

<b>Act Number</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Total Number of Committee Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of House Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of Senate Pages</b>
PA 71-268		6791	12	3	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Public Personnel &amp; Military Affairs</i> 62-63</li> <li>• <i>Public Personnel &amp; Military Affairs</i> 74-83</li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1987- 1989</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1700- 1701</li> </ul>

**H-112**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 5  
1968-2502**

Monday, May 3, 1971

20.

roc

THE SPEAKER:

Without objection, so ordered. In view of the fact that it is not printed in today's file, I think that this is appropriate action.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

That is the status of the Calendar as we know it now, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will return to the beginning of the Calendar and proceed with the call of Today's Calendar.

THE CLERK:

The first matter that appears on Page 6, Cal. 539, Sub. for H.B. 6791, AN ACT CONCERNING PARTICIPATION OF HOUSING AUTHORITIES IN FUND B OF THE MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT FUND, File 500.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 2nd. Rep. Motto.

MR. MOTTO: (2nd)

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

THE SPEAKER: (2nd)

Will you remark.

MR. MOTTO: (2nd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment.

Monday, May 3, 1971

21.

roc

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk call House Amendment Schedule "A", on Cal. 539, Substitute for H.B. 6791, File 500.

THE CLERK!

House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. Mot to of the 3rd. In line 46, insert before the word "employees", the phrase, "Unless the board of commissioners of a housing authority votes against such participation".

MR. MOT TO: (3rd)

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A".

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark.

MR. MOTTO: (3rd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment speaks for itself. It puts into the hands of the board of commissioners a vote that would allow a housing authority to take part in Fund B of Municipal Employees Retirement Act. I, therefore, move adoption.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House Amendment A. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. The amendment is ADOPTED. It's ruled technical. The gentleman from the 3rd.

MR. MOT TO: (3rd)

Mr. Speaker, I now move acceptance of the Joint Committee's

Monday, May 3, 1971

22.

roc

favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A".

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage as amended. Will you remark.

MR. MOT TO: (3rd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. This bill has caused us no end of grief in getting it on to the Calendar for passage. It does two things. It allows the Housing Authority to take part in Fund B of the Municipal Employees Retirement Fund without having to go through a referendum of the legislative body of the town and it also allows the board of commissioners to reject the Plan. And the purpose of this is so that housing authorities can take advantage of federal funds that are available for their pension systems. It also allows other housing authorities who do not so desire to make use of this to be able to withdraw from the Plan. I therefore urge passage of this bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A".

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 560, Senate Bill 989, AN ACT CONCERNING CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS CONCERNING MORBIDITY AND MORTALITY.

**S-79**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 4  
1457-1920**

May 11, 1971

14.

would give the Attorney General a very powerful tool to use against any corporation or business entity that has been infiltrated by any cartel.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 555, File 764,500 Favorable report joint standing committee on Public Personnel and Military Affairs Substitute H.B. 6791 An Act Concerning Participation by Housing Authorities in Fund B of the Municipal Employees Retirement Fund.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Burke.

SENATOR BURKE:

Mr. President, the clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment A. Senator Burke is already included in File 764.

SENATOR BURKE:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

May, 1971

15.

SENATOR BURKE:

\* This bill place the employees of the municipal housing authority under the Fund B Retirement after July 1, 1972. I move its passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Page 4, top of the page, Cal. 557, File 530 Favorable report of the joint committee on Insurance and Real Estate Substitute H.B. 6875 An Act Concerning Standard Provisions of Accident and Health Policies.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Dinielli.

SENATOR DINIELLI:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR DINIELLI:

This bill, Mr. President, reduces incontestable clause in accident and health policies from 3 years to 2 years. And removes some defense mechanisms. Its a good consumer bill Mr. President.

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC  
PERSONNEL  
AND  
MILITARY  
AFFAIRS**

**1-148**

**1971  
Index**

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

has no intention of opening the door all the way. It does look for fairness in this category. The law as presently constituted provides that anyone in classified service may not engage in any political activity other than to cast their vote or to speak in public as an individual, this bill would seek to allow them to engage in political activity especially on the local level. The time has come to open up the door to this extent and I hope you give this bill a favorable report. Thank you.

