session to be the record for the people of the Western part of our

Mr. Tom Petteway continues: State in the Naugatuck Valley in behalf of H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT and the other supporting bills covering this private housing. We are in hopes and we know that it isn't the complete solution to it, but it is the necessary step to start bringing about better living conditions in the State of Connecticut where people would be able to purchase homes within their means. As I stated to one of the Committees at a former session it is unrealistic to assume that a person in a \$4,000.00 job category would go out and try to buy in a \$30,000.00 area. That is not the purpose of our appeal. It is an appeal that there are decent people in every financial category and these bills will give these people an opportunity to live in decent neighborhoods and not have schools and other things become blighted because of stagnation. Thank you, Gentlemen.

Mr. Peter Markis, Waterbury: I am an attorney practicing in the City of Waterbury and I am Vice Chairman of the Waterbury Community Relations Committee of the Jewish Federation. One of our members was going to come up here to speak today, but unfortunately, he could not. I think that what he would have said would have been of some interest to this Committee because he represents a group that has not been heard from here. He is a member of the Real Estate Board in the City of Waterbury and a member of the Community Relations Committee. He is strongly in favor of this bill. He is Jewish and he has never wanted to handle property which is restricted to race, creed or color. He has handled such listings in the past despite his own desires and he tells me that many other people in the Real Estate profession feel as he does and that is good. As long as Real Estate Agents generally may discriminate for anyone Real Estate Agent to stand up and say, "from now on I will only handle property that is available to all persons" would in effect ostracize that person, might cause him difficulty in obtaining multiple listings, etc. There are many such individuals in the Real Estate profession in the State. I sincerely hope that the overwhelmingly majority of Real Estate Agents in the State although they recognize the existence of discrimination will fight to do everything they can against it but they feel that unless the prevailing community sentiment and the Legislature give them some assistance they will not stick their necks out as individuals to take a stand on an issue like this. They feel that if this bill, H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter) DEFINING THE COVERAGE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ACT is passed, they will then be in a position to say to anyone that walks into their office, "you have a right to feel as you do, but I am forced by

Mr. Peter Markis continues: law to turn down your property for listing. 'I am forced by law to sell this property to anyone who meets the generally accepted standard for home ownership, and therefore, I can abide by my principles and not handle your property.' He feels that this will be a very substantial aid to all of the sincere, honest and Democratic Real Estate Agents in the State of Connecticut. Thank you.

Sen. Scanlon: Would you give us his name? If he had been here, he would have had to state his name.

Mr. Peter Markis: His name is Joseph Taber.

Sen. Scanlon: Are there any other proponents for this group of bills? Is there anyone here in opposition to these bills?

Mr. Frederick Waterhouse, Counsel for The Manufacturers Association of Connecticut: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I think it's quite unfortunate that these bills are grouped as they are because there is only one bill to which I wish to speak. These housing bills are not a matter for my discussion here and they won't be lobbying later on as somebody suggested. We, as you know, are not the kind of an Association that is afraid to present our position. We have thoroughly looked into it and feel that it is sound and just and we would like to tell you the reasons why we oppose the H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION. Now, that's the bill that would give the Interracial Commission the power to require an employer to hire, upgrade or promote, with or without back pay, anyone whom they decided had been discriminated against. This is not a new bill. This is a bill, as has been said by Mr. Friedman, has been here before and we've advanced the same reasons and I think that the experience of the Interracial Commission during the past two years sort of substantiates and emphasizes the propriety of our position rather than giving any aid to the desire of the Commission for further power. I have here the digest of the Connecticut Administrative Reports to the Governor for 1957 and 1958. It's a public document and is available to all of you and I assume most of you have it. I would like to read briefly from it. It's a very brief statement. Here is one paragraph that is particularly pertinent to this question. It says, "One aspect of the employment situation which is interesting and encouraging is that the complaints filed with the Commission this year do not indicate any increase in discriminatory practices in connection with lay-offs. This is the first year since the F.E.P. Act

Mr. Frederick Waterhouse continues: was passed when there has been above normal unemployment in Connecticut. During periods of labor shortages it was assumed that employers would be less inclined to discriminate in hiring and laying off workers. It is therefore, gratifying to note that the number of complaints in discrimination in employment dropped from 87 in 1956 to 1957 to 70 in the present reporting period." I think that speaks well for the attitude of Connecticut employers with regard to discriminatory practices in hiring. Something about the history of this situation in Connecticut. You may know, or may not, some of you probably must know, that for a number of years there was an Interracial Commission, it wasn't called that at that time, but it was the predecessor of the present Commission, which had power merely to educate, to extend educational programs and try to get the acquiescence and acceptance of employers and others to the integration situation. A few years ago, about ten years ago, the F.E.P. Act was passed. I am quite proud of Connecticut in its industry and happy to say that in the past ten or twelve years that they have had only 800 complaints, and that's all they have had in connection with employment and it hasn't indicated how those complaints have been straightened out or determined, out of an employment that runs close to one million people at all times. I think that speaks very well for the employer in Connecticut and that no further power or authority needs to be or should be given to the Commission. Now, in the past year, out of an employment as I say of just under a million people according to the Labor Department reports, they have had 70 complaints. As far as I know, not one of them has got to the hearing stage. It may be that one of them has. I don't know. I do know about the three previous hearings or cases that did get to the hearing stage. None of them involved a manufacturer. One of them and one that went to the Supreme Court involved discrimination by a labor union. Another involved a small commercial establishment and another involved one of our local insurance companies. Now, those three cases, the insurance company case was dismissed because of lack of any proof at all, the other two, there was found some discrimination. Of course, as far as the union was concerned, he gets no back pay anyway. As far as the employer was concerned, I say as I have, that it was a small commercial operation and what it amounted to I don't know. I think that also was a part time job. I would like to call your attention - Mr. Friedman testified on this same thing two years ago and at that

