Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-315		**6183**	**20**	**4**	**2**
Committee Pages: • *Education 308-327*				House Pages: • *2831-2384*	Senate Pages: • *1975-1976*

H-112

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 5
1968-2502

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I don't have to djh
tell anyone in this House what the problems that have been created as a result of drugs and narcotics, the illegal use thereof in this state. Many communities in this state have seen fit, or citizens of communities have seen fit to form voluntary organizations of, dedicated to helping young people who are troubled and afflicted by this terrible problem and many communities have been asked to appropriate money directly to these organizations to assist them but find no statutory authority to do so in our general statutes and the adoption of this bill will give them that statutory authority. I urge the adoption of this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill?

MR. STROFFOLINO (143rd):

Mr. Speaker, I also want to support this bill. It's a good bill and I urge it's passage and it will help the Town of Westport considerably. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 724, Substitute for H.B. No. 6183, An Act Concerning Adding the Secretary of the State Board of Education as an Ex-Officio Member of the Commission of Higher Education, File No. 702.

MRS. TRUEX (23rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment. Will the Clerk please read the amendment?

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. The Clerk has House Amendment Schedule "A". Will the Clerk call House Amendment "A"?

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has two amendments, one amending line 41 and 42 and one amending line 5.

MRS. TRUEX (23rd):

It's the amendment amending line 40 and 41 and that is the one I wish the Clerk would read. I think the other one has been withdrawn.

THE CLERK:

Well, let's try this one. House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. Sarasin of the 95th.

In line 41, after the word "member", insert additionally the word "ex-officio".

MRS. TRUEX (23rd):

This is it.

THE CLERK:

In line 42, delete the particle "A" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the right to".

MRS. TRUEX (23rd):

Vote.

THE CLERK:

"The right to".

MRS. TRUEX (23rd):

I beg your pardon, vote is already there. Thank you.

THE CLERK:

Is that the correct amendment, Ma'am?

MRS. TRUEX (23rd):

Yes, that's the correct amendment. This is a technical amendment and when the bill is explained you will, at least I hope it's technical amendment, Mr. Speaker. When the bill is explained, you will see the point of it is merely reinforces the fact that the Secretary of the State Board of Education is an ex-officio member on this commission without vote and I move for the acceptance of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of adopting House Amendment Schedule "A" indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Amendment "A" is adopted. It's ruled technical.

MRS. TRUEX (23rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and the passage of the bill as amended by Schedule "A".

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

MRS. TRUEX (23rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a companion bill to one which we passed a week or so ago in its relationship to the State Board of Education and the Commission for Higher Education. This would make the Secretary of the State Board of Education a non-voting member on the Commission for Higher Education and it is an attempt to bring these two bodies into closer relationship which is becoming increasingly important particularly in the field of teacher training and so forth where the lines of jurisdiction frequently go from one to the other board. It's a good and I would urge it's passage.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might request that the vote on this bill be passed temporarily to give me a chance to talk to Frank McCarthy who had drafted this amendment and as I see the amendment which passed, there seems to be something lacking that we had discussed before and rather than hold things up, if we would pass this for just a brief moment, I think we might be able to resolve it.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk is in the possession of the second amendment too. I'm sure the gentleman is aware of that which was not offered by Representative Stevens. However, noting the presence of our former member and distinguished counsel, Mr. McCarthy, this item can be passed while we have a conference.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 725, Substitute for H.B. No. 6696, An Act Concerning Candidates for Positions with Local Boards of Education.

MR. MC NELLIS (85th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

MR. MC NELLIS (85th):

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that more than one applicant for each teaching position must be presented to the local Board of Education by the Superintendent of Schools. Currently these provisions apply only to supervisory or administrative positions. The bill also gives local Boards

S-80
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL.14
PART 5
1921-2435

favorable report and passage of the bill, as amended.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR CIARLONE:

Mr. President, many times there has been a question raised by our State Auditors that certain programs are reimbursed 75% by the Federal government, and the way they do it before, the Town of Greenwich only received 50%. As the bill now reads, they would get the exact matching funds as the Federal government pays the State of Connecticut. It's a good bill. We urge its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Turn to Page 8, please. The third item from the top. Calendar No. 673, File No. 1027, 702. Favorable substitute report of the joint standing committee on Education on Substitute House Bill 6183. An Act Concerning Adding the Secretary of the State Board of Education As An Ex Officio Member of the Commission On Higher Education.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, this bill provides that three members of the Commission on Higher Education shall be appointed by the Governor in February of each odd numbered year, provides that the Secretary of the State Board of Education, or his representative, shall serve as a member ex-officio of the commission without the right to vote, and also provides commission members shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed for their necessary expenses in the course of their duties. I urge adoption of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Turn to Page 9, please. The first item. Calendar No. 682, File No. 685. Favorable substitute report of the joint standing committee on Judiciary, on House Bill 9096. An Act Concerning Evidence of Ten-Hundredths of One Per Cent or More of Alcohol by Weight as Prima Facie Evidence of Operating Under the Influence of Intoxicating Liquor.

SENATOR JACKSON:

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

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE HEARINGS

EDUCATION

PART 1
1-330

1971
Index

to speak on behalf of the Fair Haven Neighborhood Corporation, which is a neighborhood based corporation in the Fair Haven section of New Haven - and also the Greater New Haven Human Relations Council, which is a human rights organization in the New Haven area.

