

SB 386

PA 624 (Vetoed)

1971

Corrections, Welfare + Humane Inst. 110, 251-254,
264, 269-270, 285-286

House 5572-5586

Senate 1244

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**CORRECTIONS,
WELFARE
AND
HUMANE
INSTITUTIONS**

1-342

**1971
Index**

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

Mrs. McCall: Gertrude McCall from the statewide WRAP group of Welfare Recipients are People. On House Bill 6363, I only have two questions on that which is that welfare carries out the inner agency policies when they support and direct a center. I already know about the health, fire and so forth. And I'm interested in the Federal regulations. I am informed that this legislation session must change the law so Welfare Day Care Centers can be integrated by income and not just for Welfare children. We also support five million to be appropriated for day care and the reduction of the town matching share of ten percent. And I have the revised revision of House Bill 6363 to submit to the Committee. House Bill 59, wait a minute, Senate Bill 386 on housing, we support. House Bill 6682 6992 we support. Senate Bill 1129, we support. Public Employment House Bill

Mr. Ciarlone: Hold on one second please. Mam, where are you getting those numbers from, those various bill numbers?

Mrs. McCall: I got it from the ad hoc human rights medical sub a Welfare sub-committee bill.

Sen. Ciarlone: I see, because we do not those bills before us this morning.

Mrs. McCall: Right, but I just wanted to get onto the agenda. If I may.

Sen. Ciarlone: I might just say when you do give us those numbers just go a bit slower so we can make notes of your testimony. Thank you.

Mrs. McCall: Would you like me to repeat them?

Sen. Ciarlone: If you would please.

Mrs. McCall: That is in the housing, Senate Bill 386, we support. House Bill 6682 and 6992, we support. Senate Bill 1129, we support. On Public Employment, House Bill 5949, we oppose, very strongly. Medical Assistance, House Bill 6340, we support. And we have also adopted the Ad Hoc Committee for Human Rights Sub-Committee of their recommendation on housing bills and we have adapted it as our statement also and I have a copy of that to submit. And House Bill 5378. we oppose. Senate Bill 127, we oppose. Thank you very much.

Sen. Ciarlone: There's a question here from Senator Crafts.

Sen. Crafts: Mam, you just stated that your organization opposes House Bill No. 5949.

Mrs. McCall: Right.

THURSDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

APRIL 1, 1971

So may I ask at this time if there are questions of Mr. Burrell, would he be permitted to answer them and then would you permit a brief statement by Mr. Boyle?

Rep. Chagnon: I'm just wondering which you would prefer, Ernie, testi- such as you have given here, to our Executive Session?

Mr. Halstedt: We'd be happy, very very happy to discuss that if Mr. Boyle could be invited to that.

Rep. Chagnon: Would that be agreeable with you? I think those are matters that...we're not hiding anything from the Public but I think that the mechanics that you are working out here in cooperation with us is something that we'd like to go through in Executive Session.

Mr. Halstedt: That would be very helpful, very helpful. And we would hope to have a Bill to show you at that time. Thank you very much.

Rep. Chagnon: We have some people here from the Welfare Department that have to go down to Washington and get it straightened out down there and Mr. Bernstein, I wonder if you can briefly report what you have. Identify yourself.

Mr. Bernstein: Irvin Bernstein, State Welfare Department. I'd like to speak to a few bills. First, Senate Bill No. 4, the Department recommends the continuance of the present law and hence, is opposed to this Bill. Our statement is more detailed but I will just say generally, that there has been a growing national trend over the last several years, to leave adult children of the burden and responsibility of providing support for their parents. On Senate Bill 148, the Department is recommending that this Bill be transferred to the Judiciary Committee on the ground that the weight of the Court fees where the recipient is unable to pay is more properly within the jurisdiction of that Committee rather than the Welfare Committee. On Senate Bill 386, the Department is opposed to this Bill as it is presently worded. What this Bill would do in effect, is give the landlord an extra month's rent. We feel this way because it is very easy to show that a person who has been a tenant has affected wear and tear and I think all of us who are tenants and have had to pay security deposits, know or have heard of landlords coming in and saying I will not return your security deposit because the place is dirty and so forth. As a result, we feel that almost all landlords, particularly those who are landlords of beneficiaries, would take advantage of the tenants, would take advantage of the State Welfare Department, notwithstanding the provisions about negotiations and so forth. The Department, however, would like to make this suggestion to the Committee; that we would not be opposed to the Bill providing a guarantee by the Department of no more, and I repeat, no more than one month's rent for the non payment of rent. We take this position on this basis. We know that it is very difficult for

THURSDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

APRIL 1, 1971

public assistance beneficiaries to get housing. And we also realize that not only for public welfare beneficiaries but for tenants who are not on Welfare, the landlords are more and more insistent on security deposits. We, therefore, feel that while we don't want to pay the deposit, that it guarantees to the landlord that if you will give an apartment or a flat to a public assistance beneficiary and he's afraid that the beneficiary is going to move out on him and he'll lose a month's rent, at least we will guarantee to that landlord that if this is the basis of his losing a month's rent, that the Welfare Department would, on such proof by the landlord, be willing to guarantee that amount. This would be only a one time basis fellows, not like the direct payment to landlords which we discussed with your Committee. The only purpose of this is to encourage a landlord who is afraid of Welfare beneficiaries to give the housing to the beneficiary and not be afraid again that the beneficiary would skip out on them and owe them a month's rent.

