

HB 5176

PA 615

1971

Labor & Industrial Relations 47, 53-57

House 4321-4337

Senate 3203-3204

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**LABOR
AND
INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS**

1-347

**1971
Index**

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

FRIDAY - 1:00 P.M.

FEBRUARY 19, 1971

C. Pickett: Mr. Chairman. My name is Charles Pickett. I am an Episcopal Clergyman on the staff of the Episcopal Metropolitan Mission as Minister to the Spanish Speaking People and I am here to speak in favor of S. B. 226 (Sen. Smith of the 2nd) AN ACT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM WAGE and H. B. 5176 (Rep. Badolato of the 30th, Rep. Stolberg of the 112th) AN ACT CONCERNING EXTENDING THE MINIMUM WAGE STATUTES TO MIGRATORY WORKERS. I speak for myself and for 12 other people who have been in touch with me since last night, when I first heard of this. I know there are many others who would want me also to speak for them but I think it is significant that 5 clergymen of the Episcopal Commission on Spanish Speaking Work asked me to speak for them this afternoon and, in addition, there are a number of Puerto Ricans who were not able to be here, who asked me, also, to speak in favor of this.

I don't think that I should take any more of your time and I will leave the names and addresses of these gentlemen and ladies with the secretary. Thank you.

Chr. Smith: Thank you very much. Alright, persons who are opposed to any of the bills. Please state your name, sir, and the bill numbers.

S. Cavanero: Steve Cavanero from Manchester, Connecticut. I wish to speak against S. B. 226 (Sen. Smith of the 2nd) AN ACT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM WAGE. This bill is damaging to business, in general, and disastrous to the restaurant industry. A bill that proposes wage increases of 51% with no increases in output, must not be contemplated without consideration for the characteristics of the restaurant business. The restaurant owner operates under overhead just proportionate greater than 9 to 5 businesses, payroll costs - 35 to 40% of sales usually, lighting, breakage, spoilage, wear and tear - requiring frequent refurbishing and redecorating, loss through pilferage, excessive insurance cost, long hours and small profits, employment of many people who have the capacity to do work at minimum standards, people able to perform routine tasks, once trained, but who must be constantly supervised and who require longer periods of time to complete those tasks.

Legislation was enacted early in the century to prevent inhumane and anti-social working conditions and to establish a floor for the lowest paid workers. The country was compelled to do this to overcome the excessive exploitation of the laboring people, but this was another era. Employed people today, and especially restaurant workers, are mobile.

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

FRIDAY - 1:00

FEBRUARY 19, 1971

- G. Jacobian: Passage of S. B. 226 will add to the problems already besetting our industry and our State. The detrimental social problems now besetting our State due to unemployment and idleness will be increased and this must also be considered a cost of the passage of S. B. 226.
- G. Harris: My name is George Harris. I am from Milford, Connecticut and I run a restaurant in Milford. I would just like to add to what has been said. As I see it, this particular bill is going to help those that really need it the least, the gratuity receiving employee who, I think, have substantial earnings. The back of the house, I think, has paid substantially more than the minimum wage. I think this ought to be considered. Thank you.
- M. Kravitz: My name is Mark Kravitz. I am the Executive Director of the Shade Tobacco Growers Association and I am here to speak in opposition to H. B. 5176 (Rep. Badolato of the 30th, Rep. Stolberg of the 112th) AN ACT CONCERNING EXTENDING THE MINIMUM WAGE STATUTES TO MIGRATORY WORKERS. I have a prepared statement which I am leaving with the Clerk.
- Chr. Smith: Excuse me, sir. What bill is that?
- M. Kravitz: H. B. 5176, extending the minimum wage to so-called migratory workers.
- Chr. Smith: You are opposed to that?
- M. Kravitz: Yes, I am opposed to that. I have gone to some length in my prepared statement and I don't want to read it here. However, I would like to make a few remarks so the Committee can become aware of our particular problems.