We are firmly committed to the necessity of providing adequate school lunch programs to the children in Connecticut - particularly to those who qualify under Federal programs for free or reduced hot lunchs. There are many children in this state who languish in classrooms hungry and undernourished even though a Federal school lunch subsidy program has been in effect since 1946. The goal of the Federal school lunch program was expressed by Senator McGovern when he sponsored the recent amendment to the Federal program when he said, "every needy child shall be served a free or reduced price lunch." We wholeheartedly support that goal and our support and testimony here today is to see that such goal is achieved in the state of Connecticut and the City of New Haven. Specifically, we support HB5958, which among other things provides state funds in such an amount as will enable the state to continue to qualify for Federal grants for school lunch programs. Under the recent amendments to the school lunch act the state must provide matching funds at least part of which is from the state tax revenue. Only the state legislature can ensure that the necessary matching funds are provided so that the Federal matching funds are not lost. We feel that it is imparitive that such Federal monies continue to come into this state of Connecticut and its school systems so that the number of lunches provided children does not decrease. We further support HB6179 and HB6180 which provide state funds to local school boards to build lunch facilities in new schools and state funds to build lunch facilities in existing schools which qualify for Federal assistance - where such schools lack adequate lunch room facilities. These bills will ensure that no needy child is deprived of the Federally subsidized hot lunch because of the lack of a suitable facility in which to prepare and serve such lunches. Finally, we support HB6183 which provides that state aid be given to schools providing free or reduced lunches to low income school children. The bill calls for a state subsidy of 5¢ for lunch for free lunches and 3¢ per lunch for reduced lunches. This state aid will enable the local and local school boards to provide a much more nutritious lunch than they might over.....otherwise afford. It will, in addition, encourage every school in state to provide free or reduced price lunches to the low income children who qualify for such programs. Finally, we encourage this committee to make its decisions not on the basis of cost but on the basis of merit. The decisions made in the legislative session will definately influence the kind of education that will be offered the children in Connecticut 10 years from now. We urge this committee to have the courage to make decisions which will positively effect education in the future at a time when there is pressure from a many directions to cut state aid and reduce spending. Thank you.

School Lunch Programs February 17, 1971

Rep. Klebanoff: Frank A. Harris.

Mr. Frank A. Harris: Mr. Chairman, I am Director of Food Services for the Town of Norwalk, Connecticut.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on behalf of HB5958. We brought along better than 200 signatures, including the signature of the Mayor and all the members of the Board of Education. We consider that this bill is the most important bill concerning the hot lunch programs throughout the state. If there are no state matching funds, chances are we will not continue to get Federal money and the program itself is going to be in trouble. We feel that this bill is as important.....as essential to education, as is math and english. I don't think anyone would ever consider eliminating any academic subjects. I feel very strongly that we must have your support in passing this bill as well as all the other bills - HB6179, 6180, 6183. You have all heard the old saying - "that you cannot teach a hungry child". If this bill is not passed, there will not be enough funds from local communities to feed our needy children and all the children that are now participating in the hot lunch program. I think that it is about time that the state will assume their responsibility in providing hot lunch to all of our children in Connecticut.

Thank you very much.

Rep. Klebanoff: George Dowaliby.

Mr. George Dowaliby: Mr. Chairman, members of the education committee, ladies and gentlemen I am from the Superintendent's office - Hartford Board of Education and I am in charge of the school lunch program. I am here this afternoon to support HB5958,6179,6180,6183.

The necessity to support HB5958 is quite obvious. There is an awful lot at stake - some $6 1/4 million worth of Federal assistance would be lost and in addition some $2 million in commodity subsidies as well. In order to take advantage of these federal subsidies state subsidies will be required. During the current year the City of Hartford has embarked on a rather large expansion of the lunch program and we have not been without our problems. The Hartford Board of Education has subsidized lunch program to some $325,000. This is a large local committment and indicates that our Board of Education's concern of the worth and need of the program. During the forth-coming fiscal year we are recommending that the City of Hartford expand the program and subsidize it to the rate of $424,000. The program during the current year will provide approximately 800,000 meals - 500,000 of which will be either free or reduced priced. During the fiscal year preceeding it we only served some 15,000 free meals and so you see there has been a fantastic expansion in the program and it was made possible primarily due to the federal subsidies. During the forthcoming year we hope to expand the program to some 1,800,000 meals. Even if this is accomplished, only 2/3 of our children in need will receive the necessary funds.

I would like to comment briefly, if I may on Section 3 of HB5958 which suggests that certain performance standards be established on the part of local Boards of Education to improve the general delivery of the food services. I support this notion, but I see that there is no funds provided here under Section 3 and that concerns me greatly. In-service training would be required and we would hope that if this section were passed that funds for in-service training would be made available.

HB6180, if enacted would provide state aid for 1/2 the non-federal share of program expansion of installing facilities. This is an exceedingly important program, particularly for urban school systems where we are operating an old super-anuated structure which are not suited for accomodating the program. What is required is not only the installation of convection ovens and freezers, but also major renovation in the school buildings - wiring plumbing - this costs a lot of money. We certainly think that the passage of this bill would certainly be a plus and we encourage expansion. Finally, HB6183 which would provide 5¢ for each free meal on the part of the state and 3¢ for each reduced priced we feel is perhaps an absolute necessity. Presently, it costs the City of Hartford ....or excuse me. Presently, it costs approximately 85¢ to serve each type A meal in the City of Hartford. The 85¢ is a very, very high figure and exceeds the 52¢ subsidy that we receive from the Federal government and/or student receipts by a considerable amount. The reason for the difference is primarly due to the enormous supervision costs required to serve the meal. I have heard state and federal officials indicate that this is not a legitimate cost. Without the supervision, without the professionals in ...or the para-professionals in the classrooms you can't serve a meal. It is just as important as your nutritional requirements. Consequently, any way that we can reduce the difference between 52¢ per meal and 85¢ would help us to expand the program. I hope that the committee passes this legislation and allows the state of Connecticut to assume its long overdue rightful responsibility in the area of food lunch programs. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Vera Willis. That is Vera Welletts.