Chairman Duda, We will now open our hearing to the public portion. When you come forward will you please state your name loudly and clearly and mention the bill number you are for or against. Will you keep your testimony to a minimum? We would like everyone to have an opportunity to talk, but we would like much of the repetition cut down. Our first speaker is Robert Kendall, followed by Anthony D'Angona, followed by Robert McNulty.

Mr. Kendall, Southern Connecticut College. I am here to speak in favor of SB-542 for Collective Negotiations for State Employed Educators. I would like to go on record as saying that the AAUP supports this SB-542 because it allows a choice between types of bargaining agents. Thank you.

Mr. D'Angona Anthony D'Angona, Executive Director Vocational Instructor Organization. I want to support HB-7957 giving Vocational School instructors an opportunity to negotiate with the State Department of Education. Collective Bargaining. The instructors shall have the right to join or refuse to join any organization for professional or economic improvement. The important features of the bill are that the contract will be binding. There's a no strike clause. It call for compulsory arbitration and a similar bill passed the Education Committee four years ago, and received a favorable through the Senate and it was referred to committee In the House. This is a good art and I hope you give it consideration. Thank you.

Robert McNulty, President of the Association of Housing and Redevelopment. Executive Director of the Meridan Housing Authority speaking in favor of HB-6791. Housing Authorities are creations of the General Assembly and a Municipal Employees Retirement Fund is also a like creation and now permits Housing Authorities to participate. However, those of us who operate both State Housing and Federal Housing Programs are precluded from enrolling because of requirements of Housing and Urban Development. We are asking for a change of impact in the law, nothing more. We request that 6791 be approved, which will over-come the HUD limitations. Thank you.

Catherine Bochino, I am employed by the town of Wallingford and I am speaking in favor of HB-7163, which will give credit in the Municipal Employees Retirement System for previous service. I think this opportunity should be granted to pay for past service and hope this will receive favorable vote. Thank you.

## PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

- Albert Young, Employed by Town of Windsor. Speaking in behalf of HB-7031  
I would like to speak in opposition to this bill. It is introduced to provide a cost of living adjustment to members of the Municipal Employees Retirement Fund B. This bill is inequitable for it only pertains to one group and makes no mention of employees in Fund A. The Town of Windsor participates in both funds, the regular employees are in Fund A and the Police Dept. are in Fund B. I would like to suggest to the sponsor of this bill that he take the bull by the horns.
- William Quinn, Speaking in support of HB 6791. Director of Management of Hartford Housing Authority. Chairman of Pension Committee for the Conn. Assoc. of Housing for the Redevelopment and Officials. The Connecticut Municipal Employees Fund was initiated to provide a sound and efficient system for the payment of retirement benefits. The plan is separate from the State Employees Retirement Plan. The State Treasurer is merely the custodian of the funds. The procedure for inclusion in the plan states "Any town, city, borough, housing authority may exercise the option of including its employees in this plan." The contributions to this plan require that housing authority employees having Social Security coverage contribute at the rate of ~~2 1/2%~~ and also 5% on any excess in the Social Security. The contribution by a housing authority consists of three parts. The stumbling block is the Federal Government. Up until July 1, 1967, the Federal Housing Urban Development Department had no objection to any housing authority joining in the Retirement Fund B. Some authorities did. New London was the last. The majority unfortunately did not, due to a lack of knowledge of its existence and opportunity to join in its benefits. On Dec. 21, 1967, HUD issued a circular entitled, Policy Governing Local Agency Retirement Plan. It provided that all new retirement plans submitted on or after July 1, would require where membership in a public plan is permitted., rather than mandatory the local housing authority employee must pay at least 50% of the cost. In this same issue HUD stated where a plan is mandatory local agency contribution may be charged in accordance with the employee, employer sharing formula applicable to other political sub-divisions. In other words, this is very discriminatory, so we are here today to oblige the Federal directive by asking this legislative body to support the change in the wording from housing authority may exercise the option of including its employees in this plan to shall, and thereby making it mandatory to join. Thank you.
- Mr. Ozomac, Executive Director East Hartford Housing Authority, Chmn. Legislative Committee for the CAHRA of which there are over 60 Housing Authorities. I also speak in favor of HB-6791 and I will not repeat what my predecessor has spoken for they have spoken the truth. I can only speak from experience of my own staff members who have retired in the last three years with a bitter feeling in their hearts that after 20 or 26 years working