The shade tobacco industry employs about 85% of the agricultural workers in the State of Connecticut. In this year, 1971, we have a decrease of production of 25% in the total acreage planted in Connecticut. This was on top of a reduction of 27% back in the 1968-1969 season. To extend the benefits of the minimum wage coverage and time-and-a-half would drive the shade tobacco industry out of Connecticut entirely, which now amounts to about \$25,000,000. worth of gross business, most of it staying within the State in agri-business benefits and in wages to employees. We are no longer in a competitive market for our tobacco leaf. This year there are extensive imports of shade tobacco leaf coming in at South America that are landed in our factories where they manufacture cigars at less cost than we can produce here in the valley.

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

FRIDAY - 1:00 P.M.

FEBRUARY 19, 1971

M. Kravitz: There was one other aspect that was covered to some extent earlier and that is the employment of youth. In this time of recession and great unemployment, we employ over 5000 local youth in the Greater Hartford area for 10 weeks during the summer - the largest youth employment program in the country. Our payroll here in the area is between 4 and 5 million dollars. If the industry is going to suffer more on this cost price squeeze and if this 25% reduction in acreage is any indication of what the future holds for us, this will throw out these 5000 kids who now work. These youth are between the ages of 14 through 17 years of age. Their minimum wage, guaranteed, is \$1.30 an hour, which is the same as the Federal minimum for agriculture. Incidentally, our adult wage at the moment is \$1.80 per hour.

If this bill would pass, we would see the end of tobacco.
Thank you.

R. Upton: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. My name is Ross Upton. I am President of Zero Check, Inc., a small manufacturing shop in Thomaston. We employ approximately 7 people. It is an economic fact that people only pay what a product is worth whether they are customers or employers. This is an economic law that cannot be replaced. I would like to quote from a publication called American Institute for Economic Research who, in turn, are quoting Prof. Yale Rosen, Business Economic Department, University of Chicago. "A recent study has shown that the percentage of youth unemployed has increased markedly as higher minimum wages have been established. In affect, the law says to every youth, you shall have no job unless the results of your labor are worth more to some employers than the current minimum wage." So, now it is proposed, in all good faith, to raise the minimum wage above that of other States of the Union. If the minimum wage is raised, the job potential and job security of a whole new block of employees will be threatened.

During the ten years that I have been in business, I have employed a great number of people between the ages of 16 and 20. Only one of them earned and received \$2.50 an hour during his period of employment. He was an exceptional boy and is, today, a medical student. You don't find too many of these people of this caliber going through an era like this when they are able to earn a high degree of money while they are still 16 and 20. This boy started at the minimum wage. He got raises as he learned. If I had to start him at his top rate of \$2.50 an hour, it would be economically impossible for me to hire him the first day. The higher we raise the minimum wage, the more people we remove from the labor market. The people lost to the labor market, generally, will end up receiving unemployment compensation,

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

FRIDAY - 1:00 P.M.

FEBRUARY 19, 1971

R. Upton: city welfare, or state welfare. This, obviously, raises Connecticut's tax burden.

I respectfully urge that the Connecticut Minimum Wage continue to follow Federal Statutes. Thank you.

Chr. Smith: Do we have any more speakers who are against the last category of bills?

G. Simpson: My name is George Simpson. I am Executive Secretary of the Connecticut Farm Bureau Association speaking in opposition to H. B. 5176 (Rep. Badolato of the 30th, Rep. Stolberg of the 112th) AN ACT CONCERNING EXTENDING THE MINIMUM WAGE STATUTES TO MIGRATORY WORKERS. First of all, Mr. Chairman, the bill while it does state that it mentions only migratory workers in its statement, it would include every agricultural employee in the State of Connecticut.

I should point out at first that the Connecticut Farm Bureau is a general farm organization of 2500 member families who represent the production of about every Connecticut produced commodity and they represent every level of production from the smallest part-time producer up to the largest producer. The fact that we must compete with industry for employees has in itself resulted in wage levels that have placed us in the position of paying some of the highest wage rates in the country. As we employ many of our employees through the State Employment Service, we are required to pay, at least, hourly wage levels equivalent to the Federally established prevailing wage rate or adverse affect wage for Connecticut of approximately \$1.80 an hour, that is, if the Employment Service is to provide us with their services.

