

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-271	vetoed	5656	11	1	10
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Human Rights & Opportunities</i> 61-62 • <i>Human Rights & Opportunities</i> 79 • <i>Human Rights & Opportunities</i> 83-84 • <i>Human Rights & Opportunities</i> 90-91 • <i>Human Rights & Opportunities</i> 102-104 • <i>Human Rights & Opportunities</i> 115 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1978(<i>consent</i>) 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1751-1760

H-112

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

Monday, May 3, 1971

11.

- Cal. 568, H.B. 5557, AN ACT CONCERNING THE RAILROAD GRADE AT FLATBUSH AVENUE IN THE TOWN OF WEST HARTFORD, File 556.
- Cal. 570, Sub. for H.B. 5656, AN ACT CONCERNING DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ON THE BASIS OF SEX OR MARITAL STATUS, File 523.
- Cal. 576, Sub. for H.B. 6474, AN ACT CONCERNING THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF CONSERVATION OFFICERS, File 522.
- Cal. 577, H.B. 6781, AN ACT CONCERNING THE NAMING OF THE NEW ARMORY IN NORWALK, File 538.
- Cal. 578, Sub. for H.B. 6871, AN ACT CONCERNING REGULATIONS OF CASUALTY INSURANCE RATES, File 521.
- Cal. 585, Sub. for H.B. 8496, AN ACT CONCERNING NOTICE OF SPECIAL AND RECONVENED SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, File 539.
- Cal. 588, Sub. for H.B. 6503, AN ACT CONCERNING EXECUTION OF EJECTMENT ON FORECLOSURE JUDGMENT WHERE MORTGAGE HAS BEEN GUARANTEED BY ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, File 552.
- Cal. 595, Sub. for H.B. 5258, AN ACT PROHIBITING UNWARRANTED INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF GENERAL ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS, F.533.
- Cal. 596, H.B. 5738, AN ACT CONCERNING RECOVERY OF CHILD WELFARE ASSISTANCE, File 531.
- Cal. 598, H.B. 7216, AN ACT AMENDING THE CHARTER OF THE UNIONVILLE WATER COMPANY REGARDING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS, File 536.
- Cal. 607, Sub. for H.B. 8618, AN ACT CONCERNING OPENING BIRTH RECORDS FOR GENEALOGICAL RESEARCH, File 560.

roc

S-79

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

May 12, 1971

27.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Caldwell.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, may we now return to the order as designated before? Returning to page 3.

THE CLERK:

Page 3, top of the page Cal. 546, File 523, Favorable report joint standing committee on Human Rights and Opportunities on Substitute H.B. 5656 An Act Concerning Discrimination in Public Accommodations on the Basis of Sex or Marital Status.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, this bill simply is to extend the rights of our public accommodations laws to persons to prevent them from being denied public accommodations because of their sex or marital status. I move for passage.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Question is on passage of the bill. Senator Macauley.

May 12, 1971

28.

SENATOR MACAULEY:

Mr. President, members of the circle, it isn't that I am directly opposed to the bill. I just think that it might pose problems. Be a little bit tough getting use to. As I read the bill full and equal accommodations in every public place might. I think would definitely say that it would do away with the distinction that we have long recognized in lavatories. Men and women's lavatories. It could be construed that way. Equally I think this would permit access to the, by men to the YWCA and other like institutions. As I said I am not so much opposed to, but I just think that we should have some warning so that we can get use to this. And perhaps at another time take this up. Another Session.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, as the Senator from the 22nd has already stated, particularly on many times that he sees merits in these bills. We understood for at least four or five days that there were amendments being proposed to the bill. And there was no objection to those amendments, if those were the reasons. The question now is whether they are just opposed to the bills. Or whether or not in fact the opposition to the bill has any weight of validity to it.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage to the bill. Will you remark

May 12, 1971

29.

further? I'm sorry Senator, I thought you were completed.

SENATOR SMITH:

Since there seems to be an absence of the amendment as we had believed there was supposedly. And in the absence of such I call for a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further?

Senator Rome.

SENATOR ROME:

Mr. President, thru you to Senator Smith. Could you tell us does this bill in your opinion and the opinion of your counsel if he has rendered one preclude single establishments from being constructed and occupied? As an example I understand there is a facility in Manchester that is going up which would be a singles establishment?