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

for a public agency they retire, one with \$44.00 the other \$46.00 and I had one just retired with \$54.00 and to get closer to the core of my retirement, I'm due for retirement in four years and after 32 years, my monthly retirement check according to the private insurance agency will be \$105.00, so it shows the members that HB-6791 is a most important piece of legislation. We humbly urge the committee to recommend the passage of this bill. Thank you.

Chmn. Duda,

Our next speaker is Mr. Perrucci followed by Senator Houley and Mitchell Labuda.

Mr. Perruccio,

Pres. Conn. Employees Union Independent. We have not received the details on SB-980. I would like to speak against SB-980 and any other bills dealing with Collective Bargaining for State Employees. There is a devious method afloat now in the state to do away with independent organizations and the freedom of choice for employees. Collective Bargaining would lead to agency heads determining what kind of pay raise state employees should have and that would take the power away from the people. I speak about the Unit System that an organization is foing to propose under collective bargaining. They want unit elections in state agencies and do you know how many units you might have one state agency? Where I work you would have the CSEA, the Psychiatric Aide Assoc. the Independent Union, Building Employees International, AFL-CIO Local 398, Welfare Workers Organization, and there are other ogganizations trying to break into state service. So, you'd have negotiations all year round between your state agencies and unit representers for these unions. So I beg the Committee, don't fall for that Unit System because that is what it is going to amount to. Don't fall for that promise give us Collective Bargaining and we won't strike. You talk about the strike weapon. That is the only way you can force any contract negotiations between an agency head and a union. There is no other way. There's an organization today asking that you pass Collective Bargaining. They've already gone to the Illinois Supreme Court on the right to strike. It was upheld for state, city and municipal employees. If that Supreme Court in Illinois says that they can strike, I'm sure in Connecticut it will be the same thing. They talk about the strike weapon, yes, in the city of Middletown today, once the union leaders, maybe I'm a different type of leader, I don't believe in the strike weapon in this day and age. There are other ways of doing it. An International Union in the city of Middletown has their workers in such a position that they can not even vote to go back to work. The power of strike lays in the hands of very few men. They say open the door and let us in a little way. I think the Legislature has been good to state employees in the 20 years I've been coming before you. You negotiate the wage benefits for us. You negotiate vacation benefits for us. You done well by us so well that they tell us you've put us in the hole, but that's alright for we have to compete with our brothers that work in private industry. Don't let them tell you that you have to have Collective Bargaining to give us the benefits we need. Many of you who know about

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

of an austerity program and suffer promotional limitation. Ultimately it would seem that faculties must suffer the fancy of the State Legislature and administration during any given year so far as their salary and other working conditions were concerned. We are asking not only for the right to negotiate in our own salaries and working conditions but also the right to negotiate our involvement in matters affecting the structure of higher education. I suggest that SB-542 and HB-7725 are best suited to provide faculty participation. Thank you.

Mr. Zettler, Howard Zettler, Retiring President of Central Conn. State College Chapter of AUP. The Conn. Conference of the Association of University Professors wishes to indicate its full support of SB-542 which is the same as HB-7725, the most effective of those bills now offered concerning collective negotiations for state supported higher education. Several features of the bill developed by Conn. AUP faculty members indicate the sources of its effectiveness and contribute a quality of uniqueness to it. The Conn. Conference wishes to offer the assistance of AUP for any research into collective negotiation for higher education that the committee may wish to make.