The fact that we have little influence on market price of our products, that the whims of nature have a decisive effect on the financial out-come of any year and the fact that we produce in one of the highest cost area of the country and the fact that we have to compete with farmers outside of the State of Connecticut, which are not faced with operation under similar legislation, creates a condition that could cause us some real difficulty financially. Agriculture, generally, is the only remaingin area of employment that provides, for example, housing - not only for seasonal workers but for year around key employees who live in homes provided by the farm employer. While it is a sizable monetary benefit, it is seldom considered among the employee's actual cash earnings. Most of what we produce is under market conditions which leaves us with little in the form of a means to pass on any rising costs and it's an industry in which each producer's product is idential to his neighbors. It's milk

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

FRIDAY - 1:00 P.M.

FEBRUARY 19, 1971

G. Simpson:

alone, it's eggs, potatoes, apples, vegetables, tobacco, and livestock. It carries no trade name and the fact that he deals with the unpredictable effects of nature and the fact that in many phases, he has only one crop to harvest and sell, leaves him in an extremely vulnerable position. The wages which Connecticut agriculture pays are considerably affected by the wage level in industry, as I mentioned earlier, and as well, the wage requirements, if you are to employ through the State and Federal Employment Service. I also pointed out that we provide housing only for individuals but for families. The housing of families are primarily provided in non-seasonal type farm businesses, such as the dairy farming business or the poultry farming business. I doubt if this benefit would receive much more than token consideration in the computation of the effective minimum wage level. Just for an example, in our own operation that ended in 1960 at the time of my father's retirement, the two employees who worked for us at that time had a wage level, and this was in 1960, of between \$90. and \$115. a week but the benefits included a $5\frac{1}{2}$ room apartment for one family and a $4\frac{1}{2}$ room home for the other, including all utilities which were borne at the employer's expense and both were provided with all their milk, their eggs, their beef, and their poultry meat requirements, all the garden space they wished including the use of all the farm equipment. The question becomes what kind of value would be given to the benefits in addition to the wages under our minimum wage law to say, an apartment or the house, which are currently renting at about an average of \$140. a month. What kind of value and what kind of consideration would be given in considering whether or not they are receiving wages that would be in compliance with the law. Currently, they certainly would be in compliance with the Federal Minimum Wage for agricultural workers at \$1.30 an hour, which does not have any time-and-a-half requirements for overtime. How would we determine the value of those benefits if we got into trying to consider time-and-a-half for anything over 40 hours? The minimum wage, too, would probably rule out the employment of some 8 to 10,000 young people who have no other employment activities, other opportunities, other than farm employment.

Now, there are two points, primarily, we would be extending to Connecticut agriculture a requirement that the farms which they compete with that are located outside the State, we would have to comply with the law that they would not be required to, yet we would be competing for the same markets and at the same time with the additional benefits that are provided of a non-cash nature, the type of consideration and complexity that we would become involved in in giving proper consideration to these in the determination of a wage or a time-and-a-half for overtime. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

FRIDAY - 1:00 P.M.

FEBRUARY 19, 1971

A. C. Fisher: My name is A. C. Fisher. I am General Manager of the Connecticut Milk Producers Association. Our Association represents, by far, the great majority of the remaining 1100 dairy farms in the State of Connecticut left out of a total of, back about 1940, of approximately 6000 dairy farms as they were at that time. Our dairy industry in the State of Connecticut represents approximately 50% of all agricultural income. For our members, I wish to register our opposition to H. B. 5176 (Rep. Badolato of the 30th, Rep. Stolberg of 112th) AN ACT CONCERNING EXTENDING THE MINIMUM WAGE STATUTES TO MIGRATORY WORKERS, which would in affect remove the Agricultural Workers Exemption from the Minimum Wage Statutes. I will not repeat what Mr. Simpson has said regarding the almost impossibility of properly evaluating the fringe benefits that the agricultural workers get at the present time but it is a very definite fact that it would be next to impossible to do so.

I can't imagine what an administrative monstrosity also that this would mean as far as the implementation of this bill as far as the Labor Department of the State. I wish to point out very briefly, that our 1100 remaining dairy farmers in the State of Connecticut contribute very substantially to the Open Space Program in this State. They are very definitely in competition with producers surrounding us in Massachusetts, New York and Rhode Island, as well as other parts of the Northeast, where the milk market is. It is a very competitive situation. It would be disastrous to the dairy farmers if they were brought under these minimum wage statutes. That finishes my statement. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chr. Smith: Thank you. We will read into the record the correspondence from:

Co-operative Area Manpower Planning System, Committee of the Stamford area, is in support of S. B. 337 (Sen. Eddy of the 9th, Rep. Boggini of the 20th, Rep. Ritter of the 6th, Sen. Jackson of the 5th, Rep. Matthews of the 161st) AN ACT CONCERNING A SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM FOR TEEN-AGERS.

