

HB 5260

PA 642

1974

Corrections, Welfare and Humane Inst. 37, 41,  
48-53 (8)

House 2825-2827, 2865-2868,  
3158-3162, 5235-5237 (15)

Senate 2896-2897 (2)

25

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**CORRECTIONS,  
WELFARE  
AND  
HUMANE  
INSTITUTIONS**

**1-342**

**1971  
Index**

Mr. Halsted: The next bill...

Chairman Brown: Sir, may I inquire how many bills ...

Mr. Halsted: 5260, 5261, 5262, and 5738. These are, I would have to say fairly short bills. They won't take long. As long as that one -- I think that what's you are getting at.

With respect to 5260, this is simply a revision of 17-2 to provide that the Welfare Commissioner should upgrade the standards of assistance periodically as required by the Federal Government. As you know in the 1968 Public Act 90-248 the Federal Government required that all of the states upgrade their standards of need effective July 1, 1969. I looked for the Federal Government to make a further requirement of this sort... with respect to the upgrading. So this is an attempt to put it on a basis having gone through the conformity business that we experienced recently of that kind.

Now, Section II tries to take care of some of the problems which arose from that conformity hearing which was held in Boston recently and which we are still pending on. Section II would delete a provision for a maximum of \$266.67 per month for a family of two under the incentive earnings program. It would further modify the provision for disclosure of information to the Central Collections Division of the Department of Finance and Control and in a manner which would put that disclosure under the control of the Commissioner of Welfare and I would hope that this would be a possible change. Now, with respect to that one too. Correspondence and telephone calls between the regional council and myself have produced the need for a slight modification in the language of Section II. I would like further to offer to your secretary the Substitute which further refines that language and in terms of putting such disclosure under the control of the State Welfare Commissioner. If I may.

Bill #5261 simply repeals a provision pertaining to taking children committed to the Welfare Commissioner away from him. Since, again, Mr. Chairman, the penal code of the State of Connecticut now covers this, both with respect to takings which result in the child being taken within the State or taken away out of the state. So, we don't feel that we need 17-42 any longer.

Bill #5262 is sure to be a controversial one. As explained in the statement of purpose under the Soman verses Shapiro case and under regulations which were quickly drawn by the Department of H. E. W. as a result of that case, unless a stepfather is a person of general support liability under the laws of the state, he may not be held, that is his ability to support his step-children may not be taken into account. This bill would correct that by making stepfathers legally liable relatives. I suggest your consideration of this on the ground that I'm sure that comes April 15th their children ... and it does seem to me that indications that I have seen ... that where a stepfather has some obligation to support it brings forth an extra effort to locate and bring to book the natural father of the children because if the state should accept the entire support of the children there's no incentive-- shall we say - to do this.

M. B. Bauer, Chief of the Bureau of Business Administration in the State Welfare Department (cont'd): encumbrances and by virtue of this action take over the property at their own gain.

We, therefore, urge the rejection of this Act.

Chairman Brown: Are there any questions by any members of the committee? All right, will you proceed then Mr. White.

Commissioner White: On #5253 we have no statement.

Chairman Brown: Would you please try to speak a bit louder as the members of our committee are having trouble hearing and perhaps most of the people in our chamber too as -- if you could speak a bit louder.

Commissioner White: On #5256 -- we have no statement. Well, except that we feel that it will clarify the fact -- INAUDIBLE \*\* of -- or courses of action recipients of welfare assistance to the State of Connecticut are valid and collectable. We will submit this statement to the committee. The passage of this act will clarify the fact that assignment of proceeds of courses of action of recipients of welfare assistance to the State of Connecticut are valid and collectable.

We, therefore, urge the passage of this act.

Chairman Brown: Fine, thank you.

Commissioner White: We have no position of #5257. Mr. Halsted has already discussed this bill in principle we like it. It does not meet the income levels we might propose -- we appreciate the fact that he has asked to have it extended so that we could look at it further.

On #5260 -- I would like Mr. Morastika to speak on this please.

Mr. Morastika: In relation to this bill we have had an assessment by the Federal Government of some of the provisions in the act in the way it's written we would like to submit a letter from the Federal Regional Office of H. E. W. in regard to this bill.