THE CHAIR:

Senator SMITH.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President to Senator Rome, I don't understand your questioning of that. I am not familiar with this establishment. That is supposedly going up in Manchester.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Odegard.

SENATOR ODEGARD:

Mr. President, to the Senator from the 2nd District thru

May 12, 1971

30.

you. I am not intimately familiar with the programming of the establishment. But as an example and I understand these are, there are several of these throughout the state perhaps many at this time. There is an apartment complex in the Town of Manchester particularly with a lot of recreational facilities and that sort of thing. Which apartments are available only to single people. Now its, I can't go into greater depth than that, I am not that familiar with it. But basically its single occupancy units. And its essentially I think a sophisticated YMCA, YWCA.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith, do you wish to reply?

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, its very difficult to reput statements that are made when the people who are presenting this before the body arn't sure themselves as to the context of these buildings.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Rome, you cannot break in. Senator Rome you are out of order. Senator Rome you cannot break in on a speaker. You can ask to be recognized on a point of order if such is in mind. Senator Smith, will you finish?

SENATOR SMITH:

Now Mr. President, I would just simply like to extend my remarks. Its very difficult to answer someone position if they themselves are not sure of it. The only point that we are making here is that, its been stated particularly by the Senator from

May 12, 1971

31.

the 22nd. That the bill itself has merit. And as I pointed out to this body. It was stated before it came out, it came to our attention that there was an amendment to take care of that. There was no objection. And to come and finally put the bill on the floor for action. A bill which everyone admits has merit and no amendment has been prepared in four days. And we see no further reason for delaying this action on it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Rome, Senator Crafts has wished to be recognized for some time. And then we will come back again. Senator Crafts.

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Mr. President, members of the circle, it was very apparent to me that there has been a great deal of misunderstanding here. The Senator from the Second District was expecting to see some amendments presented. Those Senators who have some objections to the possibility of this infringing on the rights of those unmarried who have contract in a complex, as identified as a singles complex. Since there are misunderstandings and the possibility of this being very damaging to these people. I move that this matter be tabled and we take it up on another day.

THE CHAIR:

The motion has been made to table. It takes precedence over the debate. Will anybody remark on the motion to table? If not all those in favor of tabling consideration of the bill signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The nays have it. The

May 12, 1971

32.

bill will remain on the Calendar for consideration. Senator Rome do you wish to be recognized again?

SENATOR ROME:

Mr. President, I am sorry I rose during the middle of Senator Smith's remarks. But I was trying to answer him as promptly as I could. The question that I had in addition to the Manchester situation is a YWCA facility, does the renting of the rooms in that kind of a facility violate this statute? Your renting to a particular sex only, I assume.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, to Senator Rome, it was our understanding when that question was raised before believing an amendment would come in if there were serious questions on that. It is my understanding that those facilities are facilities which are supported by religious groups. I don't know how true that it. Its the Young Man's Christian Assoc. and supposedly supported by religious organizations. And as such would not be covered. These other kinds of so called public accommodations, complexes for single people I imagine they would be if that existed.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR PETRONI:

Mr. President, members of the circle. Through you to the

May 12, 1971

33.

gentleman from the 2nd, Senator Smith. My question doesn't involve lavatories or YMCA's. And certainly this language is sacred in many ways in this bill. That this state recognizes that we do not deny equal accommodations because of race, creed, color or natural origin or ancestry. It has been the law for some time. And I certainly have supported it. But when I read these additions, sex or marital status. I would like to know from Senator Smith, some examples that he may have in mind so that, to convince me that there was a need for this particular change to this. I think very good bill that is now law in Conn. Could you give us some examples of where discrimination has taken place in marital status or sex that this bill will correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, to the Senator from the 24th. Some very real examples of discrimination on account of sex has to do with precisely with the attitudes of some people that women live cleaner than men. Or you have less problems. In some of our commercial buildings that we have, the real estate dealers would rather rent to women than men. This is prejudice on account of sex. In some instances its vice-versa. As far as the marital status is concerned, a lot of real estate dealers who do not want children in their buildings will discriminate against young married couples. Believing that sooner or later they are going to have children and they would have difficulty getting them out. These have been

May 12, 1971

34.

some cases which, Senator you asked a question.