Vera Welletts: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee I am the School Lunch Director from the Town of Cheshire and I would like to speak in behalf of HB5958.

It is a must that this bill be brought out of committee and passed by our state legislature. If this bill is not passed it will mean the end of our school lunch program as we know it today. It will mean one giant step backwards. Instead of the well balanced nutritious lunches that we are now serving, we will be forced to serve snack items at high prices. It has been increasingly difficult over the past few years to obtain a break-even point, and this year it is impossible. The Town has taken away all subsidies in the form of paying the school lunch director's salary, the paying of repair bills and the paying of utilities.

It is now necessary for the program to pay all salaries, all repair bills, a portion of the utilities. It also has to pay for garbage removal and any other expenses that are incurred. With the high-cost of wages, fringe benefits, and food - this cannot be done. Our present aim is to try to survive this year. However, the picture looks very black. Man hours have been cut, school lunch workers laid off, but we still appear to be on a collision course with bankruptcy. Our only hope now is if bill 5958 will pass and Federal aid will continue. Let us also hope the state is not going to come through with too little - too late. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Rep. Klebanoff: Barbara Kenny.

Barbara Kenny: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee I am a resident of Hartford. As legislation chairman of the Parent-Teachers Association of Connecticut (an organization with some 100,000 paid members).

Long before the passage of the National School Lunch Act, PTA members throughout the State and indeed, the Nation, encouraged supervised nutritional programs for children, sometimes to the extent of themselves preparing and serving it. PTA members are still concerned about school nutrition.

The Connecticut PTA membership in Convention April 15, 1970 adopted a Resolution, copies of which will be made available to the Committee, expressing their desire for free and reduced price lunches for children in need and that such programs be a part of the educational program of the school.

We therefore, wish to register strong support for HB5958.

We also wish to express our support for HB6180 which would pay one half of the non-federal share of the cost of installing facilities in schools lacking facilities.

Further, we would urge a favorable report on HB6183 which would provide special aid to cities with lunch programs for disadvantaged children.

We are beginning to know the extent of physical and emotional damage that junger can cause in children and the cost of efforts by public schools, health facilities and institutions to later repair such damage.

We already know that a child who is hungry cannot learn.

We also know that the school lunch program serves some better than others and some not at all. Too many of our poor children receive no lunch because neither they nor their school district can afford it.

School Lunch Programs February 17, 1971

We respectfully request and look to you, the Education Committee and the entire General Assembly for favorable report and passage of HB5958, HB6180 and HB6183. We feel that such legislation would serve to supplement but not substitute local efforts. Hopefully, they would stimulate and increase local efforts towards sound school nutritional programs.

We would also respectfully request the Committee to consider the formation of a School Nutrition Advisory Council. Many Connecticut citizens have become envolved and concerned with school nutrition and are working individually and in groups to improve the situation. An Advisory Council would allow some of these people to participate on the State level and would serve as a valuable communication bridge between citizen and State.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our views.

RESOLUTION (as mentioned above)

Resolution #5

WHEREAS, Recent studies have confirmed that undernutrition and underachievement are closely related; that children who are well fed are more receptive to learing than children who are hungry; and

WHEREAS, Despite the widespread recognition of the value of the National School Lunch Program (which includes the special school breakfast program), it is generally failing to serve those children who need good nutrition most and yet have the least chance of getting a school lunch; and

WHEREAS, In most junior and senior high schools it is taken for granted that cafeterias contribute to the convenience and efficiency of the students while in many elementary schools it has been assumed that a walk home for lunch is better for young children, a viewpoint which does not always consider the needs of many of those children for whom home is too far away, clothing is not warm enough, and more importantly, there may be nobody at the home to prepare lunch, or no adequate food available; and

WHEREAS, A people who have generously extended a helping hand to ease hunger around the world can no longer ignore the hunger of our own children by whatever source it is generated, whether ignorance, indifference, or poverty; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That local PTA Units and Councils study the school lunch and breakfast needs in their own communities to the end that existing school food service programs be strengthened or that new ones be established; that such programs make lunches available to all children at a minimum cost with special provision made for free and reduced-price lunches for those who cannot afford to pay,

that breakfast programs be inaugurated in areas of need; and that such programs be a part of the education program of the school, teaching good nutrition and good eating habits; and be it further

RESOLVED, That PTA's provide parents with information about the school lunch and breakfast program and their children's right to be included in it; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the membership of the Connecticut Parent Teacher Association urge educators, school board members, and the total community to support and use the National School Lunch Program.

Adopted by the Delegate Body in Convention
April 15, 1970
Bridgeport, Connecticut

Rep. Klebanoff: Mr. Ronald Armstrong

Mr. Ronald Armstrong: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Education Committee and many interested people here to see that legislation is passed in order to support the Lunch Program.

I am Assistant Director or Manager of Food Services in the City of Hartford.

