

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 901	PA 253	0504 1967 1967
House	2567-2568	(2)
Senate	1090	(1)
Labor	142-143, 145, 149	(4)
LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE		
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY FAX		
Total - 7p.		

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

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2012

CONNECTICUT

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS

1987

VOL. 12

PART 6

2001-2018

Monday, May 22, 1967

This bill simply insures that included in our Statutes is a provision that members of the General Assembly, may not be eligible for unemployment compensation during the time that the legislature is in session.

36
dem

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the senate. Will you remark further? If not, All those in favor will say aye. Opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 652. S.B. No. 901. An Act concerning the Definition of Employer under the Fair Employment Practices Act. Favorable report Committee on Labor. (File No. 437).

REP. LAROSA - 4th.

I move acceptance of the committee's J.C. favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the senate. Will you remark?

REP. LAROSA - 4th.

This bill broadens the coverage for the Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act, it would cover employers of 3 or more, rather than under the present Statutes, 5 or more. This would benefits of the Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act to a greater number of Connecticut workers and in addition, it would prevent any "unfair" employment practice that may occur because of race, color, religious creed, age, national origin or ancestry. This is a good bill and I move it's passage.

REP. KENNELLY - 1ST.

This bill is in furtherance of this legislature's committment to true equality of opportunity employment. No period in Connecticut legislative achievements has been more enlightend, or more dedicated in the field of human rights than in the years

Monday, May 22, 1967

of the "Dempsey" administration. This bill represents continued and expanded implementation of sound and realistic "human rights" dem legislation and I respectfully urge it's adoption. 37

REP. DOWD - 125th.

At this time in our history, when before us almost every day is the real problem and the fabric of our "American" life of discrimination in it's many forms. We on this side of the aisle are very pleased to support this bill for further testimony to Connecticut's committment to non-discriminatory practices in what ever form.

MR. SPEAKER:

Questinn is on the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the senate. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor will say aye. Opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 653. S.B. No. 1262. An Act concerning Tags for Bedding and Upholstered Furniture. Favorable report Committee on Labor. (File No. 503).

REP. BONETTI - 175th.

I move the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on the committees, acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the senate. Will you remark?

REP. BONETTI - 175th.

This bill will assure added protection to the purchasrs of bedding and upholstered furniture at public auctions and to bedding and upholstered furniture that have been ~~condemned~~ contaminated by fire, smoke, chemicals or water. I move the passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the senate. Will you remark? If not, all those in favor say aye. Opposed?

565

MINING AND
METALLURGY ASSOCIATION

MEMORANDUM

PROCEEDINGS

1967

1967

Page 21

May 15, 1967

ceding enity.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? All those of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill signify by saying, "aye". Opposed. The bill is passed.
Cal. No. 366 File No. 437 Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Labor
Senate Bill No. 901.

SENATOR MILLER:

Mr. president, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill broadens the coverage of the present fair employment practice act. It reduces its five employees to 3 employees. It is a good bill and ought to pass.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? All those in favor of the acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill signify by saying, "aye". Opposed. The bill is passed.
Cal. NO. 367 File No. 438 Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Labor
Senate bill No. 903 An Act concerning Discrimination in Employment on
Account of Sex.

SENATOR MILLER:

I move for the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill adds to the Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act and it will make it unfair employment practice to discriminate because of sex. The clerk has an amendemtn.

CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A", offered by Senator Miller. Senate Bill 903

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

LABOR
1-319

1967
INDEX

MONDAY

LABOR COMMITTEE

MARCH 13, 1967

Angelo Cirluco: We could only refer them to Washington. At the present time, there are some nine states, two of our sister states, New York and Massachusetts, have present laws covering sex. As to the question as asked a short while ago, would we be able to handle any additional load? Do we have the machinery and mechanics to do this? The answer is yes. It would be handled in the same manner in which we handle our present complaints.

Also, I might add, that, presently, many persons and perhaps, to a great extent, the word sex might favor a woman. Of course, also, we have had inquiries from males concerning discrimination because of their sex. So that the word sex in this particular instance encompasses both male and female.

Chr. Miller: Thank you. Anyone else?

Mrs. Jerome Caplan, West Hartford: I am speaking for the League of Women Voters of Connecticut in support of S. B. 903.

The League of Women Voters supports the principle that all people are entitled to equal opportunities in employment and that all levels of government should participate in the effort to achieve this end. The Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination in employment based on sex. The League of Women Voters of Connecticut believes that the state statute should be amended to include this same provision to put Connecticut in line with federal regulations.

I would also like to speak to S. B. 901. Again, speaking for the League of Women Voters of Connecticut in support of S. B. 901.

Based on a nationwide study and consensus, members of the League of Women Voters believe that all levels of government share the responsibility of providing equality of opportunity for all persons in the U. S. S. B. 901 would provide more employment opportunities to people in Connecticut by including more employers under the coverage of the Fair Employment Practices Act,

However, since the League of Women Voters believes that all people should have equal employment opportunities, we respectfully suggest that all employers might be subject to the provisions of the Fair Employment Practices Act.

Connecticut has consistently shown leadership in the area of human rights and opportunities. We hope that it will continue to do so.

MONDAY

LABOR COMMITTEE

MARCH 13, 1967

Chr. Miller: Thank you.