Mr. Phillips, David Phillips, Faculty member at Eastern Conn. State College and Vice-chairman of Education Council of CSEA and it is in that latter capacity that I speak today. I come to speak in behalf of SB-788 and 450. The principle of collective bargaining is one which is strongly supported by members of my council, CSEA members in general, and I certainly urge you to pass a collective bargaining bill for state employees in this session. Beyond that there is shaping up in the bills you have before you a major conflict over the system of collective bargaining that could be introduced. There is an exclusive bargaining system, there is a unit or council system in several other bills, including the ones I am supporting, and it's my understanding that the bills you just heard testified on that the AAUP are supporting have a kind of compromise where a decision as to exclusive bargaining or council bargaining can be made by vote at the unit level. My position on this matter is that there is nothing perfect in this imperfect world. There are advantages and disadvantages to any system that can be devised. I would say to you that it is my judgement and that of a majority of my colleagues that the unit or council system is preferable to exclusive bargaining. SB-788 and 450 are good bills, they ought to pass.

James Curran, Housing Authority, City of Danbury. I am here to urge the passage of HB-6791. Just last November, one of our employees retired at just \$37.00 a month after 18 years of service. I'm here to urge the passage of this bill. Thank you.

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

- Ernestine Hall, Project Manager of Housing Project in Danbury and I am here to speak in favor of HB-6791. As a long time employee of the Danbury Housing Project I wish to state that the salaries paid are not sufficient to provide adequate retirement funds. If this bill is not passed many of our employees feel it will be necessary for them to seek employment in other agencies where an adequate retirement fund is available. Thank you.
- Peter Allen, Asst. Personnel Director for the Dept. of Transportation. I wish to speak on HB-5111. I am speaking in opposition to this bill simply because it discriminates in favor of a small segment of transportation employees. The department feels that retirement provisions should be uniform for all state employees engaged in hazardous duty. We feel the entire area of hazardous duty in terms of retirement should be studied prior to giving any preferential treatment to groups of employees. We are also opposed to bills 305 and 5116, which were heard last week, for the same reason. Thank you.
- Clyde Summers, I teach Labor Law at Yale University. I am an alternate member on the Conn. Labor Relations Board. I want to speak to the question of the bills proposed concerning collective bargaining in higher education. I want to say first, I am strongly in favor of collective bargaining by all state employees. My concern is that the problems of constructing the appropriate system for higher education is a radically different problem from any that has confronted other kinds of legislation of other employees. I taught for seven years in a city university, the University of Toledo. I taught for seven years at the University of Buffalo. I taught for a year at the New York School of Industrial Arts. I speak not out of experience in an institution like Yale but rather experience in institutions which are of the sort with which this legislation is concerned. It seems fundamental that collective bargaining must be designed to fit the particular institution which is involved. Collective bargaining in the construction business is different than collective bargaining in the auto industry or the aircraft industry. Collective bargaining of university professors is a totally different thing because the traditions the practices, the internal structures of universities are a very unique animal. Traditionally, universities, colleges particularly those who earn recognition as living up to the higher standards of the profession. College professors have traditionally considered it is a part of their function to help run the university. It seems to me of first importance that this problem be considered as a separate problem, that the legislation dealing with state universities be dealt with as separate legislation. I am strongly supportive of the proposal of Rep. Stolberg that this legislation should be treated separately in a sub-committee to deal with it as a separate problem carefully designed. Thank you.

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

Joseph Bober,

Sec'y-Treas. State Labor Council speaking on behalf of HB-5296. Collective bargaining is not new, it will not mean the end of the world as some speakers would have you believe. It has been in existence in this country since the days of the colonies in the United States. It goes back a long time. It has succeeded. There is no reason why state employees should not be included under collective bargaining. Also I want to speak in favor of 5636 and on the same token I have to speak in opposition to HB-7033. This is political activity of teachers. If I speak in favor of political activities for state employees then I would naturally be opposed to restriction for any group of citizens in the State of Connecticut. I urge this committee to report favorably on political activity for state employees. Thank you.