A year ago today I had an opportunity to be a part of the Committee that was formed by many community groups. Our aim and purpose at the time was to see that we would get a nutrition program into the school system in the City of Hartford. As Chairman of that committee I raised a great deal of hell in the City of Hartford. There we were very fortunate and quite able to get a program going. The Board of Education turned around and gave me the job and responsibility of carrying out the function of this program.

I am still raising quite a bit of hell. Unfortunately, it will do no good unless there are proper funds to carry out the program. Desperate needs of the urban city to have the funds to renovate old or obsolete schools to useful lunchroom programs is very hard and very high. There is another point that brings to mind that we have the consistent program problem of trying to maintain an operational cost, which if we go ahead and expand the program using the existing budget - Federal monies or state monies do not come in - there is not enough - so the expansion that is necessary gets delayed.

The urban cities, I know, especially need more help. Definately. Because with all the special programs that I have heard...and I am interested in many of them myself... that I have heard this morning. I think that it is important that Connecticut who has been rather lax in this area - take a giant step forward and provide not only the needed funds to carry out the program as it is stated now in bills 5958 - 6179 - 6180 and 6183, but try to supplement these bills with more funds. The cry is great. The need is greater. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Kathleen Gabianilli.

Kathleen Gabianilli: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee I speak for the Housatonic Civic Association of Seymour. Its members, who all have children in school, pleaded please to pass these bills to keep the hot lunch program.

I also speak as a volunteer in the program and I speak for the volunteers of Center Annex school in Seymour. I also want to take this opportunity to commend all the hard-working women that are in this program because they get low wages and believe me in the schools in which I have been active - they try their best to do their best. So please give them a break.

Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Marjorie Anderson.

Marjorie Anderson: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee I am from West Hartford and I am representing the 6,600 members of the League of Women Voters of Connecticut.

We wish to speak in support of HB5958, an Act Concerning School Lunch Programs, which would make it mandatory for the State Board of Education to see that a school lunch program which meets the requirements of the national school lunch program (42 U.S.C. 1751-1760) or its equivalent, be established for all public school children in the state and that the Board shall provide free lunches to children whose economic or health needs require such action.

We are concerned that all children have the opportunity to benefit from school. We realize that hungry, malnourished children are not well prepared to learn and develop.

A well planned school lunch program, tied in with a free milk program (as this would be) will enable children to derive more benefit from the programs presented to them as well as helping them grow into healthier adults.

We understand that for the next fiscal year the State will have to expend $270,000 to cover 4% of the cost of the program and that the per cent of state support would increase to 10% within the next 10 years. However, the $270,000 will bring to Connecticut $4,800,000 of federal money and almost all of the $5,070,000 will go to the local communities to provide needed lunches and milk.

We appreciate the fact that the facilities aspect is drafted to allow for consideration of a variety of methods for providing lunch services.

Finally, we approve of the requirement that the State Board of Education oversee the eligibility for free and reduced price lunches because we are concerned that all potentially eligible children be located and that their right to personal dignity be preserved.

Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Mr. John Tyler of Glastonbury.

Mr. John Tyler: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee I am from Glastonbury, Connecticut and I am a member of NICE - Nutrition In Children's Education. This organization started meeting about a year ago and met throughout 1970 investigating the various problems involved in bringing school lunches - or bringing lunches to children in schools and other places throughout the state. One of the concepts which seems to be extremely important in our very early studies of school lunch programs was the fact that federal money was available but space - some space at least - did not..... was available but states - some states at least - did not take full advantage of this federal money because of lack of action on the part of the state's legislature. This, of course, we discovered long before the present bills were formed and before the present situation with regard to finance was incurred in the state of Connecticut. At that time we were thinking primarily of poor states in the United States where federal money was not being used because of malfeasance in office of individuals in these states which we considered to be something quite different from the sort of government which we have in Connecticut. It was only later that we discovered that Connecticut is one of the states which does not provide state funds from its tax revenues for school lunch programs. During the last session of Congress and Act was passed requiring 4% during the year 1972 to be provided by states and this was enacted in an effort to have the states provide some good faith in the program. In other words - not pass all of the cost onto children and that the states assume some responsibility, the kind of responsibility that they have been asking from the federal government and here we now find that in Connecticut, to this point, we have provided absolutely nothing to match the state funds. Next year, this coming year, if we don't provide a measly 4% we lose the $6 million which we have been getting from the Federal government. This is just something to us is absolutely unbelievable. But it is happening and it is happening in the state of Connecticut.

You have heard a great deal from people who have been close to the details of these programs as they are administered in the schools. I think most of you here and I think members of the Education Committee are well aware of the need.

What I would like to speak to is an area which needs attention and which is a little different. The Education Committee, I believe, should bring to the

legislature of Connecticut - particularly those who have to do with the finances of the state - the need for a 4% contribution in order to obtain the 100%. Now the money to be spent for school lunches comes from Connecticut citizens and if 4% of that is required to come thru the state taxes and be invested in this lunch program, I think that it would be the sort of thing that we, in our thoughts, have accused other states of doing - if we did not have a legislature which would pay this small 4% in order to gain for its citizens the dollar - the full dollar. In other words pay the $270,000 in order to gain $6 million.

Now, there is another point which I would like to be able to bring to the attention of the Education Committee. I believe that some of the money, if not all of the money which is called for in HB6179,6180, and 6183 - if those funds are properly handled I believe they can be recognized by the federal government as a portion, if not all, of the $270,000 required as the state of Connecticut's portion. And while I certainly feel that the state should pay the $270,000 even if these other funds are not considered part of it - in an effort to make our money go as far as possible I believe that we should try to include these other funds and I think that the effort along this line has to be in meeting the requirements that these funds be distributed in a proportionate manner as spelled out in the Federal Law. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Rep. Klebanoff: Sir, would you just remain at the microphone for just a minute. A committee member has a question.