Sen. Ciarlone: Mr. Bernstein, Ciarlone of the Committee, would this be in conflict with any Federal legislation? This one month payment.

Mr. Bernstein: Well, I assume you're talking about matching, Senator Ciarlone, and I discussed this with Mr. Bauer yesterday. We're not sure. Mr. Bauer felt that we might be able to get matching but even if we didn't, we we figure that there would not be that many cases that in order to help the housing situation for beneficiaries, and after all they're human beings just like the people who are not, that a guarantee to the landlord of this one month's rent, would help us get rents, get housing for our people and perhaps even result in a saving where we'd perhaps have to give temporary housing more expensive to beneficiaries. It's an incentive to a landlord and I can't give you a definite answer. All I can say is Mr. Bauer said he thought we might be able to get matching.

(unidentified speaker) I have a question. On the one hand you are saying to me, to the Committee, that the Department would guarantee one month's rent, as far as security deposit is concerned, am I correct?

Mr. Bernstein: That's right, sir.

(unidentified speaker) But on the other hand, it is so stated that is in affect now as I know it, that the Department, once a Welfare recipient does not meet their payment on time, the Department automatically takes over and sends the check directly to the landlord. But, if we guarantee, I don't get the point, because you automatically pay the rent every month anyway.

Mr. Bernstein: Well, sir, we of course, oppose Public Act 299, as you know, Representative Morgan, because we're going along with the

THURSDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

APRIL 1, 1971

beneficiary that on the whole the beneficiary wants to get the month's rent, I'll just give that as one example. They want to have the right to, as human beings, to control it. This, what we're suggesting to the Committee, is that we would be willing to guarantee only one month rent to the landlord. In other words, the beneficiary would still get his rent in his check. Now, let us say that there's one month, this month, that the beneficiary does not pay his month's rent. The landlord would then get that month's rent from us. But, he's then on notice from us that that's all. Hereafter, we are going to continue sending the check directly to the beneficiary and if the landlord is not happy, if he's afraid he's going to lose his rent thereafter, he can then go and institute eviction proceedings. But that's his headache. We are willing in order to, you know there's some landlords claiming, well the welfare beneficiaries are poor rents and they're not going to pay their rent. In order to help the beneficiaries get housing, we are willing to guarantee that one month and thereafter we will continue to send the check to the beneficiaries and, as you know, the way they've talked at Hearings, that's what they want. If the landlord is afraid the tenant beneficiary is a poor risk, it's his headache, he's got to institute the eviction proceedings. We would do our duty. We would be paying the check to the beneficiary, not to the landlord. And of course, we get matching. Of course, the whole problem, as Senator Ciarlone said, is the problem of matching. Under P A 299, once you get above that ten percent protective payment, you get no matching. We are only taking the risk, possible risk, as I just said, of losing the matching on that one month's rent.

(Unidentified speaker) This would assume that we'd do away with that 299.

Mr. Bernstein: That's right, sir. That's what that assumes, that's correct, sir.

(unidentified speaker) Well, are there any cases where today, where any landlords have been behind since you've had this new law was instituted in, let's see, it was instituted in 1969. There's never been, to my knowledge, any landlord who has been without a month's rent.
(inaudible)

Senator Ciarlone: I think Senator Finney has a question.

Senator Finney: You are merely, what you're trying to do here is to get Housing, aren't you?

Mr. Bernstein: That's our major concern. That's right, Senator Finney. But it's, as Senator Ciarlone said, I should have said we're assuming that P A 299 is repealed. And this of course, as all of us are when we go to rent a house or an apartment, the landlords are more and more insisting on security deposits. And

THURSDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

APRIL 1, 1971

so this is a double incentive. A, it's, the beneficiaries as human beings anyway, and B, there is so much talk of landlords that the beneficiary is a poor risk and so forth. So, at least he can be sure that he won't have to worry about the beneficiary skipping out on him. As I said to Senator Ciarlone, even if the final decision of the Federal Government is that we would not get matching for this month's rent, we feel that the overall benefit to the, in the housing picture for the public assistance beneficiary, is fine as far as the State Welfare Department is concerned. We want to get housing for these people. That's the whole picture of my remarks. On Senate Bill 727, we have no objection to the Bill. This is the one about the Town's responsibility for injuries being expadded. The only point I want to make here is I want to be sure the Committee understands that if this Bill is passed, that the net affect would be that we would have to increase reimbursement to the towns. There would be more claims. On 731, An Act Concerning Emergency Homes which is only a statement of purpose bill, we very much favor the establishment of emergency homes. We feel we now have the authority to do this under Section 1734, but we would like to see an appropriation earmarked, if necessary, for this purpose.