Statement in support of H. B. 6047 (Rep. O'Brien of the 131st) AN ACT CONCERNING ESTABLISHING A LABOR-MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL, from Rep. Thomas O'Brien, 131st District.

The Connecticut Council of Churches in support of H. B. 5176 (Rep. Badolato of the 30th, Rep. Stolberg of the 112th) AN ACT CONCERNING EXTENDING THE MINIMUM WAGE STATUTES TO MIGRATORY WORKERS.

The Connecticut Jewish Community Relations Council is in support of H. B. 5176 (Rep. Badolato of the 30th, Rep. Stolberg of the 112th) AN ACT CONCERNING EXTENDING THE MINIMUM WAGE STATUES TO MIGRATORY WORKERS.

H-116

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 9
3878-4343**

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

178.

THE SPEAKER:

Tabled for the Calendar and printing.

THE CLERK:

Page 7 of the Calendar. Cal. 1042, Sub. for H.B. 5176.

AN ACT CONCERNING EXTENDING THE MINIMUM WAGE STATUTES TO
MIGRATORY WORKERS.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 30th.

MR. BADOLATO: (30th)

Mr. Speaker, we have another good labor bill and I
move for acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and
passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Would you remark.

MR. BADOLATO: (30th)

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment. I would be
happy to outline the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

MR. BADOLATO: (30th)

While the Clerk is finding it, we can save some time.
This amendment again is a result of discussions, many discussions
held with the parties concerned. The bill in the file without
this amendment would have created some problems. We hope that
we may be able to resolve those problems with the amendment.
The amendment provides that for agricultural workers the minimum

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

179.

wage will stay at \$1.61 an hour until October 1, 1972. At that time it will go up to \$1.70 and it will stay into effect until October 1, 1973, at which time the minimum wage will then go up to \$1.85. We are also providing in the amendment a provision to cover the minors under the age of eighteen with a minimum wage of 85 percent of the established minimum wage. In Sec. 4 of the Act we are also providing for an exemption in the overtime provisions of the law for agricultural workers. And as I pointed out earlier, the amendment is as a result of discussions held with the people in the industry. It is something that they feel they can live with and is acceptable to them. They have informed the leadership on both sides of the House that the amendment, or the bill as amended would be acceptable to them and something that they can live with. I urge its adoption.

roc

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule. Will you remark. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. HOUSE A IS ADOPTED. It is ruled technical. The gentleman from the 30th.

MR. BADOLATO: (30th)

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment A.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark on the bill as amended.

MR. BADOLATO: (30th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. This bill, as amended, for the first

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

180.

in the history of the State of Connecticut, brings under coverage of the minimum wage act agricultural workers. It has been a long time coming for those people that are involved in agricultural work. It is something that this session ought to be proud of. It's a bill that the Labor Committee certainly is proud of and the compromise is something that as time goes on will prove fruitful to all of the people concerned. There have been many people in the State of Connecticut that have been concerned about the plight of the agricultural worker and we are hopeful that this will resolve some of their concern. It is a good bill and I would urge passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage as amended. Will you remark further. Representative Hogan from the 177th.

MR. HOGAN: (177th)

Mr. Speaker, I have had a little experience with farms and farm labor and youths, etc. and probably I should absent myself but I don't intend to, since the others who are involved don't absent themselves on similar matters. Many times we get here and we hear people get up and say this is a people's bill. This is a people's bill. I cannot see this as a people's bill. We just passed the minimum wage law for \$1.85 per hour, and no one said that was a people's bill because this will increase the wages of every boy and girl that works in the supermarkets by 24cents an hour and the people will pay the bill. That should have been a people's bill. Now the title of this one is an act

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

181.