Rep. Dice: I just want to ask whether you are familar with the fact that Gov. Meskill did include the $270,000 for the state hot lunch program in his proposed plan or budget as found on page 107 of the proposed budget. Are you familar with the fact that he included that?

Mr. John Tyler: In the Governor's message here in the House just a few days ago he stated specifically that he recommended leaving the $270,000 ...or that is deleting the $270,000 from the budget for the hot lunch program.

Rep. Dice: Well, apparently he did include it in, as it is printed on page 107 of his proposed budget.

Mr. John Tyler: Well, let's hope that he sticks by what is printed rather than what he said. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: That's very tempting, but I will refrain from comment.

Marjorie Holgate.

Mrs. Marjorie Holgate: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee I am speaking as a representative of the Connecticut Nutrition Council. I am also supervisor

of the New Haven School Lunch Program. The Connecticut Nutrition Council, an organization dedicated to developing and maintaining interest in nutrition as a contributing factor to health and to promoting nutrition education within the State of Connecticut, urges the favorable consideration of HB5958, 6180 and 6183 by the Education Committee.

The school lunch programs operating under Federal requirements furnishes each school child with one-third of his daily food needs. This is a very positive program which not only feeds the child but provides an education tool to daily demonstrate the kind of food to be eaten for good health.

Federal funds provide assistance to reach each child whether he pays the full price, a reduced price or pays nothing.

Public Law 91-248 mandates that state funds be provided in order to continue to receive federal funds. The passage of House Bill 5958 or 6180 and 6183 will insure the continuance of the school feeding program with a minimum contribution of state aid.

The State of Connecticut will lose over six million dollars of aid to child feeding programs if this legislation is not enacted. The Connecticut Nutrition Council requests your support.

Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Anthony Strezzo.

Mr. Anthony Strezzo: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee I am Superintendent of Schools for the Town of Ledyard. I would like to speak in opposition to the wording in Section I of Bill 5958. I believe that is is rather unfortunate that a school system, or a community, lose their right to determine whether the need (and I wish to emphasize the word NEED) exists, for a school lunch program in their system. Over the past 10 years a tremendous amount of school building has taken place in the Town of Ledyard. We have two 25-room elementary schools and at present we have a $2.8 million high school plant being constructed now. In none of these schools have provisions been made for a hot lunch program - and this is based upon the desires and needs of our community. I wish to ask the committee to consider a change in the wording of Section I to make the bill permissive rather than mandatory.

Thank you very much.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you. Anthony Serrio.

Mr. Anthony Serrio: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee I am President of Connecticut School Food Services Association. We in Connecticut School Food

School Lunch Programs February 17, 1971

Services Association support HB5958, 6179, 6180, and 6183. We urge that this Committee strongly support these bills. After the austerity program that Governor Meskill presented yesterday we in the School Lunch Programs have had, and are in an austerity program and have been for several years now. We must receive state aid - NOW. If we do not receive help within the near future all of the effort that has been put into the school lunch program since 1946 will be lost. We hope that we will receive support of this committee and that we will receive state aid this year. To continue this fine program we must have financial aid from the state. This program is important to the needy and also to the small suburban towns in Connecticut.

Please give this bill your unanimious support and we hope that we will be able to continue our fine program and improve our program moreso by receiving state help this year.

Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Phyllis Novack.

Phyllis Novack: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee I am a resident of New Haven, Connecticut and I have children in elementary and Junior High School. I am also President of a PTA.

I would like to not reiterate some of the statistics which we have already heard. I would like to tell you, from the child's point of view, what is it like to be in a program or school that does not have a lunch program.

What is it like to be one of over 400 children in a school, like the one in which I am PTA President? At present, you would bring a bagged lunch from home, eat in a classroom assigned as a "lunchroom", and be one of 200 children who are permitted to stay in school for lunch because you have a mother who works, or because you are one of 25% who are bussed to our schools from other parts of the City.

If you are in one of these categories, you unroll your lunch bag and..... ....what! You have forgotten your lunch! (Needless to say, there are many reasons for this happening - and many of them are very frequent. What happens when you forget your lunch? You are told to find a child who is willing to share with you. Sometimes that works, and then you have two children eating an inadequate lunch. What happens if you cannot find anyone willing to share? You try cajolling, embarrassing, begging, or even stealing. Is this what we mean to teach in our schools? Aren't children entitled to good nutrition? Is there any good reason that children in the richest state in the United States should have to go hungry in their schools?

The United States Congress has done its part, and now we must do ours, as a State. The education that our children are receiving can be improved by good nutrition. This state contributed 27% of its budget to education. The National norm is 40%. We do not even reach the national level of normalcy.

I strongly recommend passage of Bills 5958, 6179, 6180 and 6183. I would like to also go on record in favor of Bill 6456 which is Aid to the Disadvantaged Children.

Thank you very much.

Rep. Klebanoff: Nancy Ciarleglio.

Nancy Ciarleglio: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee we are here today as a delegation for the parents of the children of the City of New Haven. We can speak for as many as 21,000 children and have today in attendance representatives from 15 of the City's 33 elementary schools. We are here primarily to beg, cajole, demand, plead, and to remind this Legislature, and specifically this Committee of its obligation to the children of the State of Connecticut. Austerity should not mean insufficiencies. Monies saved in education during the last session and this session can be counted on to cost us many, many more dollars once these children leave school. Crisis in the Cities is not a catch phrase to those of us who come from the cities. The property tax can bear no more; the City has given its all -- the help must come from the State of Connecticut Government.