Senator Ciarlone: Have you any idea what the appropriation should be?

Mr. Bernstein: On a statement of purpose bill, it's very hard to say. It's just that if the Committee comes up with definite figures, I can only say as to the purpose of the Bill, we are much in favor of it. On Senate Bill 736, since the conformity issue is so much in the highlights, or headlines these days, I would like to point out that the Bill is talking about the ceiling on earnings in the general assistance program. The conformity issue only involves public assistance. So that we are of the opinion that if the city were, that if the city were, if the ceiling were removed in general assistance, there would be an increase in the amount of money we would have to reimburse the towns. So that is our only point. If the Committee, in its judgment decides to give it a favorable, and remove the ceiling, we would not object to it, except that we want to assure that the Committee realizes there would be, as a net result, result in more reimbursement and the second point I want to point out to the Committee is that this is not a conformity issue so that we are not necessarily insisting that this Bill must be passed or recommending hopefully the Bill will be passed so that we would be in conformity. It is not a conformity issue.

(unidentified speaker) We don't get anything back from Washington on this.

Mr. Bernstein: This is G A sir, that's right. Senate Bill 940, again a statement of purpose bill, I need hardly repeat to you that Commissioner White has said time and time again that he definitely wishes to have Day Care Centers, the number of Day Care Centers

THURSDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

APRIL 1, 1971

We do this because our positions in regard to this matter is that the whole issue of assimilation of Indians into the American's mainstream is one that should not be decided by Governmental policy, by statute, but rather on the free choice of the Indians involved. If in any way, this Bill should, 6683. could be interpreted to force assimilation or termination, it could be a very detrimental affect. Therefore, we ask that this Bill be considered in light of what it could do in terms of assimilation and termination. Thank you.

Rep. Chagnon: Do we have any further speakers?

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, ladies and gentlemen, my name Paul (inaudible) of Bridgeport, Connecticut. I'm a relative of the Chief Pan Harris of the Schaghticoke tribe. I've been on this reservation in 38, 39 and 40. We had some Pow Wows up there, where we had Indians from all over the State come to attend these regales. Things were made for them. People saw how they lived. My belief in this matter, I have seven children, and they tell me my children got eighth blood. Well, I can't see eighth blood, because I am Slovak and Slovak I'll always be. My children will have Slovak blood in them. My wife is a quarter Indian and therefore, I believe that my children are Indian. They are not quarter, half, eighth, sixteenth, etc. They are Indian, just like the white man, the black man, Japanese, or anybody else. We don't tell them that they got a quarter blood, they got an eighth blood, they are Japanese, they are colored, or they're white. We are Indian and I feel my children are that way. And I believe this is the way we should stay by it. You're either one or the other, there's no down the middle. You're either Indian or you're not Indian, or you're Japanese or you're not Japanese, or whatever the case may be. And definitely, I had such a wonderful time with these people, and they always treated me so good, I only wish I was born one of them.

Rep. Chagnon: Mr. Renkun, do you have any further people? We will proceed then to the regular order of business. And thank you so much for your presentation. Mark Aronson, Attorney for WRAP.

Mr. Aronson: I am Mark Aronson, Attorney for Welfare Recipients are People. I wish to speak briefly on four Senate Bills. First, Senate Bill 148 would permit a Judge of the Circuit Court to weigh the statutory filing fee for an appeal from a Welfare Fair Hearing decision. We favor this Bill. On Senate Bill 386, this Bill would authorize the Welfare Commissioner to guarantee in writing, the rental security deposit to cover damages to housing occupied by Welfare recipients. While we think an actual cash security deposit would result in more housing being made available to recipients, we recognize the need for priorities in cash outlays. We, therefore, would favor this Bill if it were coupled with a Bill such as Senate Bill 1129 which is now before the Human Rights and Opportunities Commission and would prohibit discrimination in housing against Welfare recipients.

THURSDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

APRIL 1, 1971

you because it's simply not available. This would, this Bill would give Welfare recipients who felt aggrieved by decisions of Fair Hearings that chance. And I think it's a chance that they should have. It would have also the beneficial affect of permitting State Courts to develop a body of law, rather than the practice which has become somewhat of a necessity lately, which is going into Federal Court on many Welfare issues, just because the Fair Hearing process runs out after the Fair Hearing because appeal fees can't be made.

Sen. Ciarlone: Excuse me, what is the time?

