Act Numbe r	Sessio n	Bill Numbe r	Total Number of Committe e Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-135		1131	8	2	2
Committee Pages: • Human Rights & Opportunities 97 • Human Rights & Opportunities 98 • Human Rights & Opportunities 101 • Human Rights & Opportunities 105 • Human Rights & Opportunities 114-115 • Human Rights & Opportunities 650-61 • Liquor 134			House Pages: • 1710- 1711(con sent)	Senate Pages: • 699- 700	

H-111

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS 1971

VOL. 14 PART 4 1451-1967

6

Oakville Fire District.

House Bill 8492 - An Act Concerning Payment of the Korean Veteran's Bonus to George Meehan.

There is further business from the Senate. A Disagreeing Action on House Bill 7645 - An Act Validating the Notice of Rue S. Smith to the Town of Southington. This bill was passed by the House on April 8, 1971 and the Senate has passed the bill as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar.

The Clerk would now begin to call the calendar. CLERK:

Business on the calendar for Tuesday, April 27, 1971.

Page one of the calendar, the Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 92nd.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHANEY:

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Joint Rule No. 48, I now move for the acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the following matters on the Consent Calendar.

On Page 1, Calendar No. 0248, Senate Bill No. 1131. An Act Concerning Discretionary Refusal of Permits by Liquor Control Commission. File No. 111.

Calendar No. 0251, Senate Bill No. 1134 - An Act Concerning Employment of Unsuitable Persons on Premises in this State

Where Alcoholic Beverages are Sold for Consumption, File No. 116.

Calendar No. 0398, House Bill No. 6639 - An Act Validating Certain Tax Sale Deeds in the Town of Windsor Otherwise Valid Except for Proof of Service of Notice on Parties in Interest. File No. 386.

Calendar No. 0401. House Bill No. 8769 - An Act Concerning Agoodat Solima Cemetery Association, File No. 401.

Unless there is objection at this time, Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report on these bills and passage of the bills.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is any individual member object to the passage of the bills indicated on the Consent Calendar today. If not, the question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bills. All those in favor indicate by saying "Aye". Those opposed. The bills indicated are passed.

Gentleman from the 92nd.

REPRESENTATIVE MAHANEY:

Once again, pursuant to House Joint Resolution No. 48, I would like at this time to move that the following matters be placed on the Consent Calendar.

On Page 2, Calendar No. 330, House Bill No. 5683 - An Act Concerning the Reinstatement of the Corporate Existence of the Hartford Tennis Club, Incorporated. File No. 423.

Page 6, Calendar No. 477, Substitute for House Bill No. 5185 - An Act Concerning Interest Charge on Water Lien Assess-

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1971

VOL. 14

PART 2

474-956

to make sure that it all fits together into a coherent law; and 2) the bill with the Amendment printed in it rather than with reference just to certain lines and words should be before the members when they are voting on a substantial change. Do you understand Senator Smith? So the Chair has reversed its ruling which I think is a correct one with the help of all concerned. If there is no appeal from that ruling I will rule that it is not a mere technical amendment and that it must be printed and referred to the Legislative Commissioner's Office. The bill will be before us in a few days. Thank you Senator.

THE CLERK:

Continuing on with the Calendar, bottom of page 1, Calendar No. 93, file no. 111, Favorable Report Joint Standing Committee on Human Rights and Opportunities on S.B. 1131 An Act Concerning Discretionary Refusal of Permits by Liquor Control Commission.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President I move for acceptance for the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, members of the Circle, this bill would simply, is to remove the provision of the law which permits the Liquor Commission to refuse to issue a Permit to sell liquor to a woman with family responsibilities.

March 30, 1971

I think per se, it can be said that said decision is discriminatory and should not be a part of our law. The only additional remarks I might have is that Section 30-47 of the General Statutes as amended by this bill to remove from the Liquor Commission the right to refuse a permit for the sale of alcholic liquor if it has reasonable grounds to believe that the applicant "in the case of a female applicant, if the duties of a permittee may interfere with the care of her family". And the provision is obviously discriminatory and it should be removed.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? Senator Hammer.