Children who go to school hungry cannot learn. A child who has to prepare his own lunch in an empty house, not by his choice but by economic circumstances, is not getting a fair shake either. School lunch and breakfast programs must be available to all children. A full stomach is a 'frill' this country can afford. Connecticut is the richest state in the Union; it therefore would be unthinkable to curtail valuable educational and food programs under the guise of saving money -- and for whom? What we are in effect doing is taking from these same children who in future years will have to initiate the programs we now propose to cut -- at double the cost for not having had the programs when they were needed for them.

PTA members are both taxpayers and parents, and as such we call upon this Committee to live up to the obligations assigned to it by the electorate -- the State of Connecticut must provide for the nutritive and educational needs of this year's school children. Their needs cannot wait for a better budget.

I also have additional signatures that I would like to leave for the record. Thank you.

School Lunch Programs February 17, 1971

Rep. Klebanoff: Claire DeMartino.

Mrs. Claire DeMartino: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee I am Nutrition Chairman for New Haven PTA Council as well as Unit President for Quinnipac School of New Haven.

New Haven has 21,000 children enrolled in their schools. All of them deserve and are entitled to the same nutrition rights and that is a school lunch.

Speaking on behalf of my own school for five years I have been working to have a lunch program instituted at our school. Our school has an enrollment of approximately 330 children who have been bussed four times a day because we have had no lunch program. We now have been promised that effective March 1st, after a long and lengthy fight, we will have a lunch program instituted at our school.

If the State does not meet the matching funds that is required by the Federal government, there is a strong possibility that the City of New Haven will not be able to continue the lunch programs that we have effective in our schools today.

Don't deprive our children of the nutritional needs that they require. I have fought a long and hard battle and I do not wish to go down to defeat.

Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Dr. Richard Granger.

Dr. Richard Granger: I am an Associate Professor of Clinical Pediatrics at the Yale Child Study Center.

I am here today wearing several hats. As a pediatrician with 22 years experience in practice and special study of children, I am personally and acutely aware of the need for better nutrition and better nutritional information for our children.

As Chairman of the Mental Health Committee of the Connecticut Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, I feel deeply that we must do something to remedy the situations revealed by an increasing number of careful researchers. Their studies document both the causal relationship between fetal and early childhood malnutrition and permanent mental retardation, and the clear-cut, but remediable, relationship between hunger in the school age child and his inability to concentrate in school, his short attention span, his restlessness - in short, his inability to learn and thereby become a useful and productive citizen. By allowing children to attend school hungry, we are adding to the

vicious cycle of poverty in our country. Feeding school lunches, and breakfasts, to all such children would make a major impact on alleviating this problem.

As Chairman of Nutrition in Children's Education, a statewide coalition of citizens and voluntary organizations dedicated to helping achieve a universal childhood feeding program including school lunch, I am conscious of the widespread understanding among our citizens of the importance of this program and their determination that the neediest among us shall no longer be left out. With all these roles and constituencies to represent, I hope you will not find it presumptuous of me to go into a brief background for the present bill.

When the U. S. Congress first passed the National School Lunch Bill in 1946, it called for the states to match Federal contributions on a 3:1 basis. The legislative history of that bill shows clearly that the Congress intended that some, or all, of this money should come from actual state funds. However, inaccurately and inadequately drawn administrative regulations allowed most states to escape this burden and pass the matching costs directly on to the parents of children participating in the program. The fees the children pay for lunch, in other words, have constituted the entire state share. As costs have mounted this has become an increasing hardship for many parents and has totally barred a large number of children from participating at all. In addiditon, the fact that most new schools with feeding facilities have been constructed in the suburbs, while most inner city schools are old and have no kitchens or lunchrooms, has resulted in the School Lunch program failing to serve those who need it the most.

Last year Congress decided to remedy this situation. Cognizant of the increasing problems of hunger and malnutrition among the poor in this country, our national representatives passed Public Law 91-248 which was signed by the President on May 14, 1970. This was "An act to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions."

Once again the legislative history is clear about the intent of Congress, and this time the regulations are in close conformity with that intent. It has now become incumbent upon us in the State of Connecticut to make changes in our programs and procedures or lose our entire Federal funding for child nutrition programs. Lest there be any question about the extent of that loss, I would like to point out that although we need to appropriate from state funds for the next fiscal year only $270,000, we are receiving in this Fiscal year from the

Federal government more than $6 million. It would seem penny wise and pound foolish for us not to make that appropriation.

I would like now, briefly, to discuss the sections of the bills that I and my organizations are supporting and show how they are in conformity with the demands of the Federal legislation and how they help meet the needs of the children of Connecticut. All language quoted below is taken directly from Pub. Law 91-248 with elisions for brevity but no change in meaning or intent.

HB5958

Sec. I would extend school lunch services to all children in Connecticut through high school. This is in direct conformity with Sec. 11 (h) (1) which reads "Not later than January 1 of each year, each State educational agency shall submit to the Secretary, for approval by him as a prerequisite to receipt of Federal funds or any commodities donated by the Secretary for use in programs under this Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, a State plan for child nutrition operations for the following fiscal year, which shall include, as a minimum, a description of the manner in which the State educational agency proposes ----(B) to extend the school-lunch program under this Act to every school within the State,---".