Chairman Brown: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner White: On #5261 - we have a -- no statement. We're in favor of this bill -- #5262 that is -- I will submit a brief statement.

#5262 - An Act Concerning Support - The Department supports the proposal to require that the stepparent assume liability for the support of his step-children to the same extent as a natural parent.

Prior to the Court decision in Solman v Shapiro and the Federal regulations which stated a state could not require support of a stepparent if State law did not require such, the Department did hold stepparents responsible for support. The policy was based upon the premise that it was not socially or morally sound to separate out children of a previous marriage and place them on assistance standards while the other members of the family were entitled to live on as high a level as the stepparent could

Representative Frazier - 10th District:

Bill #5262 - This Bill was introduced into the 69th session -- as I understand it it makes the person marrying -- a person on welfare marrying agains -- that the new husband shall be legally liable for her offspring by the first husband.

Commissioner White: That's correct. That doesn't say welfare -- whose on welfare -- it's any husband is responsible.

Representative Frazier: But doesn't this then put a burden on the new husband. Especially if they're on welfare -- that the new husband is legally liable for the offspring of her previous spouse.

Commissioner White: Sure, it puts a burden.

Representative Frazier: Well, basically what I am saying is that a woman now on welfare and especially the man she is going to marry -- is a little hesitant about marrying a woman with say X number of children if he finds himself legally liable.

Commissioner White: Well, it depends upon the degree to which he loves the woman I suppose.

Representative Frazier: I remember at the last session there was quite an uproar concerning this. The average woman that wanted to get married thought that she was hindered from getting married especially if this would expose the new spouse to her previous offspring.

Commissioner White: Well, I'm supporting it because I believe in support.

Representative Frazier: You believe in support -- I wonder if the new husband will believe in support.

Commissioner White: I hope he does.

Representative Frazier: There's one more bill sir -- #5260 -- as I remember in the last session we had a cost of living index commissioned and the former Commissioner said that this commission what it does is go along with the cost of index in the living costs and in the last session the former Commissioner said that it wasn't needed and consequently it was -- as I understand it -- it was done away with.

Commissioner White: I'm not sure that I understand ---

Representative Frazier: The Cost of Living Commission of the Welfare Department.

Commissioner White: And the buck ends right here as far as adjustments.

u

Representative Frazier: And I'm wondering if this bill is any good because it was then determined by the former Commissioner that — no indiscriminately but at his whims could change this or increase the amount of money given to a recipient. I'm wondering now why a bill such as this is being re-introduced when its already been proven inadequate.

Commissioner White: Well, first of all maybe it's been proven inadequate because no increases have come through but that the section the so-called escape clause giving the Commissioner the right to review as he sees fit that the benefits conform the issues and all of that but that's really not why this bill was put in. As we understand it — it's a conformity issue here. We're removing the 266-67 incentive earnings and we're going back — let's see — and we're trying here to resolve a situation with regard to access of records of finance and control. Their access to our records and really this bill is to clear up — to help clear up the conformity issue. Anything else. We're not taking anything away from anyone. As a matter of fact it is giving people something.

Representative Frazier: There was another bill concerning liens —that's #5007 — I think that this bill should come under close scrutiny because that first thing that would happen that a person conceivably only needs temporary aid can have a lien placed against their home if they have obtained one and they could stay in a rut more or less. Now, in the event that they did come into — not a windfall— but into a position that they could take care of themselves the total amount of that lien can be called on demand by the Welfare Department.

Commissioner White: Well, now lets look at it this way — if — lets take a piece of property where there's a mortgage on it — and then say a person is on welfare and a lien is placed — some of that help will go onto amortize the mortgage right —so that money that is distributed by the Welfare Department is at least recuperable under the lien.

Representative Frazier: Well, you know — I never considered Welfare a permanent way of life. I always considered it a stepping stone to better living conditions. Thank you sir.

Chairman Brown: Senator Finney has a question please.

Senator Finney: Mr. Commissioner on #5260 — are we not just taking off the upper limit that we put on the incentive earnings program?