Mr. Waxman: I believe it's 30 days. So, essentially, you have one month's budget to get it out of and that often means food. On the second Bill I'd like to discuss is Senate Bill 386, which we support. I live in an apartment and have lived in one for several years and never looked at one where a security deposit hasn't been required of me and the same is true of most apartments that are up for rent right now. Some sort of security deposit, be a written lease or be it an oral month to month tenancy is required by most landlords. And, because of the absence of any provisions for those security deposits, the Welfare recipient finds himself in a situation where tremendous percentage of the available housing market which, in towns like New Haven and Hartford, are already overburdened. The Welfare recipient is cut out even further because of his inability to provide a security deposit. As far as the suggestion made by the gentleman who spoke earlier from the Welfare Department, of changing this to some sort of a guarantee of not more than one month's unpaid rent, I am not sure how that would work, quite frankly. I would hope that this Bill could be passed as it stands. I think the guarantee, unless it had very careful restrictions that made sure that it didn't fulfill the purpose of getting a landlord funds where a tenant was intentionally withholding rent because of the same kind of problem that has been raised with regard to the Bills on Rent Vendor Payments, that is the problem of tenant's right to complain about housing code violations, is right. I think that this sort of Bill would with a guarantee might lead into that problem unless it was very carefully structured to avoid that. So, on balance, we would oppose the Bill as written or we would support the Bill as written, pardon me.

Sen. Ciarlone: Excuse me, Mr. Waxman, Senator Finney has a question.

Sen. Finney: Mr. Waxman, would the ordinary security deposit be one month's rent?

Mr. Waxman: Yes, that's what I pay on my apartment right now and that's what I've usually been asked. There have been some cases of two months, but most of them are one month's rent.

THURSDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

APRIL 1, 1971

Sen. Finney: And it's the lack of this, on the part of the recipient, that sometimes prevents him from getting an apartment.

Mr. Waxman: That's correct.

Rep. Chagnon: Is there any legal basis for them doing that?

Mr. Waxman: Any legal basis for who doing what?

Rep. Chagnon: For the landlords in requiring deposits.

Mr. Waxman: I frankly don't know the answer to that, sir. I don't know of any statute that requires or prohibits, either way. But I know that it is fairly common practice. On the incentive earnings Bill, Senate Bill No. 736, we have submitted statements on this. This particular Bill seems to deal primarily with general assistance or local assistance. In New Haven, at least, and I believe everywhere else, there is no incentive earnings on general assistance so, we support the Bill because we feel that the ceiling on incentive earnings should be removed on all cases insofar as it applies to the State programs this is very definitely a conformity issue. And after a statement was made by the gentleman from the Welfare Department, I called back to my office to check the decision which we just got today and this is one of the major points in the conformity hearing, the ceiling on incentive earnings.

Sen. Ciarlone: On general assistance also, Mr. Waxman?

Mr. Waxman: On general assistance, I think the matter primarily is an academic one, quite frankly. I don't know of any general assistance programs which provide incentive earnings in any event. But I think just as a matter of clearing up the statutes completely, I would support the removal of the restriction. Now, Senate Bill 731, is an Act concerning emergency homes which I believe is similar to House Bill 8092 which has already been heard by this Committee. It's one that we support. It would provide for the Commissioner of Welfare to set up emergency homes in a situation, crisis situation where children had to be removed from a home someplace they could stay and get proper care and treatment, pending decision by the Juvenile Court or the Welfare Department as to what's to be done with them, whether they would be put into some other longer term type of home, group home or into a foster home or whether, after the crisis is over, they would be returned to their natural parent. But these kinds of homes, I think, are necessary to provide for this emergency kind of care. Finally, Senate Bill 940. An Act to expand the number of Day Care Centers, I think this is a vital matter. This is a statement of purpose Bill and I feel that gives me a little latitude to comment. I would say this, first, the need for the number of Day Care Centers is that, but second, the more important thing is the need for better coordination among the agencies

THURSDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

APRIL 1, 1971

don't want to disagree with you but I've taught in a Day Care Center for working mothers, I've taught in a nursery school, my kids have attended a nursery school and I really feel there is little difference between the kind of quality of staff and quality of program that you want to give to a child regardless of how many hours he's there, what kind of a home he comes from or what the auspices of the program are, the standards which we have attempted to put through in regulations in staffing, remember, we didn't get them. The standards that we put through are those that we think are the minimum standards, the minimum ratio of children to an adult, under any circumstances. We feel that kids are kids and they need a good program. Now, the fact of the matter is that the so-called Day Care Centers, where children of working mothers are cared for, if they have AFDC kids in them, or if they're going to be getting any Federal subsidy, have to conform to higher standards than we are requesting for the State as a whole. So these programs are okay. They aren't going to be any problem because they're going to have to conform to Federal regulations which say, for an example, five three year olds to an adult. We're saying seven. We would not think that the nursery school type of operation really wants a lower set of standards. And we certainly think we feel that the standard should be the same, regardless of what the type of operation is.