SENATOR PETRONI:

I am listening.

SENATOR SMITH:

Well those are the only answers I can give to you. In addition to that when you talk about sex. Your simply, having to admit again that male or female are American citizens under our law. And that whether they are protected by the state or not is not the question. But most certainly no one can argue that they are not protected as American citizens under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. And also in our Federal Laws, our Federal Laws the Civil Rights Act of 1964-65 also protects people from being discriminated against on account of sex. The marital status you may have something there.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage, will you remark further?

Senator Rome.

SENATOR ROME:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the bill. I do see some defects. And I don't know if there are any merits to the bill. Because I don't fully understand it. I am concerned that I, that the point I raised with regard to Y.W.C.A. facilities, even though they be supported by religious organizations are not excluded by the bill. But there are many other areas that are not excluded some of which I could think of and take care of by

May 12, 1971

35.

Amendment. Some of which I could not now imagine. I think there are some areas in our society where we have a right to discriminate. And we discriminate everyday. I think that we have already decided that we cannot discriminate on the grounds of race, creed or color. And this was very right for us to do. But there are other areas that I intend fully to discriminate and to make a separate judgment on. And I think that this is one of those areas where its hazy and vague to me is just what we are getting into. And I think our legislation ought to be very specific. As to just what we intend to do. And where we intend to go.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of a roll call vote has requested. All those in favor of a roll call vote signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? 21% having requested a roll call vote. A roll call vote is ordered in the Senate.

THE CLERK:

A roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Will all Senators who plan to vote please return to the chamber. We have a long Calendar and it will expedite it if each Senator is in his seat when his name is called. I didn't mean you Senator Caldwell. I saw you lurking. Proceed.

May 12, 1971

36.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

If you hold on Mr. President, I will go get the television.

THE CHAIR:

Its unnecessary. Will the Senate stand at ease a moment.

What is the vote Mr. Clerk?

THE CLERK:

Yea 17, Nay 17. Absent and not voting 2.

THE CHAIR:

The President of the Senate votes yes. I didn't have the strength left to say the bill is passed.

The bill is passed. I do think I am entitled to a remark. Regretfully to depart from my fine Senators with whom I am so closely associated. I did not particularly believe or understand the objection to the singles as it was explained by my party. I've heard discussion in caucus. I do not believe that this bill would affect the single apartment out in West Hartford. I don't read it that way. I do not believe that it would affect the single apartment out in Manchester. The arguments were persuasive and well made but as a lawyer as I read it. I do not think that objection is a sound one and I do accept Senator Smith's argument that there is a problem that his committee has found to exist which requires alleviation. Senator Caldwell.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**HUMAN RIGHTS
AND
OPPORTUNITIES**

**PART 1
1-350**

**1971
INDEX**

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

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

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Mrs. Ann Bendaziam: accommodations of sex or marital status and SB-499 which is concerned with the penalty for deprivation rights because of alienage, color, race, sex or source of income.

Because the rights of women ~~kg~~ so dramatically, we feel the creation of a separate department or commission concerned with the status of women is urgently needed; such a commission would have fact finding and research powers.

In conclusion, we hopefully trust this State will soon pass our own Equal Rights Amendment to the Connecticut Constitution legally recognizing that women are people with sensitivity, intelligence and humanity - able to contribute immeasurably to our society. Thank you.

Chairman Smith: Mrs. Bendaziam you mentioned a couple of Bills - 1346 and 1348. What Bills are those?

Mrs. Bendaziam: They remove women from the provisions of these sections restricting the hours of labor of women in order to eliminate discrimination against women in employment.

Chairman Smith: I'm sorry - these are the additions and we didn't get them with the Bills for this evening. Miss Janice Trecker.

Miss Janice Trecker: My name is Janice Trecker and I represent the Connecticut Committee for Women's Rights. (Printed Statement)

Chairman Smith: The next speaker is Diane Hitchcock.

Miss Diane Hitchcock: With your permission, I would like to talk about the sex segregated what ads tonight.