Commissioner White: That's correct. It's a conformity issue.

Chairman Brown: Representative Coatsworth do you have a question?

Representative Coatsworth: Mr. Commissioner: I am new in my job as you are new in yours but one thing which has impressed me during the past few months is that the most comment that I get about state government in Connecticut has to do with the welfare department and has to do in particular in support of what I would call repressive climate in the State of Connecticut in regard to the operations of that department and the allocations which are distributed by your department to people in need. I've done by myself my own research into your field — into the

Representative Coatsworth: (cont'd)

Department of Welfare and it seems to me that welfare is indeed a legitimate expense by the State of Connecticut in helping people who are in need and I think one of our problems -- I'm talking about yours and mine -- one of my problems and yours also is the fact that this climate does exist in Connecticut -- that each time the -- a welfare bill does come up we hear from the public -- usually in an uninformed way -- so what I'm saying is that many people in this state have a very poor idea as to what the operation of your department is all about and I would appreciate it if you might take into consideration that opinion and that point of view and try to correct it by attempting to inform the public more about the operations of your department and the kind of assistance that you distribute. This is a terribly discouraging problem to me and I think to other people in this room and I would consider asking you to carry on some kind of love affair with the press in this state to try to correct this bad image that you have.

Commissioner White: May I thank you for making that statement. I really mean it because I couldn't agree with you more. We've talked about placing children in foster homes -- and I think the Welfare Department needs to be placed in a foster home at this point -- at least that's the image that is sort of given it and to answer you directly -- a love affair with the press -- sure -- frankly I've set the wheels in motion to hire -- and he will probably be on deck -- within a month -- a public relations person. I think it's very important that the taxpayers know that their money is being well spent and I think it's very important for the recipients to know that the Welfare Department has problems too -- like money and it's very important for our people -- our staff -- to know what's going on. They don't. Many of them know what's going on and I thank you for making a statement and I commit to you to do something about it.

Chairman Brown: Any other questions of the Commissioner before we turn this meeting over to our public who has been so kind as to bear with us this morning.

Before we hear from Senator Hammer I would like to acknowledge two guests who are with us this morning. We have with us Mr. Park -- Chief of the Department of Health and Welfare from Korea seated up here and with him is Mr. Chang who is accompanying as an interpreter. If they will please stand we will give them a hand.

Chairman Brown: Mrs. Hammer, will you please testify.

Commissioner White: Mr. Chairman, could I break in for one second?

Chairman Brown: One second --

Commissioner White: I just would like to thank you for letting me and my staff present our bills first as you did. Thank you very much.

Chairman Brown: We were happy to hear your opinions. Senator Hammer.

Lucy Hammer, Senator from the 12th District:

I want to speak very briefly Mr. Chairman on two bills -- Senate Bill #480 which incidentally was introduced by Senator Lieberman and myself and is so printed on the bill. I don't know what happened in the bulletin. It shows other people.

I want to speak in support of this bill -- strong support -- you will hear some more expert people on it and this bill revolves around the problem of disturbed children who are placed in foster homes where the foster parents cannot cope with them. They go from one home to another. The child is obviously marred and usually ends in an institution. I've had some personal experience with this and it is a tragic and traumatic experience for the child and for everyone concerned. The proposal here is to train a small number of foster parents and pay them a small salary so that hopefully the child could remain in one home and receiving understanding and effective care. It could be a very practical and economical program and I hope you will give it consideration. It represents savings to the state and savings, most especially, to these children.

I would like to speak also with great feeling about S. B. #523 which would restore the age limit under which a child can receive help under Aid to Dependent Children Program -- would restore to 21 -- if he's still full-time in school or college, rather than the 18 years of age which he -- which is called for now. I have had experience with this situation a number of time with my own constituents , and let me tell you that if a child whocis on welfare program awards manages to stay in school after 18 and particularly if that child manages to go to college, it represents a terrific struggle for that family and he should be helped for the sake of the child. But, there's more to it than that, for the sake of the state too and society. It is our policy to try to move welfare clients off the welfare rolls. This is the very best chance for a young person who has this much determination to try to get an education -- we should certainly help him for this two-fold good -- the child and society.