Rep. Chagnon: We may call you back on this. We're running into time now.

Mrs. Roberts: Remember, we're not talking about trained teachers, we're talking about adults. This could mean an adult in several ways, including volunteers.

Rep. Chagnon: Eliza Williams.

My name is Eliza Williams. I am the Temporary Chairman of Connecticut Welfare Rights and I'm the Vice Chairman of Waterbury Welfare Rights. We support S B 940. For five years in Waterbury, we have been fighting for Day Care. We finally got an okay, after fighting with the Mayor, the Board of Alderman and everybody else and we still don't have a Day Care. All I can say is that if this Committee can do anything to transfer it to any other Committee that will provide and start in operation, some Day Care Centers in Waterbury, we will fully agree with you. We are also in support of Bill 386. We find that we can get much better housing if the security deposit is made by recipients. We also understand the other problems in doing this. Landlords can start anytime, stopping recipients and asking them for security deposits for run down apartments. On the other hand, Welfare pays high rents. They're paying vendor payments to landlords right now, for undesirable housing. With the dire need for better housing, we'd rather pay security-deposits out of our own pockets but our children would be suffering more than they are doing now. We find that we can get an apartment for like \$70.00. We pay a security deposit of \$70.00 and where we're living at, our rent is \$70.00 and the landlord wants to go up to

THURSDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

APRIL 1, 1971

\$100.00 for a six room apartment and it's not fair. We'd rather pay the security deposit and get better housing and maybe pay \$85.00 a month, then for him to go up \$100 for unsuitable housing. And we are really in support of this Bill. And we feel that if there is a guarantee, the guarantee should be made with State Welfare and the landlord, that the apartment, if there are damages, is not because the landlord did not take care of the housing. If you have to take that security deposit and pay for damages, it should be on the part of the recipient, not on the part of the landlord. A lot of times, the landlords are saying recipients mess up the house and tear up the house when the houses have been run down and everything before the recipient ever moved in there. Thank you.

Rep. Chagnon: Thank you very much.

Sen. Finney: Do you think that if you were able to put down a security deposit of one month, you would get better housing?

Mrs. Williams: We have found by going out looking for housing, that we have found housing and landlords who want to rent to recipients, but they cannot pay that security deposit. You know like sometimes before the first of the month, when you pay your rent, the middle of the month you don't have no money to pay your rent, so you'd miss out because somebody else would come along with that deposit and get the apartment and you're still left there living in unsuitable housing.

Rep. Chagnon: Thank you very much. Gail Coleman.

Mrs. Coleman: I'm Gail Coleman and I'm from the New Haven Welfare Moms. I'm Vice President. I'd like to speak on a couple of Bills. I wanted to speak on 940 because I agreed with it. We do need more Day Care Centers, but then I guess it's 8938, I disagree with and I'm really not sure because I just found it when I got here. So it's very confusing. What I'd like to say is that the lady before me was saying is that Day Care Centers are necessary, nurseries and day care centers should be in the same qualifications. My son has been in both and I think the Day Care Centers are necessary, not just for working mothers, that need Day Care but it also should be the beginning for a child that's going to enter kindergarten. So, I think Day Care Centers are so necessary, especially in the urban communities where our school system isn't that well. The child does not get that start that he or she needs. And I think it has helped my son so much, because I am a working mother. And he has been at Day Care Centers and I think it has made such an improvement in him.

Rep. Chagnon: Tell us a little bit about your Day Care Centers.

Mrs. Coleman: My son has been in two. He's been in nursery school when he was three to four. In nursery school he played and they had mostly play and very little creative activity. In the Day Care

H-120

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 13
5555-6226**

Tuesday, June 8, 1971 18.

MBS

Mr. Speaker, I move that this item, Calendar No. 427 be passed retaining its place on the calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 633, Senate Bill No. 0739, An Act Concerning Burial by Towns.

JOSEPH COATSWORTH, 76th District:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

JOSEPH COATSWORTH, 76th District:

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an attempt, it's, I think, a valid one, to cut through some of the red tape that has caused problems between towns, in billing between towns for burial expenses. This act would provide that each town would merely bill the state for whatever funeral expenses were caused to them by deceased persons. I urge the passage of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 635, Substitute Senate Bill No. 386, An Act

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

19.

MBS

Concerning Rental Security Deposits Required of Welfare Recipients.

JOHN D. PRETE, 114th District:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

JOHN PRETE, 114th District:

Mr. Speaker, yes, this bill simply provides authority to the Commissioner of Welfare to offer security deposits where they are required by the landlord in order to open up more housing for welfare recipients. It is a good bill in that it eliminates the necessity for emergency housing about which we've heard a great deal recently, that is, emergency housing in hotels and motels and so forth. It's a good bill and ought to save money for the state of Connecticut. I urge its passage.