roc

concerning minimum wage for migratory farm workers. There is absolutely nothing in the bill that refers to migratory farm workers. This refers to workers in agricultural areas. We have all heard a lot about the grapes in California, we have heard a lot about the lettuce in California and regardless of what may be said here, this is putting your foot in the wine barrel, the grape or the lettuce barrel or something. Now when it comes to the nitty-gritty, if that's the word that sometimes is used around here., the question before this Assembly here today is whether you want more boys and girls on the streets or whether you want them in some type of good healthy employment. Now it is not too difficult for any farmer, myself included, to go into chemical farming. We can buy another machine, go into more machine farming but the chemical farming is very easy the equipment if needed is not expensive, the spray in most cases is not expensive and if the environment bills in this Assembly passes they will rule all sprays out of the way or out of order, then we can easily go into that. I want to tell you a little bit of an experience that I had in the last couple of weeks. Two weeks ago, Sunday, I had a fellow call me from Simsbury who said he would like his daughter to pick strawberries for me, which incidentally is piece work so it is/now under this Act. This is why I feel that I can talk on it. When the gentleman said he would like to have his daughter work for me and I said, "how old is she?" He said she is sixteen. And I said, where do you live. He said we live in West Simsbury. Well, I said, this just would

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

182.

roc

not pay for her to pick strawberries way over here. We don't go to Simsbury that's tobacco country. We don't go up there to get farm workers, we just^{use}/local girls, and maybe they work two hours or three hours and it doesn't pay for someone to come a long distance for those few short hours that they are going to work. And he said, we are not concerned about the money. He said, "I have heard about your farm, I've heard about the girls and I have heard about how they are used (laughter) - this was the father talking, not the girl. I told him it just wouldn't pay. About four days later I got a letter and he said I am sure Cynthia is going to be working for you this summer if you like her. We are going to bring her up. Rep. Webber from New Haven has asked me if I could find a place for his boy to work up on the farm. He is fourteen years old and he doesn't want any pay; he wants to get him out on the farm. But I saved the best one till last. A week ago Sunday, we had two girls drive in the yard. They weren't too bad looking. They had a nice looking automobile and they said they were from New Haven. One was 19 and one was 20. They were going to college and they said they would like to come to work on the farm for the summer. They wanted to get out of New Haven. But we assured them if they were going to college and maintain an apartment in New Haven during the college time they wouldn't make money enough on a farm; of course under this Act I suppose the rebuttal will be that they will, but we told them they just wouldn't make money enough and this is the interesting part they said we could live in; we don't want any money.

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

183.

(More laughter) And if we can't live in, if you will find us some quarters and pay our board that's all the money we want. So I think there is a definite trend for people who want their children to get out in the country to do some work on the farm to get away from the gangs, to get away from the dope which this Legislature is so much concerned with and to become healthy citizens. I have from time to time and quite often brought in some of my farm help here. I might bring some more tomorrow. This is my so-called slave labor and they aren't too bad. I think they are fairly healthy people and I think that this is nothing more or less than an attempt by the labor people to get their hands on agriculture and I won't say why I think so.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended. Rep. Lyons.

MR. LYONS: (149th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think when Mr. Badolato brought this bill out he said it was a good bill. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, any bill that pays a man less than \$80.00 per week, is a lousy bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended. Rep. Vicino.

MR. VICINO: (34th)

Mr. Speaker, I am not too familiar with the problems in the area of agriculture especially in the migratory workers; Although last summer I had an occasion to be involved with some of our youngsters from Bristol, probably one to two hundred of

roc

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

184.

them who were working in the tobacco fields here in Connecticut. After visiting the farms and receiving many complaints from constituents whose children were working on these farms, I think that the bill is a good bill. In a fact it doesn't go far enough as far as I am concerned. We witnessed inadequate toilet facilities, we witnessed children who were the recipients, if I can use the word, of tobacco rash, who were working the fields after the rains, who were sent home after an hour or two after being transported for a hour or two drive from our town and I certainly think that 85% of the minimum wage for these children is justified and adequate. I support the bill and I hope that the members of the house will consider the ramifications of such a bill especially for the thousands of children who work in our tobacco industry here in Connecticut.

roc

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Vaill.