The reasons for this are clear. In Connecticut almost a fourth of our schools serving almost a fifth of our students, have no school lunch at the present time. More than half of these, serving 10% of our children are in low income, urban areas where the need is greatest. It is essential that we insist that these children be served. Sizable monies are available for facilities and equipment to make programs available, and in this case the Federal government pays 75% of the cost. Congress has given us the leadership and the funds. We must show comparable will at the State and local levels.

At this point in it should be made clear that the proposed legislation requires only that every school make a lunch program available to every child. It does not require that every child participate. I am aware that some families prefer that their children come home for lunch, where this is possible, and the new legislation would in no way interfere with this. I must say that I, myself, believe there are positive values for the children from participating in the lunch program and that these values are social and educational as well as nutritional. But I am not concerned with those children who can go home to a good lunch. I am concerned with those children, primarily in the inner city, who cannot go home because there is no one, or no lunch, awaiting them.

In case some of you feel that relative malnutrition is not a problem in Connecticut because we cannot show you pictures to match starving Biafran children, I would like to cite to you a few results of some studies done in this state in the past few years. Surveys in those same urban ghetto areas which are just those which do not now provide lunch services reveal that the heights and weights of children in these schools are below those of their peers in more favored neighborhoods. This is a prime sign of protein deprivation. Iron deficiency anemia is also prevalent in these areas to an alarming degree. The major source of iron and protein in these diets is meat; and meat is just what these children cannot get, except in the school feeding programs.

Sec. 2 of the proposed bill is designed to meet a 4% matching fund requirement of Sec. 4 of the Federal law. As I have already mentioned, we are required to put up, this year, only $270,000 to receive more than $6 million. It is true that the matching requirements rise 2% every 2 years to a final total of 10%, but it is anticipated that Federal funds will rise even more sharply, and especially in those areas which do not require state matching funds. It must be remembered that if we do not meet these matching funds, or matching requirements, we will lose all our Federal child reeding funds, for rich and poor, urban and suburban alike.

Sec. 3 of the proposed legislation empowers the State Board of Education to issue regulations for the control of school lunch programs. The new Federal law specifically makes the State agencies responsible for seeing that the provisions of the law--programmatic, financial, and nutritional--are met. We feel strongly that with responsibility should go authority. It has always been clear that some school administrative authorities have been more appreciative of, and therefore supportive of, the value and performance of school lunch programs. We feel that such an important matter as the nutrition of our children should not be left to the whim of individual administrators but should be regulated by a responsible, informed central authority such as the State Board of Education through the State School Lunch Director.

HB 6180 and HB 6183

Both of these bills have the same general intent--to meet the specific intention of the Federal law by making free and reduced price lunches available to a vastly increased number of eligible children. Both bills do this by increasing State aid to local authorities, HB6180 by paying half of the local 25% of the cost of new food facilities where none now exist, and HB 6183 by providing additional State money for the direct food costs of free and reduced price lunches. It is estimated that these two appropriations would require $54,000 and $225,000 respectively.

The reasons for adopting these measures are threefold:

1. To begin meeting the specifications of the Federally required state plan which calls for the rapid extension of lunch programs, especially free and reduced price programs, to all schools;

2. To encourage heavily burdened local authorities to increase services rather than to consider dropping out of the program entirely; and

3. To ease the burden on local taxpayers by spreading the cost of these new programs throughout the State. This is certainly in line with the new plans for revenue sharing from the Federal level downward to equalize the costs of new services and programs at the local levels.

I, and the organizations for which I speak today, feel most strongly that the time has come for all America to demonstrate its commitment to children, our most precious commodity. Every survey of Federal and State funding demonstrates that children do not now, and never have, received anywhere near their fair share of the public moneys expended for any kind of programs, either on a percentage or on a per capita basis. We feel it is time that trend was reversed. It is time we started investing in our future instead of constantly running to catch up with the patch up the....that is... catch up with and patch up the neglect of the past. School Lunch programs may not be a panacea, but they constitute an important link in a nutritional program which will help make it possible for all our children to claim the heritage to which they are entitled.

I thank you for hearing me out and I urge your favorable consideration of these bills.

Rep. Klebanoff: Norma Huyck.
While the next speaker is preceding to the microphone I would like to give a statement from the Mayor of the City of New Haven to our stenographer to have read into the transcript.

Mrs. Norma Huyck: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee I am the Nutritions Concultant to the Maternity and Infant Care Project in the City of Hartford with the Hartford Health Department and a member for the Steering Committee for Nutritional Programs in the Hartford Public Schools and mother of two school-age daughters.

On behalf of these interests and the Connecticut Dietetic Association which I represent today, I strongly urge your support of HB5958, 6180 and 6183. It is so essential that such a bill as 5958 be passed to safe-guard the daily nutritional benefits to children who presently participate in the school lunch program. We must also consider the expansion of school lunch services to schools that now lack facilities. As has been pointed out, many of our most needy children attend schools which are not a part of the school lunch programs. There is an urgent need to expand this program to all children in Connecticut. Again, on behalf of the Connecticut Dietetic Association, I urge your support.

Rep. Klebanoff: Joseph Bober.

Mr. John Tubiak: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee my name is John Tubiak. Mr. Bober had to leave and he asked me to speak for the Connecticut State Labor Council.

I am the Legislative Vice President of the Connecticut State Federation of Teachers. On behalf, also, of the Connecticut State Labor Council I would like to speak in favor of HB5958 and also to commend the legislators and the Governor, I suppose, in this particular case for having placed in the budget enough money to carry out some of this hot lunch program that has been talked about today.