Ken Ouimette,

Member of Local 321, AFSCM Employees AFL-CIO. I rise in support of two bills before this committee today. This is a legislative year which must be the turning point towards justice and equality for the employees of the State of Connecticut. HB-5296 and HB-5636 are two bills which must be enacted to secure security for employees of this state. It is a year when the state employees have become an oppressed minority whose hard earned gains are threatened. There is a general feeling among state employees that perhaps the legislators have not developed the needed empathy and their cries for economic survival may be falling on deaf ears. The state employee has always been shackled by rules and regulations which could impose severe penalties for even the mildest form of criticism. The first step to changing these conditions must be the passage of HB-5296. The time has come for progressive change not legislative lunacy. State employees like their counterparts must also be guaranteed the right to political freedom. The opportunity is now for politicians to become statesmen and to enact forward looking legislation that is constructive instead of destructive in intent. With the passage of HB-5296 and HB-5636 comes the opportunity for the state employee to take one giant step forward, as a worker, as a man and as a first class citizen of the State of Connecticut. Thank you.

Chmn. Duda,

Robert Krause followed by John Bannon followed by Walter O'Connors.

Robert Krause,

Personnel Dir. for the City of Hartford. I am here to speak for Mr. Friedman, who is sitting at another meeting. I have brief comments on four of the bills before the committee today. With regard to HB-5419. This would create a new retirement fund C. for municipal employees. The major provision of this bill would provide for retirement at age 50 with ten years of service. Employees would pay a portion of the cost and the state would share the additional cost

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

with the municipality. This an unwaranted benefit compared to private retirement plans and Social Security most of which provide for retirement at age 65. If this benefit is established there will be enormous pressure in cities and towns to join this new fund. With the state sharing the cost it would be difficult to resist the employee demands, yet the cost to the municipalities would be very high even with state sharing. We therefore oppose this bill. HB-6791 relates to Housing Authorities being covered by Fund B. of the fund. The problem we see with this bill is that it provides for mandatory cover under Fund B. which has a provision for retirement after 25 years of service regardless of age. We would think that this would be a very costly precedent to set for other municipal employees. We feel that Fund A. provides gererous benefits and we would recommend that the bill be amended to provide for mandatory coverage under Fund A. by Housing Authorities. HB-7031 provides for increases in retirement benefits for members of Fund B. to reflect cost of living increases. This bill is not complete as it is now written because it does not provide a specific formula or guide lines or limitations. We oppose this bill. We support HB-7033. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chmn. Duda,

Mr. Bannon, Walter O'Connor and Michael Ferrucci.

John Bannon,

Pres. State Federation of Teachers. AFL-CIO. I am here to oppose HB-7033. This is an act concerning Political Activity of Teachers. Most of the problems today in our society is based on the fact that many people are saying that our education is not relevant to the problems that we are facing today. What we would be doing if this is the law, we would be standing in front of our students every day and asking them to be participating citizens in this country and the students would be sitting there having no faith in our teaching because they would know we did'nt have an active role in the present day society. For that reason we oppose HB-7033 as one that would go contrary to the teachings that we had been giving our students over the years. We do favor HB-5636, 7293 any othe bill that would return full citizenship to the citizens of the state. We would also like to go on record in support of a bill submitted by Rep. Stolberg. It does not have a bill number as yet. This act concerns collective bargaining for state employed educators. It provides for an exclusive bargaining agent. Therefore we hope you would support bills supporting exclusive bargaining for state employed educators, but we would also ask you to avoid the joint bargaining concept. Thank you.

Walter O'Connor,

Represent the Uniformed Firefighters of Conn. I'd like to put our organization on record as in favor of HB-6782, 6784, 6791, 7031 and 7163. Thank you.

## PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

Rep. Ajello,

I want to speak briefly to you on an act that we recommended to the committee titled; The State Labor Relations Act. Without going into too much of the background, we feel that the bill we have filed with you will take care of some of our concerns in the General Assembly and also the needs of state employees. The inability of an individual to be fairly heard in the large government that exists today requires that public employees be allowed to act together for their common needs. We believe that the integrity of all employees demands the enactment of legislation which gives greater definition to their position in the basic matter of their own labor relations. The position of any state employee is complicated by the nature of his position. We know these men and women are conscious of the unique responsibility toward their employer, the public, not found in any other employment. Our bill is an attempt to protect them. Paramount in our concern is the removal of the General Assembly from a direct roll in collective bargaining, the setting of wage rates and general terms of employment. We believe that the system devised in this bill will accomplish this by making a better system for all parties concerned. We have prepared a bill providing for the free selection of representative bargaining agents by our state employees for grievance procedures and protection of employees against discrimination on account of union activity. In this act the rights of state employees are carefully defined, clear procedures are set out to protect these rights and a method of peaceful solution for all disputes is provided for. It would create an agency within the Dept. of Finance and Control to bargain collectively and establish the bargaining unit among state employees, provide for a grievance procedure, unfair labor practices are prohibited, more or less. It establishes the Commissioner of Finance and Control as the negotiating agent for the state, it creates an agency to be known as the public employees relations agency with five members who are appointed by the governor with the consent of one house or the other of the General Assembly and provides for minority representation, a fulltime chairman who would be salaried, members of the commission to receive an expense time payment for their services, provides for the election of representative groups, unions for the employees. There will be a general statement concerning the responsibility of the General Assembly in terms of ratification of contracts and conditions of employment. That, in substance, is the bill which the democratic leaders have filed and hope it will meet with your approval. Thank you.

Rep. Frazier,

I am here speaking on HB-6791. The low rent housing is operated by the Hartford Housing Authority for the Federal Government and must have their budget approved by HUD. HUD permits roughly 5% into their pension fund. It states

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

that if the Hartford Housing is compelled to join a Municipal Employees Plan then HUD will permit the employees to pay into the plan whatever it calls for. I think it is a good bill and I wish you'd push it. Thank you.

Rep. Badolato, I wish to be registered in favor of HB-5419. This bill provides for a new retirement system in the State of Connecticut which would be funded three ways with the Community the State and the Employees sharing equally in the cost of the pension plan itself. It provides vesting of interest after 10 years and would not grant retirement after ten years other than vesting of the interest and on reaching retirement age, the employee at that point would be eligible to receive retirement benefits. This is a common practice in the private sector, in fact, the years now are being reduced to a point where many employers now vesting after 5 years and not 10 years. This bill would assist the communities in funding their retirement plans and would be a great assist to the larger communities.

The next bill is HB-5296, and though I won't speak directly to that bill, I will speak to the subject matter. It has to do with Collective Bargaining for State Employees. I think that this bill is long over due in the state service. There are many states in the country now that provide collective bargaining for its employees. I think adoption of this type of measure for Connecticut would relieve the employees of the fears of repercussion after an election or fears of regression in times of such as we are having today. I would urge that your committee give serious consideration to this bill, and grant them the rights that all employees in the private sector have.

The next HB-6782. Retirement Credits between Municipalities and Special Districts. Under the present statutes any employees moving from one community to the other that is covered by Municipal Employees Retirement System can transfer their credits. This bill goes a step further and grants to those employees who are working for special districts the right of portability. I hope your committee would act favorably on that bill.

HB-6791 is a bill I introduced which has to do with providing Housing Authority Employees the benefits provided for in Murph B. This bill is a unique one in that it has support from the housing authority officials and the employees involved. I would hope your committee would support this bill. Thank you .

Chmn. Duda, Michael Ferrucci, Damon Shingleton and Ben Colver next speakers in that order.

## PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

M. Ferrucci

Pres. Council 16, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Union AFL-CIO. I rise to speak in support of HB-5636 which calls for the repeal of the regressive political restrictions bestowed upon state employees. I don't have to repeat some of the excellent points made by previous speakers and I will not. On the political activity situation, I think we were trying to cope with a law which was enacted way back when the Spoils System was really the order of the day in public employment. Under the Spoils System as a new administration came in if you were on the right side of the fence, you went in with them but if you backed a loser you were out of a job. It is hard to talk on political rights without mentioning collective bargaining process, and by that I mean the Spoils System has been replaced by the Civil Service situation which brought about the concept of Merit. Experience even with the Merit System tells us that it is suddenly become the personnel system. What we need to solve the problem is the enactment of the collective bargaining situation to give the rights of employees, that they can go before their employer in a give and take manner. I urge the committee not to just look at the political activity situation and maybe tie it in and liberalize it, rather I would like to see you repeal the Hatch Act entirely. I would like also to support all bills that would call for the enactment for a collective bargaining bill and I say all bills, for there are several bills. The CSEA has now raised support for collective bargaining and while I might not totally agree with their concept to the workable situations within such a law, I admire them for their stand upness to the state employees in wishing collective bargaining rights on their behalf.