MR. VAILL: (173rd)

I rise to oppose this bill. I see here that we are raising the minimum wage by 25 cents. I think anybody here would like to get a 25 percent raise. I think the consumers are going to pay it and I know that I have four or five boys who work for me after school and on weekends. They are not paid as low as the minimum wage but when you raise the minimum wage you raise all the people that have been working for a number of years. And to keep the wages in line, I think this is a very bad bill.

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

185.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended. Rep. Ajello.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, I think we should keep the perspective in mind as we consider a bill like this which has great import, that there is a vast difference between the kind of operation run by the two distinguished farmers who have spoken this afternoon on the bill and as one who has had some experience with farm work, enough to make me not want to do anymore of it as a young man, and I can say I think truthfully that the only thing that made my father get all the way through college was that everytime he went home he had to work on the farm. So that, there is a good aspect to having a place like the farms run by these gentlemen where a young person can go and get the kind of work experience that he really needs and learn the virtues of the outdoors and hard work and hones work and all that goes with it. An in that respect, I wish that we didn't have to have a bill before us today because I don't think that the scale of pay in a situation like that means anything. In fact, as recently as when I was in law school, I would go and work on the farm for no pay at all. Although perhaps I wasn't always happy to do it, I feel it was an important contribution. And we still own that farm. But there is no doubt that any of us who have looked at the situation of the tru migratory worker, the farm worker who has so little control over his own destiny, realizes the importance of the protection for those people. There are people who are exploited,

roc

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

186.

roc

who are brought to live in places to work who have no ability and no money to get away from those places and who are subjected to terrible exploitation as has been pointed out earlier. It is because of those abuses that this kind of bill is able to be before us and be favorably considered today. I think it is a sad comment on human nature and inhumanity to his fellow man that we have to do this sort of thing because were it only for the tneafarmer, the residents such as the gentleman who are members of this House, I would not think that we ought to have a bill like this before us. I recently had occasion to see the progress that has been made in the State of Florida where they built new facilities for their migrant workers where it is of course a much more serious problem than it is here in terms of numbers and they are across the street and side by side from the former dwellings of those migrant workers which are simply shacks with no windows, no toilet facilities, no sinks, etc. So if this is a trend which seeks to protect those who cannot protect themselves, then in that sense I support it and I think it is a good idea. It is sad that we have to do it at all.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended. Rep. Edwards.

MR. EDWARDS: (155th)

Mr. Speaker, a question, through you to the Majority Leader. You have brought up a point that you are unhappy but also as I recall your language, sir, you did distinguish between the professional, if you want to call it migratory worker, and

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

187.

roc

the farm youngster that Rep. Hogan and Vaill are taking about, who can really be described as casual labor who reside within the area, etc., who are not professional labor. Could it not have been possible to so word the bill that the migratory worker who, I agree with you, is badly treated, very badly and this bill should protect him, but could not that wording have been so made that he would be protected and yet the opportunity for the youngster who would like to do casual work on the farm would still exist.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Well, Mr. Speaker, of course there is a distinction and the amendment which placed an 85% limitation on the pay of the young people recognized that. I think that in all fairness, we must say that there is no definition that the problem is not susceptible of being spelled out in the statutes which would make a sensible distinction between the migratory worker and the part-time worker, because in essence, although not in actuality, on paper they look the same. They can be classified part-time in a sense. They are only there for a short period of the year and brought in for a short period of time. I suspect that the resourcefulness of the farmers will go a long way towards alleviating some of the problems brought on by this bill, although of course not all. I recognize their unhappiness with it.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended. Rep. Vaill, speaking

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

188.

for the second time.

MR. VAILL: (173rd)

Mr. Speaker, agriculture is presently under the Federal Minimum Wage Law which is a \$1.30. This raise would raise it up to a \$1.61 which is a 31 cent raise per hour. The present legislation before Congress right now that is favorable is a raise of the Federal Minimum Wage to \$1.50. Now this seems more feasible to keep this under the Federal minimum wage than it does to create a minimum wage in Connecticut. It gives everybody a 25% raise across the board. Therefore, I oppose the bill and I move that when the vote is taken, it be taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call. All those in favor indicate by saying AYE. A roll call will be ordered.

Does the Clerk have further business to be read in.

THE CLERK:

With Emergency Certification of Favorables from Judiciary, Sub. for H.B. 5715. AN ACT CONCERNING WORK AND RECREATION ON SUNDAY.