RONALD SARASIN, 95th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this item of legislation. I would point out that the Welfare Department is, in fact, not in favor of this bill and estimates that the potential cost of this type of legislation will be \$1,600,000. for which there is no provision in the budget and, in addition, to that there will be no federal match. I think before we take on an item such as this we should be very, very careful

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

20.

MBS

and should have provided the funds, which we have not done, we're in very strong opposition to this piece of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed? All those in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed? The Chair is in doubt.

JOSEPH COATSWORTH, 76th District:

Mr. Speaker, I move when the vote be taken, it be taken by a roll call.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, a roll call will be ordered.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further announcements or introductions during this period of time? If not, the House will stand at ease.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the members please be seated? Please be seated. For the benefit of those who just returned to the hall of the House, we are on page 6, Calendar 635 on which a roll call vote has been ordered. Will you remark further?

JOHN PRETE, 114th District:

Mr. Speaker, it seems that every time a welfare bill comes up in the House, we are faced with a problem of instant opposition, often without careful analysis of just exactly what the bill does and what impact it will have on the state.

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

21.

MBS

Now, the opposition to the bill stated that the bill will cost money and therefore, and it hasn't been appropriated. In fact, it has a favorable report of the Committee on Appropriations and, indeed, it will cost little, if anything. The fact that these are security deposits means that when the tenant vacates the housing the security deposit is returned to the Welfare Department, in this sense, there's no cost to the state. The benefits of the bill far outweigh any problems that there may be with it. I believe that the purpose of the bill is to open more housing to welfare recipients. The reason why more housing is needed, is simply this, the more housing that can be opened the less it is going to cost the state. If we can offer some security to the landlord he is going to be more willing to rent to welfare recipients and the critical housing shortage for welfare recipients will be relieved, at least to some extent, and as soon as it is relieved the price per family, per housing is going to go down. So that in the final analysis this bill doesn't cost money, this bill saves money. The reason why there's no federal participation is because it doesn't cost any money to begin with and so there's nothing for the federal government to participate with. In summary, it's a good bill, it will open more housing, the housing that is occupied by welfare recipients will be less expensive and in emergency situations it is less likely that recipients will be forced to live in motels and hotels, at terrific cost to the

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

22.

MBS

state. I believe it is a good bill and I believe it is a bill that will save money for the state of Connecticut and I urge that we support it.

OTHA BROWN, 148th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I would certainly agree with the statement that was made by the distinguished representative, Rep. Prete, I think that in the last few days that we have been in some real serious battles with respect to welfare. I would only say that our heads are bloody but unbowed. I think what we are talking about here is to whether welfare recipients are to be treated as decent human beings and people whose only problem may very well be is that they are poor. And the fact is, is that I believe that we agree that it is not a sin to be poor in this country and that it is not a crime to be poor so that if anything that they can be criticized for is that in a country such as ours, which is the richest country on earth, is that there are many people, about 30 million people in this country and those are the ones who are poor and need some type of assistance. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we have not only people who are poor but we have industries who are poor and we don't hesitate one moment, if necessary, to put up security deposits, or whatever is necessary, for our poor industry. And as a result, the greatest resource that we have in this country is its people, so that we are talking about people

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

23.

MBS

who happen to be poor. Let me remind you that no landlord is going to rent or provide housing to welfare recipients just because he is a welfare recipient, without that person meeting the same obligation as anyone else. In most of our housing, in most of our large cities, you have to pay a security deposit. That is a fact of life and if you don't pay a security deposit you cannot get certain housing, so prima facie, immediately, without any other cause a welfare recipient is denied even the pursuit of the same kind of housing as any other person, of any other human being so what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is the dignity of the individual, we are talking about the person being unique, having the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness whether he happens to be poor in this country or the more fortunate. I hope that we will search our hearts and our minds, our intellect most of all because we're not talking about begging for people, we're talking about the fact that this country has an obligation to help people to live the same way as other people who happen not to be poor. So again, Mr. Speaker, I know that our welfare bills have been suspect, they've had a rough time, we are still cheerful about it. This is one that I think is extremely important if we're to open up good housing for people who happen to be poor. I support this kind of step with this bill and I hope that the House will pass it unanimously. Thank you.

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

24.