Specifically, we back HB-5296. I do stand here rather disturbed to hear that maybe this bill is an attack at certain people. Nothing can be further from the truth. This bill would provide the kinds of rights the state employees should enjoy. And the possibility of chaos will diminish greatly. With the move afoot now by the present administration, to supposedly save five million dollars, but in reality cut the state employees pay by five million hours by extending the work week, is the prime example and the real issue that points to the proper communications link between employer and employee. When Governor Meskill in his budget message said that he would work to restore the 40 hour week, I am sorry to inform the Governor, that he is going to buy an awful lot of trouble, and I don't think when the issue is properly presented to the people of Connecticut that they'll get the message that they are not saving the kind of money that the Governor would lead them to believe. They are cutting the pay of decent, hard working and dedicated employees in Connecticut. I know that our organization will strongly resent that. We are not in a compromising situation on something that is already been granted us by a past session of the legislature, which brings out the other important factor of collective bargaining. Does the legislative

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

process have any advantages to the employees versus the collective bargaining process? The answer is no. The legislature which enacts a law in 1967 on behalf of state employees finds itself now trying to withdraw that law from the books. This has a very scary effect on our people. Does it mean that when the problems of the state address themselves to financial matters when we are involved in a budget state employees must make that sacrifice and subsidize the problem? Of course it should not mean that, but apparently that is how the pendulum swings in state government. The legislature is not in the position to get really involved in these problems. I think the legislature has an awful bigger task to perform than to try to be the bargaining agent for the State of Connecticut. I think we have many officials of state government and the commissionerships that are more able to deal with the specifics of state employees problems. So, I would hope the legislature would rid themselves of this situation where we come before you annually and try to make our pitch. So, I urgently support your support for collective bargaining. Thank you.

Damon Shingleton, Legislative Director for Conn. State Employees Council 16. I rise to speak in favor of HB-5636, 7293, 5296 and SB-980. I'll keep my comments brief for the subject has been thoroughly covered. In the collective bargaining area, our bill which is 5296 entitles the state employees to much similar to SB-980 and we believe either one of these bills would be a very good bill. In the area of political activity, our council strongly urges the repeal of restrictions on political activity and although we are willing to compromise to a bill such as SB-768, we feel that the answer to our problem would be complete repeal. Thank you.

Ben Colera, Member Legislative Comm. Council 16. I rise in favor of HB-5636 which would repeal the political activity restrictions, some of them. There was an interim hearing before a special committee last year on political activity rights of state employees. When I appeared before that committee, I made one particular statement which I would like to repeat. During the last presidential campaign, one of the candidates made this statement; "every American should be involved in political activity." This is on record. Now, this is not the Connecticut Civil Service regulation. Personally, I am registered with a party. I've been to every caucus for the past 12 years and as a state employee. I just sit and the only right I had was to vote. I've seen candidates that I did not approve of, and could not speak against them. I heard candidates that I liked and I could not speak for them. We are not considered first class American citizens. I urge this committee to adopt a favorable attitude toward a matter which discriminates against state employees. Thank you.

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

Hershel Smith, Teacher, Housatonic College. As a teacher, this hearing reminds me a little of talking to a large class where the teacher is unsure of how his message is being received. You've been hearing testimony on the merits of these bills, but I can't tell how you feel about collective bargaining as a principle. I'd just like to put in a good word for the principle of legally sanctioned collective bargaining. Laws should march with reality. The reality is the reality that we have all seen that negotiations do take place and the only question is whether this collective bargaining will be sanctioned or unsanctioned. Unsanctioned negotiations take place in an atmosphere of tension and force and of impotent laws and resentment. This is an atmosphere that makes agreement hard to attain. Many people associate negotiations and contracts with strikes, turmoil and grievances. The fact is that the existence of freely negotiated agreements results in smooth personnel relationships, high morale in an environment where everyone knows his rights and duties and responsibility. We need this and we don't really have it now. Thank you.