THE SPEAKER:

Tabled for the Calendar and printing.

Does the gentleman from the 118th have information relating to three items which were passed temporarily, which he now wishes to move for Pass, Retaining while we await the return of the members.

roc

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

189.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I can find some of them. We still seem to be having trouble with alcoholic problems, Mr. Speaker, I would therefore move that Cal. 1202, Sub. for H.B. 6886 be Passed Retaining its Place.

THE SPEAKER:

Unless there is objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Page 8, Cal. 1126, Sub. for H.B. 7842.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, I would move that that Calendar item 1126, Sub. for H.B. 7842 be Passed, Retaining Its Place.

THE SPEAKER:

Motion is to Pass, Retaining. Unless there is objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Page 13, Cal. 1231, H.B. 5047, which was Passed, retaining earlier today.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

This item will be ready for action today. We expect to take that up.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

I move that Cal. 913, on Page 30, Sub. for H.B. 6161 be Passed Retaining its Place.

THE SPEAKER:

Unless there is objection, so ordered.

roc

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

190.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the members be seated and the aisles cleared. I will announce the roll call again. For the benefit of the members who have just returned. We are on Page 7, Cal. 1042, Sub. for H.B. 5176, in your files as 1141, AN ACT CONCERNING EXTENDING THE MINIMUM WAGE STATUTES TO MIGRATORY WORKERS. Will you remark further. Rep. Miscikoski.

MR. MISCIKOSKI: (174th)

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to bring out one thing that wasn't brought out before on the discussion of the \$1.85 minimum wage. It really is not 25 cents an hour more, its 14 cents an hour more because when you include 25 cents per hour in increase you have to, everything in business is based on total gross payroll, so that means your social security will go up, your workmen's compensation, your state and federal unemployment rates will go up plus miscellaneous things. I just wanted to get this clear, that this is 40 cents an hour and the people in the state of Connecticut are going to pay for this in all the services when they go to their laundry to get your shirts, your suits cleaned, everything across the board, they are all going to go up.

THE SPEAKER:

I would respectfully remind the gentleman that we are talking about migratory workers.

MR. MISCIKOSKI: (174th)

I don't know why we have two separate bills, when we

roc

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

191.

are discussing the same thing. Why didn't they just make the one package deal and run it through.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended, now pending before us. Rep. Badolato.

MR. BADOLATO: (30th)

Mr. Speaker, briefly I would like to point out that so that the people won't get the wrong impression. Agricultural workers are not covered under the unemployment compensation act. It is true they are covered under the Federal Minimum Wage Act but we do not have a State Minimum Wage Act. I would like to point out for the membership of the house that figures that were given to the Labor Committee by the Research Department at the University of Connecticut indicate that the people that are brought in from Puerto Rico now receive a minimum wage of \$1.80 an hour by contract with Puerto Rico. The youths that are working at least in the tobacco industry, receive a minimum wage, not a minimum wage but on piece work and they average \$1.45 an hour. There has been enough comment about the large increase bill if it were to pass. It is really not a large increase, it is because we are talking about providing a minimum wage for minors below the age of 18 of 85% of the established minimum wage. So that until July 1 of next year, the minors will be receiving a dollar and thirty-six cents an hour; so that it is only six cents an hour increase. They were talking about for a period of a year and even if we were to extend it to the following year, it would only go to a \$1.44 an hour so that it would be an

roc

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

192.

increase over a two-year period of 14 cents an hour. Now that the people who are paid lobbyists, the people that are here representing the industry, have endorsed this bill as amended. They did not endorse the original bill but they do endorse this bill as amended and support this bill as amended. It was by agreement by all of the parties concerned. They are happy with it. They would urge the adoption, if they were here they would say it themselves and they have said it to the leadership on both sides. I urge passage.

THE SPEAKER;

The gentleman from the 173rd wish unanimous consent to speak for the third time. Is there objection. Hearing none, Rep. Vaill.