SENATOR HAMMER:

I support this bill. I think its obsolete, it goes back to another century. The way the law is written now, who in the world can judge properly other than the woman herself, if the duties of a permittee may interfere with the care of her family. I never heard such nonsense. Senator Smith I am glad you brought the bill in.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Turn please to page 2, top of the page second item down. Cal. No. 95
File No. 116 F vorable Report Joint Standing Committee on Human Rights and
Opportunities on S.B. 1134.

28.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE HEARINGS

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

> PART 1 1-350

1971 INDEX

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971 **7:30**

Presiding Chairman: Senator Wilber Smith

Chairman Smith: The Legislative Committee on Human Rights and Opportunities will now commence the Hearings on the following Bills which have been given to you: - HB-5656, HB-7244, SB-489, SB-490, SB-1129, 1130, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1134 and SB-1135.

Our first speaker will be Mrs. Ann Bendaziam.

Mrs. Ann Bendaziam: I am Ann Bendaziam and I am speaking as a concerned American and then as President of Central Connecticut NOW - the National Organization for Women.

It seems to me that our country is sick. The reason for this illness is that too many people are being kept down... notably are minorities and our women.

Women are the largest oppressed group in the country and the world. At this crucial point in our history, we are desperately in need of the best every individual has to offer regardless of race, color, creed or sex.

Our main concern tonight deals with the right of women to earn just wages without strings, blocks or deceptive labels. Our human dignity will follow when we have just pay with hope of advancement.

I shall be addressing myself briefly to the following Bills:-SB-1130,1131,1132, 1133, 1134, SB-1346,1348, 1347.

SB-1130 provides that a woman not lose pay, position or chance for advancement because she leaves work to have a baby. Women must not be penalized for producing the most valuable product in the country - its future citizens.

SB-1131 will remove the provision of the law which permits the Labor Commission to refuse to issue a Permit to Sell Liquor to a woman with family responsibilities.

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

- Mrs. Ann Bendaziam: It is discriminatory to place the entire responsibility of parenthood upon the female. NOW recognizes the father as an equal parent and feels neither should be penalized.
 - SB-1132 would repeal that Section which permits the Labor Commission to regulate the employment of certain women between various night hours and a Section which exempts certain women entertainers from the coverage of Section 3119.
 - It seems grossly unfair to me to have the Labor Commissioner or any individual prohibit the kind of work a mother must or choose to do.
 - SB-1133 will require that seats be provided male employees where they are now provided for females. NOW feels both sexes are human and deserve human consideration.
 - SB-1134 will remove the provision which allow that no female unless she is the wife or daughter of a proprietor shall be employed in a tavern. This kind of law keeps women in subordinate and dependent situations.
 - SB-1346 and that's B-1348 would remove restrictions from the hours of labor a woman may work. There is no reason to prohibit a woman from working the hours she wants to and to contract for employment on an equal basis with men, and it should be the duty of the Union leaders to encourage women to jobs of advancement instead of instilling self-doubt or fear.
 - SB-1347 would repeal the discriminatory provision which prohibits a woman from standing at a bar. A woman standing at a bar is no less honorable a person than a man standing at a bar.
 - I would like to add that we wholeheartedly support HB-7244, SB-489 and SB-1129. We especially endorse the passage of HB-5656 which would prohibit discrimination of public

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Dorothy Annozanan: due to the State's disqualifying us because we received an increase in social security to help us with the cost of living increase. We ask for no handouts, only medical assistance. We would not even ask for that if we were not too sick to work.

I also wish to back these other ladies in SB-1130, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 1346, 1348, 1347, 1140 and of course I'm talking to you here now for. I hope that this would be rectified in the fifth legislation that is coming up and that all women will be able to collect on their own social security as human beings and not as dogs, and thank you very much. It's been a trying thing for me to have to come up here, I suppose that I shouldn't be, with my physical condition being as it is, but I don't think I can take another year of Connecticut abuse by the way they have done with the elderly and the disabled in Title 19.

