

<b>Act Number</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Total Number of Committee Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of House Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of Senate Pages</b>
PA 71-474		5874	4	1	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Labor &amp; Public Employees 187-190</i></li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3018</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2658-2659</li> </ul>

**H-114**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 7  
3011-3376**

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

8

Connecticut Board of Examiners of Midwives and the Transfer of its Powers, File No. 986; Calendar No. 0942, substitute for H.B. No. 5202, An Act Concerning the Establishment of Maximum Noise Levels to Control Noise Generated by Vehicles, File No. 982; Calendar No. 0944, substitute for H.B. No. 5874. An Act Concerning Medical Treatment for Injured Workers, File No. 998; Calendar No. 0947, substitute for H.B. No. 6613, An Act Concerning Savings Bank Time Deposits, File No. 1002; Calendar No. 0949, substitute for H.B. No. 7428, An Act Concerning Cost-of-Living Adjustments to Beneficiaries Entitled to Workmen's Compensation Death Benefits, File No. 1015; Calendar No. 0969, substitute for S.B. No. 0464, An Act Concerning the Merger or Consolidation of State Banks and Trust Companies, File No. 709; Calendar No. 0970, Substitute for S.B. No. 1311, An Act Concerning the Reversion of Estate to Spouse, File No. 807; Calendar No. 0972, substitute for S.B. No. 1681, An Act Concerning Prosecution of Traffic Violations on Grounds of the University of Connecticut, File No. 809.

Mr. Speaker, if there's no objection to any of these bills, I move now for the acceptance of the committees' report and passage.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You heard the motion. Is there objection under Rule 48 on the part of any individual member to any of the items contained in the motion being considered on consent at this time? Hearing no objection, all those in favor will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bills are PASSED.

MR. MAHANEY (92nd):

Mr. Speaker, at this time, due to an objection, on page 3, I'd like to move that Calendar No. 0971, the third matter on the Calendar, substitute for S.B. No. 1421, File No. 806, be removed from the Consent Calendar.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

**S-81  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 6  
2436-2873**

June 1, 1971

20

An Act Concerning the Establishment of An Office of Solid Waste Management Within the Department of Health.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, this calls for appropriation of thirty-five thousand dollars. It is creating an office of solid waste management within the Department of Health. Money basically will be used for a Deputy Commissioner and a member of his staff. I urge the passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Cal. 842, File 998 Favorable report of the Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations on Substitute H.B. 5874 An Act Concerning Medical Treatment for Injured Workers.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

June 1, 1971

21.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, this bill simply states that the employer shall not require the worker to receive medical attention for injuries covered under the Workmen's Compensation Act. After his regular working hours. If the injured employer's working hours overlap or coincide with the doctor's office hours. The purpose is to allow the injured worker to receive medical treatment for his injuries during his regular working hours. I move passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Cal. 859, File 1212, Favorable substitute report of the joint standing committee on Appropriations Substitute S.B. 372. An Act Concerning Cost of Living Adjustments in Salaries of Retired State Employees.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, the money is in the Appropriation act on this particular measure. And it directed to the State Retirement Fund. It provides an annual cost of living adjustment in the salaries of retired state employees. The 1967 Supplement of the General Statutes had provided for a bi-annual adjustment. Thus it in effect is indeed a housekeeping measure. I urge its passage.

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**LABOR  
AND  
INDUSTRIAL  
RELATIONS**

**1-347**

**1971  
Index**

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

HALL OF THE HOUSE  
FRIDAY - 1:00 P.M.