We are very definately in favor of the principles and the concepts imbodied in this whole idea of providing a nourishing lunch program for needy children. So we are very definately in favor of this particular bill. Even though we do have an austerity program in effect at the present time, we don't feel that this should in turn be a case of taking food out of the mouths of children.

I am somewhat reminded in hearing a great deal of the testimony that was made here with respect to the missionaries who want to China and who found out that the only way and the only time that they would be able to get some education into the children was to give them some rice. We have the so-called rice christians at that time. So it is a lesson that goes way, way back into history and it doesn't need to be repeated over, and over again, I suppose. A child who is hungry and who is not properly nourished is not certainly an apt student for receiving educational benefits that are provided in the schools.

I am also here to speak on behalf of HB6970, which is duty-free lunch period for teachers. This kind of got squeezed in here. It probably seems rather inappropriate because we are talking about the children for the most part. But children do grow up, and many of them do become teachers and at this point we hope that we didn't just take the food away from them too, and say well, now that you are grown up you don't need food any more. In many instances there are teachers who have just 10 minutes to 12 minutes to eat their lunch periods in - which is very unfair when you start to think of the fact that it is almost an impossibility sometimes just to get down to the cafateria - wash your hands - get down there - eat your meal and then rush right back to class. This bill has been before the General Assembly I think for about 10 years now and each year they wonder why do we want at least 1/2 hour in which to eat lunch. Well, it is just the same old story. There is so many tight stomachs and frayed nerves that have to have some kind of recuperation at least for 1/2 hour without any kind of interruption with respect to duties that are imposed

on teachers during this period of time. So, we do hope that in this particular instance the General Assembly will look favorably on both of these bills - HB5958 and also HB6970.

Thank you very much.

Rep. Klebanoff: John Wilhelm.

Mr. John Wilhelm: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee I am the business agent of Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union Local 217 in New Haven. I am here to support in the very strongest way HB5958. Our Union, Mr. Chairman, represents nearly 200 school cafateria workers in towns as diverse from each other as Guilford, Milford, and New Haven. The lady, who spoke earlier from Seymour, made reference to the low wages that characterize school lunch programs in most of Connecticut and while I suppose that it is the major purpose of our Union in representing those school cafateria workers whom we do represent - I suppose it is our major purpose to elavate those wages and benefits and so forth. Our people also have a very serious interest as workers - and in many cases - as parents or former parents of children in those schools. Our people have a very serious interest in the quality of the lunch program in its expansion and its continuation.

I am here to speak today representing those sentiments on their part. Mr. Chairman, our people in New Haven, nearly 100 school cafateria workers bargaining for a new contract with the New Haven Board of Education are or did attempt in recent months to include in our collective bargaining agreement language that would have accomplished in New Haven much the same goal as Sec. 1 in HB5958. That is, we attempted to include in our collective bargaining provision that the school lunch program would have to expand to the some twenty schools and if memory serves me some 5,000 students who do not have the opportunity presently in the City of New Haven to properly benefit from the lunch programs. I personally was shocked to learn that that many schools and that many children didn't benefit from the lunch program, even though I spent several years in the Hill Section of New Haven in which there are a number of those schools - working in anti-poverty programs. I saw from that perspective the importance of the school lunch programs. Other people more qualified than I have touched on this here today. But let me say that in addition to Sec. 2 of 5958 which is of course absolutely necessary to provide the state money for the federal to come in - in addition to that Sec. 1 is extremely of interest to our Union. It is our feeling that the lunch program is important above and beyond just the jobs that our people have. Our people are proud of their attempts to put out the best lunch program possible and we are very interested. In fact, in the New Haven situation we would have settled for a smaller wage increase had the Board seen fit to agree with us on the expansion of the program. The Board didn't see fit to agree with us, which is of course the Board's privilege. I say that just to emphasize the extreme importance of this

to our members who function not only as people who work in the program, but as mothers and members of the community. Thank you very much.

Rep. Klebanoff: At this time I have no other names on the list, but if there are others who wish to speak at this time - please feel free to do so. Are there any others? Yes?

If there are no other speakers, I wish to thank you all for coming. I wish also to thank the members of the education committee who put in a rather long day on some very important hearings and we hope we will be seeing some of you, at least, again. The Sub-committee will be taking this matter up in some detail. Again, thank you very much for your patience and for coming.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS TO BE READ INTO THE RECORD.

Richard Renkun, President UAW CAP Council: As President of the UAW CAP Council, I want to go on record as favoring HB5958, HB6179, HB6180, and HB6183.

It would appear that there could be no justification for not giving first priority to the appropriation for $270,000. It is inconceivable that the failure to pass HB5958 would jeopardize the six million dollars in cash assistance and the $2,000,000 in Government donated foods.

In addition, to the extent that funds are available, passage of HB6179, HB6180, and HB6183 is in the best interests of the children of Connecticut.

State of Connecticut - Department of Aging: The Department on Aging conducted public hearings in 9 different cities in June and October 1970. 1,100 elderly attended, requesting that school facilities be made available for serving lunches to the elderly and expressed needs for specialized programs such as meals on wheels.

Fair Haven Neighborhood Corporation, New Haven: As parents of children attending Cheever Elementary School, we know quite well the burdens of not having a lunch program at our school. There are some of us who need to work for economic reasons, and we cannot do so if there is no lunch program at the school. There are many of us who have children who must walk several blocks to get home for lunch. The routes are all congested and highly travelled streets,