While I'm on my feet I want to speak very briefly about Bill #5262 which has to do with stepfathers. You know there's something quite wrong here in my opinion. Under the common law the stepparent is not responsible for the stepchildren and I can't quite see how we can write special law and say that because the children are on welfare he then becomes responsible. I do hope you will-- give serious consideration for this point of view. Thank you.

Chairman Brown: Senator Lieberman - any comments you have to make this morning?

Senator Lieberman: Thank you and I want to be brief -- in spite of the pile of papers that I have in front of me because I think that this morning is really the opportunity for the public to be heard by your committee, but, let me make a few general comments. I was not in the legislature as you know and perhaps it's unfair of me to criticize of

Senator Lieberman (cont'd):

particular act of the legislature, but, it does seem to me the repressive climate -- the climate of misunderstanding that exists in this state toward welfare resulted in the passage of an omnibus welfare act by the last legislature which probably should go down as a monument and one of the most tragically misguided and inhumane pieces of legislation that has ever been enacted in the state. This act was not only lacking in compassion and a sense of respect for human decency. It simply lacked common sense. And so it has gone counter in some instances. The rhetoric that people used against welfare. For instance, the incentive earnings bill -- we hear so often this common this common rhetoric of let's get the people off of welfare. Well, here's a bill -- program that was aimed at encouraging people to earn money -- to go out to work -- to help themselves in what the ceiling enacted by the legislature last year did to remove those incentives. I hope that in that area and all the other areas that your committee will lead the way in writing some -- righting some of the tragic wrongs that were committed in that act.

I want to mention a few other points briefly. One has to do with S. B. #480 - Concerning the training of special foster parents for special care. Senator Hammer spoke eloquently on the bill and I support it.

I feel the same way about the aid to cities that are now forced to bear an unfair burden in terms of welfare costs, a burden that necessitates increasing property taxes at the local level and that's most unfair system of taxation whether you are a property owner or tenant so I hope you take that burden off of the local government.

Incidentally, in regard to the omnibus welfare act, I'm unable to be here before your committee tomorrow but I wanted to say just in a sentence, that I hope that you will also right the wrong that were done in the eligibility requirements under the Title 19 Medicaid program. I -- the more I look at the income requirements that were set the more angry I get and I hope that you will change that system.

Finally, there are a whole series of bills that I've put in myself with other people including Senator Ciarlone that have to do with a change in the state's attitude toward foster parents -- recognizing the tremendously important service that foster parents do -- the tremendously positive results that their work can have on the people of tomorrow. <sup>SB</sup>I regret very much that the Welfare Department has opposed ~~Public Act~~ #729. This is a very difficult human area but let me just read the statement of purpose which we've put in. I am sure that Representatives of the Foster Parents for Progress and other groups here today will speak more eloquently on it but this bill aims to allow a child's foster parents a hearing before the welfare department to seek termination of the natural parents' rights where there has been only minimal contact between the natural parents and the child for four years or more. In many cases foster parents really become the natural parents of the child and this bill will allow that right to be asserted and would protect the human and emotional investment for both the child and foster parents that has gone into this family situation.

Senator Lieberman (cont'd):

You have a very difficult task before you. This is not an easy area in some ways because of the unpopularity of the field of welfare. You have a difficult job to do politically. But, I urge you as deeply as I can to do what it is necessary and what is right and I am confident that you will. Thank you.

Chairman Ciarlone:

Thank you Senator Lieberman. I'm sure that my committee is mindful of the shortcomings during the past 69th Assembly. I am very optimistic that some of those shortcomings will be corrected.

I would like to call Mr. and Mrs. Gertrude McCoil -- if I pronounce that properly. Will you please testify.

At this point I will turn this meeting back to Representative Other Brown.