The continued practice of segregated help wanting newspaper as according to sex, puzzles many of us in the Women's Rights Movement.

Four years ago, the EEOC decided that this practice constitutes employment discrimination on the basis of sex;

-20-

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Mrs. Charlene Morton: in a factory. I feel I can hardly be classified as society. I have worked in a factory and a mill. I felt the undue pressure put upon women by not having overtime benefits and no opportunity for advancement.

Concerning overtime - when I was a waitress, I worked as long as there were customers. I worked over 50 and 55 hours a week. Sometimes, and usually much later than 2:00a.m. I was willing to do this and happy to make the money. It did not tell on me in any particular way.

Our laws are inconsistent and prohibitive. You have the power to change this. Let us make our own decisions as to what hours to work and have the benefits men derive from overtime pay.

A U.S. District Court in Massachusetts recently declared that limiting women's working hours was unconstitutional. It will go to the courts in Connecticut if our laws are not changed now. Thank you.

Chairman Smith: Thank you. Mrs. Cecily Berzions.

Mrs. Cecily Berzions: I don't speak for any group, I speak for myself and my own experience which has been sometimes painful, at least educational.

As far as the unequal treatment to which women are subjected and which discrimination, degrading, insulting, outrageous, and irrational and in many instances, sustained and supported by laws made by the legislators of this State for whom I vote personally, I am going to speak specifically to HB-5656 and SB-1347.

I'll start with perhaps the more light of the two issues. As Mr. Keifer mentioned earlier, women standing at a bar, and this is what this Bill relates to. I was one of the women who accompanied my husband to dinner. After a very expensive and delightful dinner, he asked me to go to a

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Mr. Arthur Green: housing accommodations in this State every day by the hundreds. Many landlords and others that are controlling property out of hand deny the welfare recipient a rental or house for sale. This is blatant discrimination, it is just as evil, this is wrong, is just as evil as color, religion or sex discrimination.

SB-1135: This particular Bill as far as we are concerned, and as far as the Commission is concerned, seems absolutely unnecessary, yet it appears to be necessary because the Courts and others in this State feel that a person can discriminate if he is the owner of a two family accommodation and resides in that accommodation or if he is the owner of a rooming or boarding house and resides therein.

The federal government and the federal courts have long turned this concept down, that a person should be allowed to discriminate in these so called "Mrs. Murphy" type of housing accommodations.

We really urge you to remove the so called exemptions from the Connecticut law. The Commission daily receives complaints and we are unable to act on those complaints effectively because of those exemptions. Those exemptions are causing mass confusion between the courts and the State, among families that are seeking accommodation in a two family owner occupied situations.

Connecticut has long been proud, according to some of our public officials of its leadership of this field of human rights and I urge you to really make that a reality by removing the exemptions.

HB-5656: HB-7244: I will take these two Bills together, for these two Bills would add sex or marital status to the Public Accommodations Law. I would like to point out that the term "sex" when we use it in these laws, does not necessarily mean women. It means men also. I think it's a situation that may be overlooked as we talk about sex discrimination.

-25-

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Mr. Arthur Green: It's a very common practice and I would agree with you that it is mostly women in our society that are denied certain kinds of rights because of their sex, but also men, Mr. Chairman, in the area of housing accommodation, single men sometime are denied the right to rent an apartment because they are single. My friends, all of us ought to recognize that too, so those of us that would oppose such statutes, such proposals should recognize that when we say sex discrimination we are talking of both men and women not just women. Certainly landlords and others who control property for accommodation also would deny a person accommodation on the basis of whether or not he or she is married. I think all these are violations of one's human dignity - these are wrong and unfair, and ought to be eliminated.

Next I'd like to turn my attention to those bills that fall within the category of Fair Employment Practices, and with the Chairman's permission, part of my presentation will be covered by the Commission's Counsel, Attorney Ornstein. But first, let me say that I think that SB-489 is very important that it be repealed outright. In lieu of history - 1967, Mr. Chairman, the Commission's Representative stood before this body asking that sex be added to Section 31-126 of the Conn. General Statutes. The State of Conn. then became the first State in the Nation to amend its Fair Employment Practices Law in that manner. At the same time, that same session 31-1.6A was added and I opposed that provision at that time, and I oppose it now, That provision has caused us great difficulty in administering the Fair Employment Practices Law as it prohibits sex discrimination. That provision is in conflict. It causes the staff of the Commission a great deal of time. We spend hours needlessly I think, on trying to convince employers to obey the law and eliminate unfair employment practices as it pertains to sex. Really, what I'm asking you to do is to make it easier for the State Agency to do its job better.