It's also true of women who are on welfare that has husbands. They are denied welfare until their husbands get out and then they're left to be ridiculed because they have accepted welfare assistance. What else can they do? Thank you very much.

Chairman Frazier: The next speaker is Mr. Edward Eisenberg.
Mr. Eisenberg? He was to speak on a Bill...Bill 1347, that
permitting women to stand at bars. At this time I will
have to disqualify myself because I would like to testify.

Mr. Speaker, I am Representative Frazier, I am against women standing at bars. This is the last bastion that we have. This is our sanctum sanctorium or our holy of holies. Women have been permitted to come into the bars, this is enough. I believe in giving them equal rights but I cannot see them standing at the bars. I would say to all men, arise, and keep the women from the bars.

Chairman Smith: Beaas I asked to lend all courtesy to all speakers.

The next speaker is Susanna Rubenstein.

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Mrs. Susanna Rubinstein: I represent the Yale University Women's Organization and also I'm coming as a private citizen very much interested in the rights of women.

I would just like to briefly say that I am grateful that these Bills have been brought to the attention of you and that I would like to support SB-1130, 31, 32, 33, 34, 1346, and 1348. I am particularly interested to talk about SB-1130, because I feel that this is one of the most discriminatory laws against women.

I don't think that a woman's sex which entails bearing of children should be reason to discriminate against her in pursuing whatever road she would like to pursue as a private individual and therefore, I feel that pregnancy or the possibility should not be permitted by law to be used as a means of restricting or denying women employment. Thank you very much.

Chairman Smith: Miss Ann Hill.

Miss Ann Hill: I am a member of Yale Law Women's Association, an organization at Yale Law School in New Haven, Conn. I recommend passage of SB-1130,31,32,33,34, 1346, 1348, 1347, 490 and 489, Bills designed to eliminate sex discrimination in the areas of employment, public accommodations and civil rights.

SB-1346 and 1348 would repeal certain laws once known as "protective" labor legislation for women. SB-489 would incorporate this repeal into the Fair Employment Practices Act (§31-126 Conn. General Statutes) be repealing §31-126a of the Conn. General Statutes, SB-1133 would extend the benefits of the existing state law requiring seats for women workers to cover male employees as well.

The existing "protective" labor laws, the maximum hours laws, (§§31-12, 31-13, Conn. General Statutes), the night work prohibition laws, (§§31-17, 31-18, 31-19) that restrict

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Miss Ann Hill: SB-1133, which would extend the requirement of seats for male workers as well as women workers, conforms with the recommendation of the EEOC that laws conferring a benefit to cover both sexes. The recommendation is sound, and I urge passage of SB-1133.

The most important Bill before the Committee in assuring women workers greater job security is SB-1130. It should be streesed that SB-1130 provides job security for women who voluntarily choose to leave their work temporarily to have a child. Concomitant with the passage of this Bill I strongly advocate that the Connecticut regulation which requires women to stop working 4 weeks before and 4 weeks after childbirth be repealed. The decision to have a child is a matter of choice, just as the decision whether to leave work temporarily for childbirth is a personal decision that should be left to the individual woman. Class legislation that applies to all women is repugnant to the notion of individual liberty and freedom of choice.

The Bills proposed to end warious kinds of sex discrimination in the profession of bartending and the sale of liquor SB_1131, 34 and 1347, are long-awaited. Depriving all the members of one sex of the fundamental right to pursue this profession or even to enjoy the fruits of this profession is repugnant to Title VII of the 1964 CivillRights Act and to the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Forty states do not have such restrictions on women in the sale of liquor and bartending. That Connecticut is one of the ten remaining houldouts is an embarrassment to the State and a deprivation of the fundamental rights of the women of this State to pursue any profession they choose. Therefore, I strongly urge the passage of SB-1131, 34 and 1347.