Mrs. Gertrude McCall representing W. R. A. P. state-wide organization of welfare recipients are people and also Vice President of Hartford's Chapter of Welfare Mothers:

H. B. #5259 Mr. Chairman -- we strongly oppose this bill for the following reasons. It is very inadequate -- no provisions for emergencies. It's differences in rents and other costs does not allow sufficient standards. Before you can even think of a flat grant you must first think of a rent control commission or something like that. It also must have a provision for the rise in the cost of living. When the cost of living rises this grant must be increased. I don't see how we could reflect household needs if for a family of four the allowance would be \$300.00. I couldn't even begin to meet the needs of my two children with this amount of money. This applies to a large family.

H. B. #5260 -- The Welfare Work Incentive Program -- should be brought up to Federal regulations because the ceiling of 266-67 hurts many of our mothers and stops them from working because of the work incentive seal.

S. B. #736 is also the work incentive-- this we strongly support. This would give a chance to get completely off welfare and this ceiling price should never have been put on in the first place -- at least according to Federal regulations.

H. B. #5657 and 5684 which is welfare fraud -- why should we oppose it? Why should we be punished because if a worker forgets to enter in our records that we reported our working and wages -- this is an administration error -- not ours. Have you ever thought of why some people don't report employment? Consider the fact that the welfare allowance is inadequate in meeting the family's needs most of the time I should say -- what is the mother to do -- let the family starve -- become a prostitute or what have you. What would you do if it depended on your family to live?

**H-113**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 6  
2503-3010**

Friday, May 14, 1971

85

ad

REPRESENTATIVE HANNON:

It is my intention to move for reconsideration of several matters that were passed retaining their place and I make an inquiry as to whether or not the Clerk would recall the calendar starting at the beginning.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the gentleman call the Clerk's attention to the matters which he intends to move for reconsideration.

REPRESENTATIVE HANNON:

Page 4, Calendar 255, House Bill 5260. That matter was passed retaining its place. I would move for reconsideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 16th has called the chamber's attention to page 4 of the calendar, Calendar 255, substitute House Bill 5260, Files 872 and 195. The previous action today was to pass the matter retaining. The motion at this time is for reconsideration of our earlier action. Does the gentleman care to speak on his motion for reconsideration. Will you remark the motion to reconsider.

REPRESENTATIVE HANNON:

It would be my hope that there would be an amendment offered to this House which would allow us to dispose of this matter today.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion before us is for reconsideration of our previous action which was to retain the matter until Monday. All those in

Friday, May 14, 1971

86

favor of the motion for reconsideration will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. Reconsideration is granted. The Clerk please reread the item.

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar 255, Substitute for House Bill 5260 - An Act Concerning the Administration of the State Welfare Law to Conform to Federal Requirements.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 41st.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN:

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN:

The Clerk has an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk please read House Admendment Schedule A. Does the gentleman of the 41st have a copy of the Amendment and if so, please send it to the well. Would the Majority Leader care to pass this matter temporarily until the Clerk's Office has an opportunity to locate the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE HANNON:

Let's try Calendar 272 on page 4.

MR. SPEAKER:

ad

Friday, May 14, 1971

87

Calendar 255 be passed temporarily. The gentleman of the 16th has called the Chamber's attention to page 4, Calendar 272.

REPRESENTATIVE HANNON:

I would move at this time that reconsideration of Calendar 272 File 215.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion is for reconsideration of Calendar 272. Will you remark on the motion for reconsideration. If not, all those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. Motion is carried and the Clerk will please reread the Calendar item.

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar 272, Substitute for House Bill 8682 - An Act Concerning Offices and Facilities for State Agencies and Institutions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Gillies.

REPRESENTATIVE GILLIES:

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark further.

REPRESENTATIVE GILLIES:

This simply provides that the Public Works Department shall assign office space and provide necessary accommodations in state institutions in with the concurrence of the Attorney General and

ad

Monday, May 17, 1971

21.

roc

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman indicates that when the vote was taken to Recommit, he was in the prevailing vote. He now is moving to Reconsider so that this item may be retained on the Calendar. Will you remark on the motion to Reconsider. Is there objection. Hearing none, the Reconsideration is granted and this item will appear again for appropriate action on today's Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Page 3 of Today's Calendar. Cal. 255, Sub. for H.B. 5260, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE STATE WELFARE LAW TO CONFORM TO FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. Brown of the 148th.