Arthur Green: Mr. Chairman, I'm Director of the Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights. I speak in favor of S. B. 901. S. B. 901 would amend the present Fair Employment Practices Act which defines an employer as a person with five or more people, including the state and all political subdivisions. This amendment would provide that some 37,500 additional employers in the state would come under the jurisdiction of the word "employer". That is, an additional 37,500 employers, if this bill would pass, would be subject to the conditions of the Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act.

It is very important that we extend as much as possible coverage to all our citizens equal opportunities in employment. Passage of this measure would do just that.

As the previous speaker indicated, many of the states of this nation have indeed gone beyond five, three, four, and many states have now held that all employers are covered by this act. We do feel that if this Committee would see favorably to pass on this measure, it would help a great deal to provide more opportunities for our citizens. Thank you.

Chr. Miller: Thank you.

Hugh Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I'm Vice President and Counsel of The Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Company here in Hartford. I'd like to speak in opposition to H. R. 4160. I have not seen the substitute bill Representative Vicino referred to but I suspect that it holds the same objections that the original bill does. This bill would interfere with the sale of a very beneficial form of insurance. I think perhaps I can make the situation clearest to you if I indicate the connection that my company happens to have with it in an important instance here in the State of Connecticut.

Some forty years ago, in 1927, The Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Company entered into an arrangement with the Southern New England Telephone Company under which, in order to make available to their employees the counseling service in connection with insurance, thrift, and the telephone company's own benefit plan and their pension plan for their employees, we worked out a mutually agreeable arrangement where our agents would be privileged to enter their plants and sell insurance and provide the service that might normally be provided by the company's personnel department. Now, this arrangement has grown over the years to the point where we have perhaps twelve agents at the present time who derive the major part of their livelihood from this particular function. It has been carefully nurtured

MONDAY

LABOR COMMITTEE

MARCH 13, 1967

Renato Ricciuti: We keep in touch with one another and there is no reason why before an injunction could be considered an issue that it would be clear that the violence, if there is any involved, cannot be controlled by the local police officials and, for those reasons, I register in favor of this series of bills.

I would also like to go on record in favor of S. B. 901 to broaden the coverage of the Fair Employment Practices Act and also in favor of S. B. 903 which forbids discrimination in employment on account of sex and to make sure that the women don't feel that I'm against them because of the position I took on the maximum hours, Mr. Chairman.

I'm opposed to H. B. 2954 which would remove from the Governor the power to appoint members of the Board of Mediation and Arbitration and vest such power to the Chief Justice. I'm a little puzzled by this bill since the Governor appoints all the Judges, including the Justices of the Supreme Court. I don't really see how this would materially change the system. While the testimony in favor of the bill said they were not criticizing the Board, they want to free it from political influence. It seems to me that supporting such a bill contains the inference that the Board is subject to political influence which is not true and it's too bad, really, that there couldn't be more specifics when such an inference and such an insinuation is made in support of a bill. I'm opposed to that bill.

H. B. 3124 - we now have filing of annual statements of Employee Welfare Funds. This is now being filed with the Labor Department and then transferred to the Insurance Department and this bill would make it filing with the Insurance Department only. The Federal Government now requires filing of all these statements, Mr. Chairman, and I suggest that the system be abolished completely since I don't see any reason why there should be dual filing in this particular instance and the federal requirements are much more stringent than the state requirements.

On H. B. 4015 - we now have a system in the State Board of Mediation and Arbitration where the appointment of alternate members is possible and quite a few alternate members are appointed when the work of the Board is sufficient to allow the appointment of alternate members and this would permit the Governor to appoint alternate members of the State Labor Relations Board. Right now, there are only three members of the Board and when one member is unable to perform, for one reason or another, although the statute does say that two people comprise a majority of the Board, in some cases, lawyers have been reluctant to proceed without a full complement of the Board and if the Governor had this power,

MONDAY

LABOR COMMITTEE

MARCH 13, 1967

Joseph Bober: injunction, so we have the courts wrestling with the terms of the agreement.

Actually, the employer has many weapons available if there is a strike in violation of the contract. If the strike is unauthorized, he can discipline the employees and even fire them if he wants to do so. He can enlist the union's support and efforts to secure a return to work. If the strike is authorized, he can sue the union for damages and other relief. Thus, he is fully protected by law now and there is no need for this additional shotgun to be placed in his hands.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment, briefly, on the other additional bills. The Connecticut State Labor Council supports S. B. 901 and 1150, 1155 and H. B. 2503. We realize that it might give some problems if the State Labor Relations Act was amended but it's necessary with the Municipal Labor Relations Act and the Teachers' Collective Bargaining.

We're opposed to H. B. 2519. We think it's absolutely unnecessary. The State Boards are doing a good job. The \$25.00 arbitration fee wouldn't add much to the income of the Board. In fact, I think it is just a matter of trying to keep the unions from bringing these cases to arbitration.

We oppose H. B. 2954. There is actually no need for this bill, whatever, and we support H. B. 3124 and H. B. 3494.

We support H. B. 4015. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

Chr. Miller: Thank you.

Robert Googins: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I'm from Glastonbury. I'm Assistant Counsel of the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company.

I'd like to speak here in opposition to H. B. 4160. We see no necessity at all for this bill. I can't understand what evil it intends to cure and by the same token, I can see that it would eliminate a very beneficial right that employees of public service corporations presently have.

It was indicated by the introducer of the bill that the prime purpose is to keep to a minimum increase in cost of services as a result of the increased book work to take the deductions of insurance companies and things