MBS

JAMES LOWELL, 38th District:

Mr. Speaker, briefly, Mr. Speaker, speaking in opposition to the bill. There were some comments made previously that at first it was unanimously supported in the welfare committee, which it wasn't and then the Appropriations Committee it was another list that went through without any question about what was happening, or not happening. Next, I'd like to comment on the question of economics, which was...to which we were exposed by Rep. Prete and it was indicated that if we passed this bill we would make more housing available. I don't think that this has anything at all to do with making more housing available, there is a critical housing shortage which must be met through both public and private housing, new public and private housing which may in the long run bring down the cost of housing. With this particular bill it creates in addition to the fact that it will not affect the price of housing. An administrative nightmare for the Welfare Department. The main thrust of this bill is to help the landlords after the welfare recipient has left to repair the house or the apartment. Now, its hoped that when anyone goes into the apartment that the apartment...that you could live in the apartment and leave and leave...and not leave it damaged. Unfortunately, the housing that we are talking about, in most cases, is far from perfect to start with and the Welfare Department's case worker or rent investigator would have a

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

25.

MBS

difficult time sustaining the actual condition of the house when the tenant moved in and hence, would not be there to protect the deposit when they left. So that what we are doing is every time a welfare recipient leaves there's an extra month's rent, for which there is no reimbursement, for which the state is out, and for which we have no federal reimbursement. I can't support this particular piece of legislation, in addition to the problems mentioned, there is a shortage of housing but it is no more critical for the welfare recipient than it is for other low income people and it seems to me that what we are here to do is to give them adequate but not to give the landlords additional remuneration for their rents. I oppose the bill.

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and I think this bill and some of the remarks that has generated by the proponents of it, indicate a very real philosophical difference that members of this House, I think, on both sides probably feel and I'm sure that we face. The gentleman from Norwalk indicated his strong support of this bill because he believes that welfare recipients have certain rights, I, for one, do not subscribe to the fact that our system of welfare has some how created vested rights that welfare recipients are entitled to. I think that we, representing the state of Connecticut have an obligation to take care of our welfare

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

26.

MBS

cases to the extent of our ability and to the extent that our taxpayers can do it. I do not believe that we somehow have converted that obligation into welfare rights. The gentleman from West Haven has indicated that the committees that brought this particular piece of legislation out of the Welfare Committee and the Appropriations Committee and it doesn't cost any money, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, neither grounds are justification for passage of a bill of this nature. I think that some of the mess that we all feel the welfare system is in, not only in the state, but in the country is certainly exemplified by legislation such as this, which is passed without regard to its effect, without regard to its impact, without regard to whether or not it is desired, nor can be implemented by the Welfare Department. This bill, this bill does, as I think the gentleman from the 95th has pointed out, does cost money. The estimates from finance and control is \$1,600,000. which has not been appropriated in any budget which this General Assembly has had the good fortune to look over. The Welfare Department is opposed to this bill, it does not feel it is feasible, nor reasonable, I think we'd make a mistake if we rushed headlong into passing any kind of legislation simply because it has the welfare tag on it. I do not think that any welfare bill will meet opposition if that bill has a local purpose, has the support of the people who are going to have to deal with it, and is a comprehensive and coordinated

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

27.

MBS

part of a budget that this state is going to pass.

CLYDE BILLINGTON, 7th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. As a manager, of over some 1,000 units of the state of Connecticut, I can assess the fact that there is a need for security deposits for welfare recipients. Mr. Speaker, I will attest also that even federal projects in the contracts that security deposits are necessary. And many people, who come to my office, who do not have security deposits, cannot receive these same decent apartments. Many of my colleagues in the House, who are from small towns, cannot see the need for this type of legislation because they do not have the welfare recipients in their small towns. However, the cities are suffering. We do need it. Rep. Lowell stated that he didn't see where this effected housing, the fact that we all need housing, but I think that he should recognize that it's the welfare recipients those people who feel that there is no decent life for them in this state, these are the people that we're having trouble with in our cities. So I ask you to reconsider and vote for this bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'd remind the members simply that we have over 100 calendar items today.

JOHN PRETE, 114th District:

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the minority leader stated that

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

28.

MBS

we are in a mess in welfare and I agree with him but I disagree on the reason why. I think the reason why is because we've had shortsighted and politically inspired legislation in the entire area. This is a good bill which I insist will save money for the state of Connecticut in the long run but unfortunately we never look in the long run, we look at the short run. Another point I'd like to clarify is simply this, there is no transfer of monies for security deposit purposes, as the gentleman from the 38th would indicate. The security deposit is not a deposit of money, it is simply a letter from the Welfare Commissioner, a letter of guarantee. The landlord does not hold any security deposit, he holds a piece of paper. If there is damage done, if the landlord contends that there is damage done to his housing, then the Welfare Commissioner, through his agents, are the people who will determine what damage, if there is any damage, and to what extent it will cost. I maintain this is good legislation, it's far reaching and in the long run it will save money for the state of Connecticut and I'm for it.

GERALD STEVENS, 122nd District:

Mr. Speaker, the unmentioned beneficiary of this bill so far, in my opinion, are the slumlords. Where unfortunately so many people on welfare today are forced to reside. They are the ones who are going to benefit by the passage of this legislation, not the individual who happens, during the....