MR. VAILL: (173rd)

Mr. Speaker, I can see the difference between the migratory worker who is a skilled worker usually because he has worked at what he is doing for a number of years, sometimes for the first time he is learning to go into tobacco or start in the citrus groves in Florida and work up to peaches in Georgia and on up to apples in Connecticut in the fall. But where you put all of agriculture under this law, where in cases of dairy or raising cattle for beef or some cases strawberry patches, potatoes, vegetables, I think you have to take into consideration that a lot of these workers are boarded, they are fed home-cooked meals, sometimes they move in with the family, their houses are provided, all their utilities, their milk; I think by putting a

roc

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

193.

minimum wage on to raise the minimum wage 25 percent, there has to be some adjustment along these lines. Therefore, I further oppose the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill. The gentleman from the 10th.

MR. FRAZIER: (10th)

Mr. Speaker, last year I made an extensive tour of the tobacco fields in Windsor. Mr. Speaker, there are many migratory workers that receive \$3.00 and a train ticket or a bus ticket to come to Connecticut. I have seen them working in these tobacco fields, actually what I am getting at is that any time of increase in their salaries would be appreciated. I've seen them take one sandwich, I've seen them take a container of milk under those hot nets under the tobacco fields in the middle of the day the milk has curdled. Mr. Speaker, I have seen the living conditions they undergo and any time of increase in salary would be appreciated. I will vote for the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Are you ready to vote. Rep. Hogan from the 177th speaking for the second time.

MR. HOGAN: (177th)

Mr. Speaker, just one more word. The higher you raise the wage, the more you encourage them to come here, the more they will stay here and create some of the other problems that we have and I am not kidding on this one.

roc

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

194.

THE SPEAKER:

roc

The machine will be opened. Has every member voted.

The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting	146
Necessary for Passage	74
Those Voting Yea	110
Those Voting Nay	36
Absent and Not Voting	31

THE SPEAKER:

THE BILL IS PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Page 13, Cal. 1231. House Bill 5047. AN ACT ESTABLISHING AN EQUALIZED GRAND LIST AND A UNIFORM SIXTY-FIVE PERCENT ASSESSMENT RATE FOR PROPERTY TAXATION.

This matter was Passed, Retaining earlier today.

THE SPEAKER:

At this time then it would be to Reconsider our previous action. Rep. Mettler.

MR. METTLER: (96th)

Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider our previous action.

THE SPEAKER:

Were you in the prevailing vote.

MR. METTLER: (96th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark on reconsideration. Is there objection. Hearing none, the item will be reconsidered.

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 7, 1971

132.

THE CLERK:

Turn to Cal. 1136 please, file 1141 Favorable substitute report of the joint standing committee on Labor and Industrial Relations on H.B. 5176 An Act Concerning Extending the Minimum Wage Statutes to Migratory Workers.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, I meant to say as amended by House amendment Sch. A. And I would like to waive the reading of the amendment. And try to explain. It is File 1141 and Mr. President, in the amendment which was ironed out as agreement between the Representatives of Agricultural association, Sec. 2 has been dropped. And these, the minimum fair wage for agricultural employees are to take effect in steps that shall not be less than \$1.61 per hour as of October 1, 1971. And effective October 1, 1972 not less than \$1.70 per hour. And effective Oct. 1, 1973, not less than \$1.85 per hour. It is a gradual increase for agricultural workers to bring them up to standard. Section 3 has been added to the file and this provided, Mr. President, members of the circle that minors between ages 16 and 18 years who are employees of the State or any political sub-division thereof. Shall be paid a minimum wage of not less than 85% of the minimum fair wages defined as above. And minors between the ages of 14 and 18 who are agricultural employees shall be paid a minimum wage of not less than 85% of the minimum fair wage defined above. And of course Section 4 is added which is an amendment to 1969 Supplement of Sec. 31-76I and it simply amended by adding sub-

June 7, 1971

133.

section K, as follows, that any person employed in agriculture. I move for passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1138, File 1344, Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Government Administration and Policy on H.B. 5849 An Act Concerning Designation of a Sewer Authority by A Municipality.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Mr. President, this allows municipalities to designate regional water authorities as the municipal sewer authority. It also allows these respective sewer authority to exchange staff services and equipment etc. with other municipalities or persons to implement the sewer systems. And to make arrangements for any and other lawful services.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1139, File 1295 Favorable substitute report of the joint standing committee on Banks and Regulated Activities on Substitute H.B. 6171 Permitting Saving and Loan Associations