MR. BROWN: (148th)

I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

MR. BROWN: (148th)

The Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, offered by Mr. Coatsworth of the 76th. In line 23, before the word "at" strike out the bracket; before the word "semi-annually" insert a bracket; after the bracket following the word semi-annually, strike the word "periodically"; insert the word "annually". In line 25, strike

Monday, May 17, 1971

22.

the bracket before the word "increase" and the bracket after the word decrease. In line 29, after the word "law" before the period, insert the following: or to meet any increase in the cost of living.

MR. BROWN: (148th)

I move adoption of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule A.

Will you remark.

MR. BROWN: (148th)

Mr. Speaker, this is a very excellent amendment that has been coined by the distinguished Clerk of the Committee on Public Welfare, Corrections and Human Institutions and because it is such a great amendment, I will let him explain it.

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. Coatsworth, speaking on the amendment.

MR. COATSWORTH: (76th)

Mr. Speaker, the amendment is designed to correct what has been a very infamous inequity in the welfare structure, the past three years in particular. In the past three years, the Commissioner of the Department of Welfare has seen fit not to increase the standards of welfare recipients during that three-year time in proportion with the cost of living increases. I am informed that the cost of living increases in Connecticut alone has increased some 18% in the past three years. Some 60% of the people who receive social security in the state,

roc

Monday, May 17, 1971

23.

also receive public assistance, that in terms of this very limited sense of helping the elderly, this is one way to do it. The fact that the Congress very cynically passed this increase in social security, those increases are never realized by people over 65 in this State because the social security payments in and of themselves are so small that the Welfare Department has to supplement them and thus any increase in Social Security for those over 65, results in a direct decrease by the State Department of Welfare. So this amendment is designed to keep those in need, particularly those over 65 years old, the needy in this State, to keep their standard of living at least in some direct relation to the cost of living in the State of Connecticut and I urge adoption of this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment. Rep. Collins.

MR. COLLINS: (165th)

Mr. Speaker, I just received this amendment. I have not seen it beforehand and after listening to the explanation it does raise several questions in my mind particularly as to substantial additional cost which this bill might now require in the event that this amendment were adopted. I would, therefore request that if this item could be passed briefly in order to give me an opportunity to check out what the aspects of this were, it would help me a great deal.

THE SPEAKER:

I suggest that this matter be Passed, temporarily,

roc

Monday, May 17, 1971

24/

so that the gentleman of the 165th can review its impact.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 301, House Bill No. 6951. AN ACT CONCERNING  
VISITS TO CLIENTS BY WELFARE DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVES.

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. Brown of the 148th.

MR. BROWN: (148th)

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

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark.

MR. BROWN: (148th)

The Clerk has an amendment. Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would ask that the reading be waived and we will attempt to explain the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection to outlining the amendment. Hearing no objection, would the gentleman from the 148th outline the amendment as opposed to a reading of it.

MR. BROWN: (148th)

Mr. Speaker, this bill which is concerning the visitation to clients by welfare department representatives has been before the Assembly before. The essential question was as to whether it should read that a department representative could visit the welfare client at all times whenever the spirit would hit them or

roc

**H-114**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

66

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further before we vote. The question is on acceptance and passage as amended. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Page 2 of the calendar, Calendar 255, Substitute for House Bill 5260 - An Act Concerning the Administration of the State Welfare Law to Conform to Federal Requirements.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 76th.

REPRESENTATIVE COATSWORTH:

I move for the acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

REPRESENTATIVE COATSWORTH:

This bill will change 2 areas where State Welfare Administration is non conforming with Federal Welfare regulations. One, eliminates (inaudible) for recipients, the other retains the privacy of welfare records by providing the Department of Finance and Control with information only directly concerning welfare collections and recovery. These changes will avoid the loss of millions of dollars of federal revenue and I understand there is an amendment to this bill offered by Representative Lowell.

MR. SPEAKER:

ad

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

67

The Clerk is in possession of an amendment.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, offered by Mr. Lowell of the 38th. Line 29, after Federal Law. Delete the period and substitute a semicolon in its place and add the following "and he may make such provisions to increase or decrease the level of assistance payments to any of said programs as he shall deem necessary to carry out the policy of this state".