Since many welfare recipients are women it is appropriate to view SB-1129, which prohibits discrimination against welfare recipients in the sale or rental of housing, as a Bill directed against discrimination on the basis of both sex and poverty. As an employee of New Have Legal Assistance Association, I have had contact with women clients receiving welfare

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Miss Ann Kinney: and Joseph Liberman as recommended by the National Organization for Women. I support these and all other Bills being discussed tonight.

When I applied for my present position as reporter, I was told that although I qualified, the paper preferred a man because men could do a better job. I accepted this, I thought I had to, and a man was assigned to this position I had sought. Several weeks later, I was approached by the paper, they offered me that same job. The man it seems had not worked out. He was released of his duties. I accepted the job.

This proved to me in a personal way that I feel that sex as such an employment factor is utterly ridiculous. So widespread and pervasive are discriminatory practices against women, they have come to be regarded more often and not as normal. This is the finding of the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, dated April, 1979.

I find it a horrifying prediction that the American house-wife will make more suicide attempt than any other category of women. Housewife's oppression so ingrained in our society is enforced by the many archaic laws on our books. I recommend passage of SB-1132, 1346 and 1348 to prohibit discrimination in working hours. There is no reason to restrict employment hours for women today. Safety factors that once warranted such restrictions, are no longer valid, as they once have been in sweat shop days.

There is no reason why a woman should not be able to pursue a career of self fulfillment and there is no reason for refusing to let a woman stand at a bar or keeping her from selling liquor. This discrimination will be remedied with the passage of SB-1347 and 1131.

I also ask the committee to consider legislation to desegregate Want Ads. Thank you.

CONNECTICUT COMMITTEE FOR WOMEN'S RIGHTS

Testimony of Janice Trecker, 33 Westfield Road, West Hartford, representing the Connecticut Committee for Women's Rights before the Legislative Committee on Human Rights and Opportunities March 5, 1971, Hartford, Connecticut.

My name is Janice Trecker and I represent the Connecticut Committee for Women's Rights. I am testifying tonight regarding protective legislation, the penalties for violation of fair employment practices acts, and denial of public accommodations to women, all of which are the subjects of bills presently before you. In addition, I will if I may present testimony concerning sex segregated classified want ads in newspapers.

We support the removal of protective labor laws which arbitrarily restrict women's ability to contract their labor, and we support the extension of genuine health and safety protections to male workers.

We now have in Connecticut statutes and Labor Department regulations sharply restricting the hours and other conditions of employment for women. While once genuinely beneficial for women workers, they are now too often used as an excuse to deny women equal employment opportunities.

We also have a set of laws which say that employment discrimination against women is illegal.

The apparant conflict between these two sets of laws is currently resolved by section 31-126a of the 1969 Supplement to the General Statutes, which provides that the so-called "protective" labor laws supersede the anti-discrimination legislation. This is not a satisfactory state of affairs, since much employment discrimination is legally sanctioned by these laws.

One obvious course of action which would assure women the opportunity to compete on an equal basis with men would be the passage of H. B. 6581 AN ACT CONCERNING DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ON ACCOUNT OF SEX which repeals all protective legislation and is now before the Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations. We have already testified in support of this measure before that committee and have here for you copies of our testimony.

Another course of action (which in our opinion is somewhat less desireable) is to pass S.B. 489 AN ACT CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT TO WOMEN, which would repeal section 31-126a Supplement to the General Statutes. This would enable the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities to argue these issues in the state courts.

As a third alternative, we support <u>SB 1131</u>. <u>SB 1132</u>, and <u>SB 1134</u> which would remove restrictions on third shift work and on women's participation in the

retail liquor trade. We do not feel that the state has the right or need to regulate women's moral conduct with regard to alcoholic beverages.

We also support SB 1133 AN ACT CONCERNING SEATS TO BE PROVIDED FOR FEMALE EMPLOYEES, because it would extend to men a desireable protection currently enjoyed by women.