MARCH 19, 1971

- R. Wallace: should not be passed. We urge you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, to reject same. Thank you.
- Chr. Badolato: Thank you. Anyone else in opposition?
- H. E. Snoke: Mr. Chairman. I am Harmon E. Snoke, Executive Vice-President of the Manufacturers Association of Bridgeport, and in view of the incompatibility of these two systems, I would be in opposition to them on behalf of our association.
- I would like to respectfully call to the attention of the author of this bill, our distinguished Chairman, there seems to be an error in reference to Chapter 358 which in my set of documents of the law says that that applies to steam boilers and I am sure that is not the intention.
- Chr. Badolato: Is there anyone else that cares to be heard on this bill? If not, we will move on to H. B. 5629 (Rep. Spiegel of the 126th) AN ACT CONCERNING COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS AND DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCES TO BENEFICIARIES ENTITLED TO RECEIVE DEATH BENEFITS UNDER WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION. Those in favor. Is there anyone in opposition?
- L. Lemaire: Leon Lemaire speaking for the Connecticut Business and Industry Association. My earlier comments on the increase in the cost of Workmen's Compensation coverage are applicable to this bill. There is another one later which is similarly designed. We oppose the bill. We hope you reject it.
- Chr. Badolato: Is there anyone else?
- H. E. Snoke: Harmon E. Snoke of the Bridgeport Manufacturers Association. I spoke in opposition to S. B. 66 (Senator Gunther of the 21st) AN ACT CONCERNING COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS TO SURVIVORS ENTITLED TO RECEIVE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION DEATH BENEFITS, AND this would also make it impossible to determine the reserves to be set up and make an actuarially sound situation. So, I will oppose it on that basis.
- Chr. Badolato: Is there anyone else? If not, then we will move on to H. B. 5874 (Rep. Mastrianni of the 119th) AN ACT CONCERNING MEDICAL TREATMENT FOR INJURED WORKERS. Those in favor.
- S. Patterson: Mr. Chairman. My name is Samuel Patterson, Local #5623, United Steel Workers of Bridgeport. I rise in support of this bill based on the simple fact of the following. We have found that it is inadequate to the injured employees for them, at the company's discretion, to be sent to doctors other than during

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

HALL OF THE HOUSE  
FRIDAY - 1:00 P.M.

MARCH 19, 1971

S. Patterson: the working hours. We realize that there is a physicians' list with some of the commissioners that an injured employee can go to and obtain the name of any physician but on making the appointment, we find that some of the companies insist that the injured employee must go for treatment after working hours. This is during the day - it is in the evening hours for an appointment with the doctor or if the employee works nights, it's the morning hours or it's a Saturday appointment.

This, in my opinion, does bring a lot of burden on the injured employee through no fault of his own and I support this bill very strongly, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Chr. Badolato: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

N. Zolot: Mr. Chairman. Norman Zolot speaking for the Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL-CIO. Previous speakers outlined the problem. We thought that the General Assembly in the last two Sessions had pretty well clarified the situation with respect to receipt of medical treatment by employees but notwithstanding the efforts of your Committee and the General Assembly, there seems to be some employers who still feel that the question of employee medical treatment must be subordinated to the finances of the company and they have required the employees to receive medical treatment at times other than their regular working hours, particularly, for the people who work on day-light hours. They would have to make those appointments other than during the regular working hours. It is a very difficult situation but, certainly, if the attending physician wants the individual there at a particular time to suit the doctor's convenience or routine or schedule because he believe it is for the best interest of the patient. We think that the employer should not have veto power in that manner. We would, therefore, say that it's regrettable that we have to go to the extreme of coming to the General Assembly to get this authority but, apparently, it is necessary and for that reason, we would support this bill.

Chr. Badolato: Thank you. Anyone else in favor? Anyone in opposition?

R. Pray: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. My name is Reba Pray of Mystic, Connecticut. I am a registered nurse employed at Federal Paper Board Company of Versailles, Connecticut, as an occupational nurse.

Gentlemen, I'm here today because I am a concerned taxpayer, who also is a working housewife and mother, in a profession concerned with people and their welfare, but at the same time I believe I am a fair-minded person and represent the company

HALL OF THE HOUSE  
FRIDAY - 1:00 P.M.