REPRESENTATIVE COATSWORTH:

I move acceptance of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark.

REPRESENTATIVE LOWELL:

This particular amendment, if we were to adopt it, would give us a clear mandate, would give the Welfare Commissioner a clear mandate to implement the policy of the state of Connecticut, which I assume from the language of last session's welfare bill that we close the welfare budget, but in closing it at that time and we did not clearly state that the Welfare Commissioner would have the power to balance the funds we had with the cases we had, not to run the deficit. This particular bill, our present Welfare Commissioner has asked that this amendment be placed on the law so that it would be possible for him and the rolls of the Welfare Department were increased. That he would be able, through no fault of his or ours, that he would

ad

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

68

ad

be able to balance the amount of money expended by the state by reducing the standard on which the welfare recipients were provided, reducing the standard that the welfare recipients received. And this amendment is simply to do this and I would hope that we would have support to live up to the commitment of the last legislature and open the budget.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment. Representative Coatsworth.

REPRESENTATIVE COATSWORTH:

I would urge rejection of this amendment primarily because the intent of this bill is to bring us into conformity with federal welfare regulations to insure that we don't lose federal matching funds. The question of adopting this amendment, is not an informed amendment in the sense that the amendment does challenge federal regulations as opposed to the serious conformity issue which could result in the loss of further federal funds. I would urge rejection of this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule A.

Representative Prete.

REPRESENTATIVE PRETE:

I oppose this amendment. I believe that while economically and physically perhaps the amendment has some merit. I believe that it would, in fact, exalt budget and accounting over the means of the people of this state. What it does in effect is not allow the Welfare Commissioners to adjust downward in the

ad

event that the state has had times economically and as a result more and more people wind up, through no cause of their own, on welfare. I'm all for efficiency in the welfare department, I'm all for the proper use of state tax money. This is not a way to do it. (machine not working) I disapprove of the amendment, I intend to vote against it. I urge that we do not adopt this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment. Representative Brown.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN:

I rise to oppose the amendment. I might indicate there has been some reference to the bill passed during the last General Assembly. The new Chairman of Public Welfare. I am certainly not going to stand here defending the bill, as a matter of fact, it was the responsibility of the committee to correct some of the inequities of the bill and also to restore it to Connecticut the proper conformity with federal regulations so that we would be able to get federal funds. As you know, because of some of the legislation that was passed in the General Assembly the state of Connecticut lost millions of dollars. The Welfare Committee has labored very long on this and I might also add that the interim committee also labored long on this, it was their recommendation and therefore the amendment which is one the maker of the amendment perhaps wants a kind of closed in budget which got us in quite a bit of trouble in the last General Assembly and which also had to be corrected in this assembly. I would oppose it with

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

70

ad

hope that this chamber would restore us back to conformity with the federal regulations.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment. Representative Lowell, speaking for the second time on the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE LOWELL:

The question of conformity really doesn't enter into this particular section. The standards can be set in any state and then a percentage is paid to all recipients. The question is that all recipients do receive an equal percentage of the standard and the standard must be periodically brought up to date. So that we would not run into a question of conformity.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The amendment is lost. Will you remark further on the bill. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

On page 4, the matter that was passed temporarily. Calendar 931, Substitute for House Bill 6483 - An Act Concerning Prescribing of Drugs by Brand and Generic Name.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 45th.

REPRESENTATIVE BIGOS:

The Clerk has an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Monday, June 7, 1971

73

This item will be passed temporarily. Would the record indicate that "A" and "B" of the Senate have been adopted.

djh

THE CLERK:

Page 37, on page 37, Calendar No. 255, a disagreeing action, substitute for H. B. No. 5260, An Act Concerning the Administration of the State Welfare Law to Conform to Federal Requirements, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. BROWN (148th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

MR. BROWN (148th):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has Senate Amendment "A" There is a long deletion and I, with your permission, would like to summarize rather than have it read.

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman outline Senate Amendment Schedule "A"?