We strongly support the principle of penalties for violations of state antidiscriminatory statutes. SB 490 AN ACT CONCERNING THE PENALTY FOR DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS ON ACCOUNT OF ALIENAGE, COLOR, RACE, SEX OR SOURCE OF INCOME established minimum penalties.

In our opinion this measure is not as strong as <u>SB 84 AN ACT CONCERNING</u> THE SUS PENSION OF LICENCES FOR VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS, PUBLIC ACCOMODATIONS, OR FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LAWS which is presently before the Committee on General Law. We urge you to use your influence with the members of that committee in support of this bill.

Women should have equal access to places of public accommodation including housing. We support the inclusion of sex and marital status in state public accommodations measures and therefore recommend passage of HB 5656 AN ACT CONCERNING DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ON THE BASIS OF SEX OR MARITAL STATUS. The most important aspect of this public accommodations legislation is that it would provide that women have equal access to housing. We would like to point out that current race, alienage, and color provisions do not adequately protect minority group women.

As a final point we would like to discuss sex-segregated want ads. We deeply regret that there is apparently no legislation pending which would outlaw this widespread and discriminatory practice. We have conducted a study of segregated want ads, and my colleague, Dian Hitchcock, is present tonight to report on it, so my remarks on this subject will be brief.

As you are well aware, EEOC guidelines prohibit employers and employment agencies from using sex-segregated classified ads. However, at present the EEOC has no jurisdiction over newspapers, and most Connecticut newspapers continue to divide help wanted columns into female and male sections.

Many groups are adversely affected by this custom:

Young women yet to make career decisions are clearly informed by this practice that women are invited to apply only for a restricted range of low paid employment, with little opportunity to advance to positions of supervisory or management responsibility.

Competent professions women, fully qualified to fill what are nominally termed "men's" jobs, are discouraged from applying for positions.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE HEARINGS

LIQUOR CONTROL

1-144

1971 **Index**

LIQUOR CONTROL

WEDNESDAY

APRIL 14. 1971

- Fred Callahan, representing the Bowlorama, Berlin Turnpike,
 Newington, Connecticut: We are a family owned and
 operated bowling center. Anybody that's going to tell
 me that anybody under eighteen years of age is not
 going to come into a bowling center after six o'clock
 at night, instead of sitting in Circuit Court 15 in
 New Britain. This week alone they had nine kids fifteen
 years of age pinched up there for fighting and so forth.
 As far as controlling liquor, it's almost impossible
 in bowling centers. Our principal business is bowling
 right now which is prospering. We're interested in
 getting people in the lanes not watching who the people
 are giving the liquor to or who the waitress is giving
 the liquor to. I want to go on record as being opposed
 to this bill.
- Representative Esposito: Any questions? Anyone else in opposition to 8343? I'll declare the hearing on 8343 closed and we will go back to Sentate Bill 393 which we discussed at the outset of the hearing. If anyone would like to speak on it please come forward. If not, we will continue--
- William Hickey, representing the Brewers and Wholesalers Board of Trade: We oppose this bill and House Bill 6121, both of which were heard at a previous hearing for the reasons that we set forth at that time.
- Fred Biebel, representing the Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of Connecticut: I too have spoken many times in the past in opposition to these bills, this one being 393. Senate Bill and House Bill 6121 and rather than take the time now, I would just like to go on record as being opposed to both of them. Thank you.
- Representative Esposito: Anyone else? If not, I will declare that hearing closed and we will go on to Bill 1131, an act concerning discretionary refusal by Liquor Control Commission. Anyone like to speak in favor of this bill? Anyone like to speak opposed to this bill? If not, we will declare the hearing on 1131 closed and go on to Bill 1134, an act concerning employment of unsuitable persons on premises in this State where alcoholic beverages are sold for consumption therein. Anyone like to speak in favor of this bill? Anyone opposed? The hearing is declared closed on 1134 and we will go on to Senate Bill 1251. An act concerning the repeal of the cabaret tax. Anyone like to speak