We have had a number of complaints from women who have gone to Public Hearings after great difficulty and only because

-31-

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Mrs. Linda Cooper: 6. Equal pay for Equal work. Thank you.

Chairman Frazier: Thank you. The next speaker is Lottie B Scott. Ladies and gentlemen I am sorry to call these ladies out by their first names, but they have not indicated whether they are single or suffering.

Miss Lottie B. Scott: I would like to speak in favor of Bill-5656, 1129, 744, 1130 and I would like to speak from personal experience as far as public accommodation is concerned.

I have had more trouble finding accommodation because of my sex more than because of my race. When you call on the telephone and you ask someone for an apartment, their first question is where does your husband work. When you say that you are divorced, they will say, I'm sorry, we don't rent to divorced women. When you try to convince them that you do need the apartment, they will say that you're not capable, that you're very helpless and that you're not able to fix faucets, you're not able to shovel snow and that you will be a headache.

In one housing project, females who rent and who are the head of households, are not allowed to have overnight guests. If you are married and your husband lives with you, you can have overnight guests and I feel that this is a cause of discrimination because of sex.

In welfare recipients are denied accommodation because mostly they are women who are on welfare, and also they are charged from time to time more rent than other women are charged, and I feel that these Bills should be passed in order to protect our women's rights.

Chairman Frazier: Thank you. Phyllis Austrian.

Phyllis Austrian: I'll forgive you for not saying whether or not I am Mrs. or Miss because I purposefully put my name down that way, it's my name and I like to use it.

- 32 -

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Phyllis Austrian: As a member of Western Conn. NOW, I have come here because I support for the passage of the Senate and House legislation involving discrimination against women, being discussed here this evening. Thank you.

Chairman Frazier: Thank you. Eileen Sarkissian.

Mrs. Eileen Sarkissian, Stratford, Western Conn. NOW: I support the passage of all of the Bills being considered here-tonight. Thank you.

Chairman Frazier: The next speaker is Mr. Joseph C. Bolber.

Mr. Joseph C. Bolber: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I am Secretary Treasurer of the Conn. State Labor Council, speaking in opposition to SB-489 and 1132. I want to read Section 31-146A "Statutes regarding hours of labor and working conditons of women are not affected. No provision of Section 31-123 or 31-126 shall be construed to void or supercede any statute relating to the employment of women including their hours of work or working conditions or any regulations promulgated under such statutes." This was passed in 1967. The history behind this piece of legislation - in 1967 the Conn. State Labor Council supported an amendment to Section 126 which would include as an unfair labor practice to discriminate because of sex.

The Labor Commissioner realized that this law could be construed to knock out all the protective legislation on the books for women, so he inserted...he added Section 31-146A and it was passed. The history of protective legislation goes back a long time. Some man decide, I mean didn't decide we're gonna discriminate against women because of sex. In the early days of this country and of this State, women were used as chapel - they were worked long hours and paid very little. By the same token, so were men. Now working long hours isn't something to be proud of, it's not something everybody wants to do, the Labor movement from the earliest history a hundred years ago, the Labor movement in

-43-

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Miss Ann Hill: who have been denied the opportunity to rent certain apartments on the grounds that they were single women with children. I endorse passage of SB-1129, which along with successful adoption of HB-5656 and HB-7244, would prohibit such discrimination.

In summary, discrimination against women in employment and public accommodations is widespread. The proposed SB-490 which imposes a penalty for deprivation of rights on account of sex, and HB-5656, which wisely includes a penalty for deprivation of rights on account of marital status, are broad safeguards against such discrimination and should be passed.