MR. BROWN (148th):

Mr. Speaker, in Senate Amendment "A" we have deleted sections from line 44 to 71 and this amendment becomes effective as of January 1, 1972. The reason for that was because it seemed clear not only to the committee but to the House and to the Senate that this was necessary to protect matching funds and to bring us into conformity on the question of net versus gross and clarified what is proper expenses under the law. And, therefore, Senate Amendment in order to bring us into federal conformity for matching funds, we move to

Monday, June 7, 1971

74

adopt Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Senate "A"? If not, all those in favor, indicate--

MR. LOWELL (38th):

Mr. Speaker, in discussing Senate Amendment Schedule "A", I think the one thing you have to recognize is that this particular piece of legislation has a great deal of logic and I don't intend to go into the logic behind the net versus gross which is a debate which rages full in the congress and in our own committee and I would simply say that this particular amendment probably will be academic with the passage of a new federal welfare regulation as now proposed in H.R. 1 in the House. The thrust of this is to hold down our expenses during the next six months to give us as low a base as possible. And I feel that it's a mistake but I would go along with this particular amendment because the bill and the other factors in the bill should be retained and so I will support the bill though I think it is a very poor piece of legislation with this particular amendment on it.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Senate "A"? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Senate "A" is ADOPTED.

MR. BROWN (148th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the, I move for adoption of the bill conditioned to Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended?

MR. BROWN (148th):

Again, Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a poor bill. It's a very

djh

Monday, June 7, 1971

75

djh

important bill because it brings us into federal conformity with issues that have been raised by the Health, Education, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Section 1, of course, authorized the Welfare Commissioner to raise standards of needs whenever he's required to do so by federal law and to eliminate from our law the upper limit on aid in incentive earning situations. Section 2 revises the access to records provisions which gives the Department of Finance and Control, in order to place the Welfare Commissioner in control of his disclosure information as claimed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Again, this bill will overcome any federal conformity issues raised by HEW. It is a good bill and I urge its passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended?

MR. LOWELL (38th):

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to correct the last all-encompassing statement. It does eliminate most, we still have one on the question of hospital costs and I didn't want the House to question when we still go to court over the question of hospital costs, the question of conformity after passing this particular piece of legislation. It does correct three of the four remaining items to be corrected.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bill is PASSED.

Announcements or introductions at this time? Does the Clerk have further business to read in?

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has a raised bill, H. B. No. 9260, with emergency certification, An Act Providing for the Sale of ~~Certain State Property~~ to the City of

June 4, 1971

highways and the communities and I urge its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 944. File 872. Favorable report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Substitute House Bill 5260. An Act Concerning the Administration of the State Welfare Law to Conform to Federal Requirements.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Senate Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. I believe there's an amendment, Mr. President.

SENATOR CIARLONE:

Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT A, offered by Senator Ciarlone:

In line 43, after the word regulations: and before the semicolon insert a bracket.

In line 53, after the word therefore, delete the bracket.

In line 58, after the word dependent, delete the bracket.

In line 65, delte the brackets and the number 2

In line 71, after the word program and before the period insert a bracket

In line 108, after the word passage and before the period insert the following: except that section 1 of this act shall take effect January 1, 1972.

SENATOR CIARLONE:

Mr. President, There was a recent ruling of the Federal Government, we found it necessary to have this amendment put in. With this amendment we now eliminate two areas where, Connecticut was not in conformity with the Federal regulations. It brings us into conformity wherein now there was a question on the net and gross income and also it eliminates the area as to work related expenses. This amendment brings us now into conformity with Federal regulations. It's a good amendment and I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CIARLONE:

I move acceptance of the bill, as amended, by Senate Amendment Schedule A. This is a major piece of legislation of our committee that we're certainly happy to be associated with. The remarks on the amendment speak for themselves and under Section 2, this is another area where our current statutes were not in conformity with the federal regulations. Under confidentiality of records we now do conform with federal regulations. So we will not be losing any federal funding. We thought it a good bill and urge adoption by everyone.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 988. File 1185. Favorable report of the joint committee on Banks

and activities. CAL. NO. 989. File 1186. Favorable report of the joint committee on Banks and 6807. Favorable report of the joint committee on Banks and 6807.