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

29.

MBS

due to their unfortunate circumstances to live in low cost slum housing. The slum landlords are going to demand one month's rent and when the unfortunate welfare recipient moves out to another location they are going to claim there is a scratch on the door or that one of the walls has a break in it and if you look at this bill you are going to see that the determination as to whether or not the damage has been done, is final conclusive and binding on the state of Connecticut. This is not the case in any other situation where you post a security deposit. A person always has a right of appeal. So when you vote for this bill, today, if you decide to vote for it, just think about those people who prey upon the welfare recipients and rent them housing which should be condemned and how many of them are going to demand a guarantee from the Welfare Commissioner and when the welfare recipient moves out are going to claim some damage to the slum houses which they own. They are the ones that are going to benefit not the unfortunate people who are going to have to live.

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more with Mr. Collins when he said we shouldn't rush headlong into passing laws simply because they are labeled welfare bills. As one who spoke with him last evening I must also say we shouldn't rush headlong into defeating legislation simply because it is labeled a welfare bill. It seems to me that while this bill

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

30.

MBS

may have problems in that it is going to cost \$1.6 million that is, in fact, less than 1/2 of 1% of our total welfare budget. And it doesn't seem that we are going to make a very big impression saving that kind of dubious money when we might have greater advantages should we pass this bill. With regard to the reference to the slumlords by Mr. Collins, or Mr. Stevens, I can't really believe that our good Commissioner, who is so steeped in good business practice will be paying too many slumlords for scratches on the doors of these slums. I have more confidence in Commissioner White than that and I am really certain that Mr. Stevens, in fact, has more confidence. As regards Mr. Collins reference to Rep. Brown stating that welfare recipient had a vested right because he was a welfare recipient, I think that's been misread. I believe what Mr. Brown is saying...what Mr. Brown has been saying for some time, is that welfare recipient has a vested right in equal opportunities in this nation because he is an American, not because he is a welfare recipient. Mr. Speaker, I believe the scales tip more heavily in favor of passage of this bill. Passage of this bill will provide an opportunity for decent housing. Passage of this bill will give the welfare recipient an opportunity to live in housing, which up until this time has heretofore been denied. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it will give them an incentive that he hasn't had before to get off the welfare rolls and live in the total environment

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

31.

MBS

as his neighbor does. I believe it is a good bill and it should pass.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are we ready to vote? Let me announce an immediate roll call.

SARAH CURTIS, 164th District:

Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege. Mr. Speaker, in the well of the house, this morning, we have Mr. Harvey Hubbels and his sister, Mrs. Shurine and her son, Frank Shurine and Mr. Hubbels son, Harvey Hubbels, the V. I know if they will rise we will accord them the usual welcome. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there further announcements or introductions?

OTHA BROWN, 148th District:

Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege. Mr. Speaker, in the gallery I would like to introduce to the House, another side of the Brown family. I might add that I am very handsome but this side of the Brown family is much more attractive. She has just graduated from Northeast State College in Tahlequah, Oklahoma and I might also add that being a part of the Brown family, I'm sure that if she will stand that the House will give her a very warm welcome, a Brown from Oklahoma, Marvel Brown.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

32.

MBS

Will the members please be seated. We are still on page 6, Calendar No. 635 on which a roll call has been ordered.

Will the members please be seated. If you gentlemen will take your seat we can proceed with the vote. Will the staff please come to the well of the House so we can proceed with the vote. Commissioner Miscikoski, are we ready to vote today? He's been out celebrating. If the gentlemen will please join us, we'll proceed with the vote. The machine will be opened. Has every member voted? Will you check the board to be sure your vote is recorded in the fashion you wish. The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

THE CLERK:

Total number voting		147
Necessary for passage		74
Those voting Yea	78	
Those voting Nay	69	
Absent and not voting	30	

MR. SPEAKER:

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 8 of the calendar. On page 8, Calendar No. 1230, Substitute for House Bill No. 5043, An Act Concerning the Proportional Costs of Water Main Assessments.

CARL AJELLO, 118th District:

Mr. Speaker, we will have to pass this temporarily, we don't have the gentleman, here, to report it.

**S-78
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 3
957-1456**

April 27, 1971 16.

Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 5, bottom of the page, Cal. No. 335, File 473
Favorable report joint standing committee on Corrections, Welfare
and Humane Institutions. on Substitute S.B. 386 An Act Concerning
Rental Security Deposits Required of Welfare Recipients.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ciarlone.

SENATOR CIARLONE:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR CIARLONE:

Mr. President, this bill merely addresses itself to
answering the housing crises. This bill allows the Welfare
Department to provide a one month security deposit for Welfare
beneficiaries. With the intent that in many areas housing would
not be available unless there was a security deposit. This bill
aimes to address itself in that direction. Its a good bill. I
urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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