Robert Lee, Faculty member Housatonic Community College, Bridgeport. I would like to speak in favor of SB-450. I would like to endorse the comments made by Edna May Sole of CCSC. The Community Colleges are the fastest growing segment of higher education in this state and across the nation and in order for us to attract good faculty members to our system and to retain them, we need the opportunity for collective bargaining with our Board of Trustees at Community Colleges. At the present, we are at the whim of our Board and do not have a constructive voice, or if our voice is too loud, we may not receive a contract the following year. We need, and the time is overdue, collective negotiations for State Employed Educators and I urge the passage of SB-450. Thank you.

Daniel Boyle, Pres. Mystic Oral School. Federation of Teachers AFL-CIO. I have a request signed by the teachers at the Oral School for their support of Collective Bargaining. We ask for the opportunity as teachers to be more effective in the classroom. It is imperative that the state teachers be allowed to sit down with supervisors in order to have a more effective voice in the education of the children. Therefore, I support bill ~~3880~~. I hope you will put down bill 7033. Thank you.

Peter Wolfe, Pres. Conn. Union of Welfare Employees Local 629. I would like to speak for collective bargaining for state employees. Our union has written such a bill which has not as yet been printed but was introduced by Rep. Stolberg. numbered ~~3872~~. It is time for the State of Connecticut to recognize the right of its employees to collectively bargain concerning all the terms and conditions of employment. With good legislation peaceable

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

agreements short of a strike have been reached in cases involving 99% of available man hours. States such as Hawaii have recently recognized this as a sensible and modern way of government. We urge Connecticut to do the same.

I would now like to speak for the concepts embodied in HB-5296 which gives employees the right to choose their exclusive bargaining agent and which recognizes such bargaining agents as equals at the bargaining table. Such equality is not chaotic but rather will lead to a reasonable atmosphere for the resolution of disputes. This atmosphere does not now exist and could not exist under a council system.

I would like to speak against SB-788 which provides for a contract at the end of a process much similar to the present personnel system. In closing I would like to stress the needs for Connecticut to recognize its employees as full and equal citizens and provide for the only reasonable means by which they may deal with their employer. I would like, if I may to yeild the floor to our vice-president, Mrs. Yvonne Bernardo, who would like to speak about political activity of state employees.

Mrs. Bernardo, We would just like to add our voice to the other opinions spoken in favor of repealing the act which prohibits political activities on the part of state employees. Our union wrote a bill 7443 calling for repeal of the Hatch Act . We are against 7033 which prohibits political activity on the part of teachers. Thank you.

Thomas Bodine, Chairman of Hartford Housing Authority. I wish to speak in favor of HB-6791. I might point out that as an unpaid commissioner of the Housing Authority, I have no personal benefit from the passage of this bill. The commissioners of the Hartford Housing Authority have long been concerned about the inadequacies of our pension program. Our budgets are subject ot Federal Government approval. The outfit is HUD. HUD says that we as commissioners can put only 5% of salaries into a Pension Plan as the employers share and this is too little to buy a decent plan, thus, we've been unable to give our people the kind of pensions they should have. If the State Legislature should make it mandatory that we join the Municipal Employees Fund B. then HUD will approve our paying whatever that fund calls for us to put in as the employer. This will not cost the State of Connecticut anything. I urge you to make it Fund B. and not Fund A. because Fund B. is tied into Social Security and thus provides a more adequate pension for our people. I plead with you for the passage of HB-6791. Thank you.

W.J. Sheehan, Conn. Education Assoc. I want the record to show we are opposed to HB-7033. which would limit political activities of teachers.

Chmn. Duda, We will close the hearing of the Public Personnel Committee.