MARCH 19, 1971

R. Pray:

I work for. As an occupational nurse, I am in a unique position to see and be concerned with both the employee and the employer. I would like to oppose H. B. 5874 (Rep. Mastrianni of the 119th) AN ACT CONCERNING MEDICAL TREATMENT FOR INJURED WORKERS. This is another example of leaving the options in favor of only the physician and the injured. This bill appears to be for the convenience of the physician and injured with no concern whatever for the employer. This bill will open even more doors for abuse by some who would use it for that purpose. The exact nature of the wording leaves no room whatever for reasonableness.

I think there are many cases where men work second and third shifts who can make appointments to doctors in the late afternoon hours and, incidently, most physicians only hold office hours in the afternoon - a few of them hold them in the evening. I think you will understand that if 5, 6, or 8 men have to make doctor's appointments in an afternoon, that can certainly cripple a business operation.

Chr. Badolato:

Thank you. Is there anyone else in opposition?

L. Lemaire:

Leon Lemaire speaking for the Connecticut Business and Industry Association. The bill is unreasonable. I thought we took care of this thing or, at least, the General Assembly took care of this thing back in 1969, I believe it was, when employers were required to pay for the time an employee spent receiving medical treatment. Employers, of course, in the case of salaried employees would get a tremendous advantage in scheduling medical treatment during working hours and would love to. It would save them money. With respect to the guy who is on the clock, the employer who schedules medical treatment after hours is required to pay for those hours at average hourly earnings. I really don't think the bill is necessary, among other things, but I think it would work a hardship in those cases where production comes first. The injured employee who is back on the job is obviously capable of performing his work or he wouldn't be there. No doctor releases an injured employee to return to work unless he is capable of performing his occupation. So, to interrupt and to cause, in some cases, serious interruptions in a production process is an undue burden on employers and as was pointed out by the previous speaker, I think some consideration ought to occasionally be given to the guy who makes the pay-check every Friday.

Chr. Badolato:

Is there anyone else in opposition?

H. E. Snoke:

H. E. Snoke, Executive Vice-President of the Manufacturers

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

HALL OF THE HOUSE  
FRIDAY - 1:00 P.M.

MARCH 19, 1971

- H. E. Snoke: Association of Bridgeport. There is one thing that has been overlooked here in this bill. The way it is drafted, it is implicit almost that it would require the physician to provide for treatment during the man's regular working hours. Now, if the man is working on the second or third shift, say the third shift from 11:00 P.M. to 11:00 A.M., the doctor just might not want to treat him during those hours and you would have a problem. I am the son of a physician and I have sat up and watched the Northern Lights up here in the dead of winter time waiting for a baby to be born and I know that it's not pleasant to be out, even with a physician, at that time of night. So, I think that the way this is drafted, it is almost impossible for some people to meet the requirements of this act.
- Chr. Badolato: Thank you. Is there anyone else in opposition? If not, we will move on to H. B. 5877 (Rep. Mastrianni of the 119th) AN ACT CONCERNING ELIMINATING THE WAITING PERIOD UNDER WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION. Those in favor.
- N. Zolot: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. My name is Norman Zolot speaking on behalf of the Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL-CIO. This bill would eliminate the present provisions in the law that say in affect, that employees who are injured on the job but stay out of work for less than 3 days are not entitled to any Workmen's Compensation benefits. You will all recall that the waiting period factor was introduced into the law really as an actuarial safe-guard to make sure that the rates charged for the services to be rendered would be adequate and, I believe, that the actuaries having studied the degree of work related injuries decided that the biggest savings would come if you eliminated first week of unemployment due to on the job injury.
- There has been a cut-back now and we have a dual standard. If you are out more than 7 days, you collect for that full week. If you are out for less than 7 days but more than 3, then you collect for the balance. The exception, at this point, no longer seems rational. There is no reason, from an actuarial viewpoint or from a humane viewpoint, to now say to the employee that, you must bear the loss of income for a short term disability which takes you out of work for 3 days or less. It amounts today to \$60. or more that the employee does not receive and we feel that there is enough actuarial information available today for carriers to determine what the impact would be of this change to build in that factor in to the cost estimates and to assure employees who are legitimately injured on the job that they would not suffer loss of income. It is rather difficult to understand