The proposed changes in protective labor legislation are a good start toward providing equal employment opportunities for women. But the plight of women workers today is dismal. Women workers compose 37% or nearly two-fifths of the total work force, yet 50% of all unemployed workers are women. The salaries of women workers are only 58% of the salaries of men workers at comparable jobs. Although families headed by women constitute only 11% of all families in the United States, such families account for 30% of all poor families in the country. The proportion of all poor non-white families that are headed by women is even greater -- 41%. Women are generally employed at low-skilled, low-paying jobs in industries that have become labelled as women's work. There is no explanation for the pervasive exploitation of women workers or temporary workers. If this was even the case, it is no longer true today, Nearly two-thirds of the 29 million working women must work to support themselves and others. Thus, laws that restrict the employment opportunities of women workers cause a serious hardship to millions of women and, must be repealed by the State legislature. In addition, laws such as SB-1130, which provide job security for women workers, must take their place.

Chairman Smith: Please file your written material with the Committee Miss Hill. Thank you.

ke

-44-

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Friday

March 5, 1971

Chairman Smith: Miss Hill please resume your stand at the mike.

Rep. Virginia Connolly: Miss Hill you said you worked for the New Haven Legal Aid Society?

Miss Ann Hill: Legal Assistance Association.

Rep. Connolly: You said you had experience where welfare recipients were refused rental housing?

Miss Ann Hill; Yes.

Rep. Connolly: Have you ever been involved in an instance where welfare recipients have been refused the sale of a house?

Miss Ann Hill: Very few welfare recipients have the opportunity to think of buying a house, and I don't know of any personally that have come to the Legal Assistance Association with that particular problem, however, rent problem is an incredible problem for welfare women who are single, divorced or separated and have children.

Rep. Connolly: Yes, I am cognizant of that fact, but I was concerned about the sale.

Miss Ann Hill: In the files we have about eight neighborhood officers and I am not aware of all the cases that are coming in but, if you would like I can check on that for you.

Rep. Connolly: I would appreciate it. Thank you.

Chairman Smith: Are there any further questions from any committee members? There's none. Mrs. Worthington.

Mrs. Margaret Worthington: I am a private citizen speaking in favor of SB-1129 to prohibit discrimination against welfare recipients in the sale or rental of housing.

-45-

HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

FRIDAY

March 5, 1971

Mrs. Margaret Worthington: I support the other speaker's statement concerning this Bill. For too long, welfare recipients have been discriminated against and treated as second class citizens. There is no reason why anyone able to buy or rent at the going rate should not be allowed to buy or rent in any neighborhood in which housing is available without question as to the source of his or her income. I ask a favorable report on SB-1129.

In this connection, I also support SB-490 concerning the penalty for deprivation of rights on account of alienage, color, race, sex or source of income, and HB-5656 and 7244 which prohibits the denial of equal accommodations because of sex, under public accommodations statute. Thank you.

Chairman Smith: Mr. John Loomis

Mr. John Loomis: I am speaking in favor of SB-1346 and 1348. I belong to a local manufacturing concern. Half of our work force is female production workers. Recently we attempted to go to a four day forty hour work week for increase productivity and to give the employees a longer weekend. We wrote the State Deputy Labor Commissioner and were refused.

The women were informed that they had a choice on this 10 hour work day. They were in favor of this, they worked hard and the work involved is not heavy, no lifting involved - it's mainly electronics work and that is all I have to say.

Chairman Smith: Thank you sir. We have two speakers listed here. The last two speakers that have signed in that is Miss Ann Kinney and Eleanor Sapko, but they have general remarks. I'm afraid that I will have to restrict you to Bills that are being heard. Miss Ann Kinney.

Miss Ann Kinney: I am a member of Central Connecticut NOW and I am also a working woman. I have worked in a factory. I am now a newspaper reporter. I urge your careful consideration and endorsement of all Bills submitted by State Senator Smith

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 desirable protection currently enjoyed by women.

We strongly support the principle of penalties for violations of state anti-discriminatory 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 SB 84 AN ACT CONCERNING THE SUSPENSION 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 accomodation including housing. We support the inclusion of sex and marital status in state public accomodations measures and therefore recommend passage of HB 5656 AN ACT CONCERNING DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC ACCOMODATIONS ON THE BASIS OF SEX OR MARITAL STATUS. The most important aspect of this public accomodations 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.