Mr. Frederick Waterhouse continues: time, he described this same bill, this same provision, as a big stick. He called it a big stick which would force employers to employ persons in these categories when the Commission came to the conclusion that they should. Now, if only four cases have come to the hearing stage and if they had only 70 cases during the past year in connection with all the employment in Connecticut and the turnover of thousands of people being employed and laid off and employed and promoted every day, it seems to me that there can be only one reason or one need or one possible use of the big stick and that is this; when the Field Agent goes out and investigates a complaint, one of these 70 complaints, he doesn't tell you how many were well founded, I don't know, I'm sure many of them were determined by the Commission to be not well founded in fact, the others were apparently straightened out without any hearing anyway, but when a Field Agent appears at an employers place and states that he has a complaint or that he thinks that you should be hiring some people in a certain classification belonging to a certain group, at the present time the employer can say, "I have an opening or I don't have an opening but if I do have an opening and you have a qualified person I will take him." But suppose somebody comes along and says, "If you don't hire this individual and we will present it to the Commission, we'll have a hearing and if it appears that we can substantiate our claim of discrimination, you are going to have to pay back pay for all of this time." Sincerely, it is a club, a big stick which will encourage the employment of persons who are not necessarily qualified and in the situation where the employer should not be required to employ him. Now, this power won't be in Mr. Friedman's hands. It will be in the hands most of the time of the hearing Commissioner. It will be in the hands of the Field Agent as a threat, as a big stick. I don't believe that is the purpose of the law. I don't believe that's the idea of the Legislature. I don't believe that anything should be done which would permit discrimination in favor of anybody. I don't care if he's in a minority group or whether he isn't and this type of power it seems can be only used for that purpose. There is no crying need here. The number of complaints, the number of jobs compared to it indicate that there is absolutely no need for any further power or authority than the Commission now has. We're interested in jobs. We'd like to have it so that anybody in Connecticut is working and we are looking for more people. That's the way to eliminate all types of discrimination in our opinion and that is what we are

Mr. Frederick Waterhouse continues: trying to do. We are convinced that the attitude of this Legislature concerning industry, concerning the employer will have a bearing, now it's a cumulative thing, this is one of the things, before your committee and before other committees of this Legislature, there are going to be many others and I am going to speak to some extent along the same line in connection with them, that it's the attitude of the State as expressed through its laws that encourages or discourages industry. It has been literally stated by persons in all parties and at all levels of parties that industry is very important to Connecticut and it is their desire to encourage rather than discourage industry. Therefore, I think this is one of the things, you can do it, you can pass it, but it is one of the things that is not needed. It's obviously for an unneeded purpose, an ulterior reason, not reason necessarily, but ulterior use is the only use that can be made of it under the circumstances and therefore, it would tend to hurt the wrong one, the very people that they and that we purport to try to help. We want to make jobs and let the employer be free in choosing the most qualified person regardless of his race, creed, color or anything else. That's our story, Gentlemen. It's the same one we told two years ago and it's the same one we will continue to tell if this bill continues to come in and you continue to take our position. We are interested in jobs. We are not interested in discrimination. I think our record will show it. You won't find a single instance in the three cases that are involved, with our industry and if you had only three cases out of three hundred that ever got to a Hearing Commissioner, certainly there is no need for this type of legislation. It's job destroying rather than job creating.

Rep. Googel: Mr. Waterhouse, what's the position of the Association that you represent with reference to the other bills dealing on Civil Rights legislation which is now before us for consideration? Your remarks were addressed to H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel) POWERS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION as I understand it. Is that right?

Mr. Waterhouse: Absolutely, the other bills that you have before you are bills of a social character, let us call it, that are not directly affecting industry except as we are individuals. I can give you my own impression.

Rep. Googel: The Association or you are not opposed to the other bills, is that correct?

Mr. Waterhouse: That's correct.

Sen. Scanlon: Are there any other opponents to this group of bills? If there are no further opponents, we will declare the hearing closed on the Civil Rights group of bills.

	<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
H.B. No. 2080 (Rep. Howard)	48	0
H.B. No. 2470 (Rep. Googel)	59	0
H.B. No. 2479 (Rep. Googel)	49	0
H.B. No. 2484 (Rep. Satter)	99	0
H.B. No. 2763 (Rep. Satter)	38	0