

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-103		5726	1	3	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Public Personnel & Military Affairs</i> 67 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1290- 1292 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1120- 1121

H-110

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 3
974-1450**

75
djh

Those voting Yea	132
Those voting Nay	28
Absent and Not Voting	17

THE SPEAKER:

The bill is REJECTED.

THE CLERK:

Page 3 of the Calendar, a matter that was passed temporarily earlier in the day. In the middle of the page, Calendar No. 238, Substitute for H.B. No. 5726, An Act Conforming State Standards of Political Activity of Classified State Employees to Federal Standards, File No. 89.

THE SPEAKER:

I'd ask the House to come to order so that we can proceed with Calendar business. Those who are leaving for further executive sessions or committees, I'd encourage you to do so now so that we can complete our business for the day in an orderly fashion.

MR. DUDA (58th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. DUDA (58th):

Mr. Speaker, this bill will represent the first significant change in the so-called Connecticut Little Hatch Act which has been the law in Connecticut since the 30's regarding political activities by state employees. The bill will relax that present restriction, the present prohibition, in two ways. First of all, it will permit a state employee to hold an appointive or elective office that is of a non-partisan nature, that is not connected with either one of the major political parties or political party that might

have been on the election, that might have been on the ballot in the last previous election. It will also permit the state employee to express his political opinions more openly than in the past, that is, a state employee would be able to wear a political button or have a sign on his car, a bumper sticker endorsing a political candidate. It will not permit a state employee to run for a political office with a party label nor hold an appointive office with a party label nor to be a member of a town committee and engage in a political campaign.

The committee studied this matter since the last session, during the interim, and feels that this bill strikes a good balance between the right of the state employee to express his opinion, to engage in some political activity while at the same time protecting that state employee and protecting the civil service from those influences that we feel would be harmful to civil service.

The bill would further provide for the Personnel Policy Board to promulgate regulations in accordance with the intent of this statute. The bill conforms to the federal Hatch Act and the reason for that is that there are a number of state employees who are engaged in projects of a federal nature which requires conformity with the federal law. And that's one of the major reasons that the committee chose this bill as a means of relaxing the present prohibition on political activity by state employees.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill?

MR. GILLIES (75th):

Mr. Speaker, through you, sir, a question if I may? I just wonder whether this bill will now enable state employees to make contributions to political campaigns?

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman from the 58th care to respond?

MR. DUDA (58th):

Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is in the affirmative. He will be able to contribute. However, there is a prohibition against a state employee using his office to coerce such a contribution.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage. All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Those opposed? The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Page 9 of the Calendar, Disagreeing Action, Calendar No. 88, Substitute for H.B. No. 6562, An Act Concerning Limitation on Indebtedness of Town or Municipality and Definition of "Urban Renewal Project", as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. SPAIN (166th):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance and passage of the committee report as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

THE SPEAKER:

This being a disagreeing action, the question pending before us is a question of adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Will the Clerk call Senate Amendment Schedule "A"?

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Sen. Rimer of the 26th, in line 47 after the word "b".

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman from the 166th outline the amendment as

**S-78
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 3
957-1456**

APRIL 23, 1971

Page 16

extremely flammable, causes strong sensitivity and has a great deal of pressure. This is the definition of a hazardous subject. I think this is a lawyers bill. It does not include any of the poisons that come under the Federal Act nor any of the drugs, food and drug act nor to any fuels that are used in the house.

It does permit the administrator who is someone designated by the Commissioner of Consumer Protection to name any item hazardous by regulation. He may ban the item altogether. He may revise the labels. Or, he may exempt the labels altogether, from this designation. It calls for penalties of up to 3000 dollars or one year in jail for violatinn of this act. I think it is a little bit too lengthy but it will do the job.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill, as amended by House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark further, If not, all those in favor of passage of the bill signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay".

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 235. File No. 189. Favorable report of the joint committee on Public Personnel and Military Affairs. Substitute for House Bill 5726. An Act Conforming State Standards of Political Activity of Classified State Employees to Federal Standards.

SENATOR BURKE:

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

This bill allows the State Employees to gage in political activity, the issue is not connected with one of the major parties. It also allows them to participate in the Constitutional Amendments, Municipal

April 20, 1971

Page 17

orders and soforth. I move passage of the bill, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage of the bill signify by saying "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 236. File No. 140. Favorable report of the joint committee on General Law. House Bill No. 5761. An Act Concerning the Extension of Time for the Organisation of the Connecticut General Insurance Company.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

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

This bill merely extends the time for organizations of the Connecticut General Insurance Company to October 1, 1973. I urge the adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it; the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 237. File No. 203. Favorable report of the joint committee on General Law. House Bill No. 5762. An Act Concerning the Extension of time for the Organization of the Connecticut General Fire and Casualty Insurance Company.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

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

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
PERSONNEL
AND
MILITARY
AFFAIRS**

1-148

**1971
Index**

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

Edward Razin,

Pres. Local 797, State Vocational Federation of Teachers.
I want to speak on Collective Bargaining. The State Federation of Teachers has a bill which has not received a number and so I can't speak of a particular bill number. On the issue of Collective Bargaining, I believe we must face this within a legal framework of Constitutional responsibility and therefore I enter the following into the record. The following is taken from the record of a New York City administrative hearing into complaints of R.A. McCoy, unit administrator of Ocean Hill requesting a transfer of teachers. The Unit Federation of Teachers Local 2 of AFT represented the teachers who were being forced to be transferred. The trial examiner found for the teachers in spite of this decision Mr. McCoy refused to obey the legal finding forcing the UFT to strike bringing over 50,000 teachers out to protect the integrity of their calling. I will place in the record a copy of the decision. The General Assembly cannot avoid the issue any longer. The State of Conn. cannot hide behind the 10th Amendment and deny its employees the rights given to them. We no longer will accept second class status. If we cannot achieve our objectives on the state level, we will move to the national level and fight this battle in Congress and in Federal Courts. The CEFT will not accept any multi-unit plan which evades the goals we are seeking. We want a secret ballot election with one organization bearing the responsibility for the contract with the state. Any other version is discriminatory. Thank you.

Mr. Moore,

Leg. Chmn. Connecticut State Employees Assoc.
I am going to just mention a few things about the right of the state employee to engage in political activity and also in support of some form of collective bargaining. I also will go on record as supporting the idea in H.B. 5111, which would bring the Bradley Field Fire Group under the protection of the state employees. In regard to the political activity, I know that the Interim Committee of Public Personnel has wrestled with this problem and has committed itself to coming out with some form of political activity bill for state employees. The two bills that are listed here for today H.B.-5726 and S.B.-976 which is merely a statement of purpose bill are the two which will receive most attention. Neither of these bills spells out specifically what the limits of political activity will be. I think that the idea is, and we are wholly in support, of allowing state employees the same degree of political freedom as afforded to Federal Employees under the Hatch Act. I don't think that State Employees deserve any more than that or do they deserve any less. It is true that the State of Connecticut is deprived of much of the wisdom and experience of state employees who live in communities which have particular problems which could be alleviated by using the brains of the state employees who live there and whose sole purpose would be to make that community a better place in which to live. With regard to Collective Bargaining, you have heard a lot about this and