

SB 943

PA 681 (Vetoed)

1971

Education 573-574, 613-615, 669

6

House 5833-5839

7

Senate 2757-2765

17

Senate - Veto session 262-269

30

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**EDUCATION**

**PART 2  
331-675**

**1971**

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TUESDAY

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

- Mr. Driscoll: We're also proposing a so-called restricted education achievement grant. This is to students mainly from minority groups be increased rather than decreased as the Governor's budget would have it. We believe that this is the only way we're going to be able to get a more substantial portion of black and Spanish-speaking students in the various institutions of higher education. Have I taken my time?
- Rep. Klebanoff: A little. I was just going to call it to your attention.
- Mr. Driscoll: I just want to see if you have any questions.
- Rep. Klebanoff: Are there any questions?
- Mr. Driscoll: Thank you.
- Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you Mr. Driscoll. John Papandrea, Assistant Majority Leader of the House of Representatives.
- Rep. Papandrea: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice-chairman. I'm here this morning in my capacity as Deputy Majority Leader of the House of Representatives with a statement on behalf of the Democratic House Leadership. I think a look at the bulletin will disclose that the Democratic House Leadership, together with the Senate Leadership has introduced a bill in statement of purpose form only labeled the "Restructuring of Higher Education." I want Mr. Chairman for the Committee to know, we consider this to be one of the most significant pieces of legislation to be considered in this legislative session and we are working on this. We have our staff attempting to come up with a bill which we hope will reflect the, not only the needs of the educational community, but of all of the people of the state and we propose to meet with the subcommittee on higher education to give you a detailed bill and to detail our position. I understand that the subcommittee will hear all of these bills which again, hopefully and in more leisure and greater detail. I am here however in an official position in behalf of the House Leadership in connection with SB 943 (Rep. Ratchford-Rep. Kennelly-Rep. Ajello-Sen. Alfano-Sen. Caldwell-Rep. Papandrea-Rep. Mahoney-Rep. Prete-Rep. O'Neill-Rep. Hannon-Rep. Morris) AN ACT CREATING A DIVISION OF CONSUMER EDUCATION IN THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT.

## EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TUESDAY

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

Rep. Papandrea: I don't think it needs saying that we in the Democratic House Leadership and in fact the Democratic party are very much in favor of expanding consumer education. During the last session, we introduced legislation which created a division of consumer education within the Department of Consumer Protection. We feel while the results of that experiment are yet to be realized because of only a matter of two years having gone by, and our inability to fund it adequately, we still feel that that division together with the proposal which is before you in SB943 this morning, those two combinations will go a long way towards educating the people who most need the education in consumer affairs in this state. No matter how much education we try to get to people it seems that on some of the simplest levels those that most directly concern the life and the economics of the family unit in Connecticut never seem to have enough. We feel that this legislation will make it possible for the extension service to perform a very valuable service. We would say to you that despite all of the efforts made within the poverty programs, within the welfare department, within the Department of Consumer Education, there is still a very sore need to bring home the lessons of basic economics and purchasing to the deprived consumer. We would suggest to you that in considering and reporting out SB943, that you may especial attention insofar as it is possible to the correlation and co-ordination of all of the programs that are now in existence. It seems that there is a ripe situation in most of our major cities where this problem has its greatest significance. Many of our poverty agencies have people who work on a day to day basis with the people who are most vitally intimately concerned with this problem. We would suggest too, in hopes that you would consider respectfully our suggestion that there be an attempt to co-ordinate all these activities so that whatever materials are available through the extension service whatever materials are available through the department of Consumer Protection are in fact made available to the person who deals on an every day basis with the person who is ultimately the object of all this legislation. We feel that this is critical, we feel that it's one of the areas where we must show the people that we care and we must give it our prompt attention during this session and we commend you to that task. Thank you.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TUESDAY

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

Miss Galvin: entire state. As a citizen and voter of the State of Connecticut I urge you to act without reservation to keep tuition down. Thank you.

Rep. Klebanoff: Charles Jones.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Charles Jones, I'm with the Connecticut Correctional Institution at Somers, here to ask your support for bill SB357, waiver of tuition fees and charges for inmates of state correctional institutions. This was a educational advantage not previously offered. Dr. Lowe mentioned earlier there was a federal grant established for education beyond high school level at our institution. We were fortunate in that we did have a high school program. Our students would not be able to pay for college courses. The average student earns between \$.38 and \$.74 a day, wages paid him for his work in the institution. The offering of college level courses gives the man an opportunity to continue his education. Before, any man that had a high school diploma was just left alone in the institution. If he wanted any courses, he had to pay for correspondence courses. Some could not afford this. There is a social aspect to a man continuing his education while in the institution. Following his release from prison he can continue in a college around his neighborhood. This would get him out of the environment of just hanging around at night associating with men that were formly institutionalized. Thank you for your attention, I ask again your support for this bill.

Rep. Klebanoff: Stan Quinn. We can pass him and if he comes back we'll call him back.

Mrs. Federman: My name is Elsie Federman, from the University of Connecticut Cooperative Center. Stan Quinn the person who signed up this morning had to go back and Fred Curry is from the Radio-TV Center from the University of Connecticut and Fred asked that I speak for Stan Quinn and him. I'm an extension family economist at the University of Connecticut and I'm speaking in favor of HB5751 and SB943 An Act Establishing A Consumer Education Division and Cooperative Extension Service at the University of Connecticut. Current information on the number bankruptcies, garnishment, wages, consumer fraud and over extension of credit, makes the need for a more comprehensive consumer education program, not only in economic terms. Many low income families are financially over extended.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TUESDAY

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

- Mrs. Federman: The family health is effected and eventually the stability of the family is endangered. The need for a systematic approach to the education of low income families falls to the leaders in Connecticut, and the low income consumer with whom they work is critical. Due to economic and staff limitations, most agencies working with low income families aren't able to conduct comprehensive consumer training programs for their staff. Staff leaders in rural and urban communities desire adequate training in consumer affairs where consumer education is deficient. A valuable resource of our state is our Connecticut Cooperative Extension Service at the University of Connecticut with its offices throughout the state. Supportive authority and personnel, such as publications, extension home economists, child development and family economics. This resource can be expanded to include a division of consumer education. One of our very valuable resources is our radio-television center at the University and at this time, Fred is going to play a couple of programs that we are know producting. This is going out to 17 radio stations, is this one of the radio spots Fred? What I am giving now to the committee is a flow chart of the proposed addition of consumer education in the Cooperative Extension Service at the University of Connecticut. Go ahead, Fred, this is one of our spots;  
"She'll try anything hoping it will work. Buyer be ware is designed to help you to protect yourself. This is Elsie Federman, consumer education specialist with the Connecticut Cooperative Extension Service at the University of Connecticut for further information about today's program, write for publication No.10, called "Worthless Arthritis Cures" make sure you ask for publication No.10, called "Worthless Arthritis Cures" write to Box U35, Storrs, Connecticut 06268. The address again is Box 35, Storrs, Connecticut 06268. Be prepared, you may be preforming a service for the honest business man and for yourself by listening regularly to "Buyer Beware".
- Rep. Flebanoff: Mrs. Federman, what I'm going to suggest perhaps in the interest of time is perhaps you might want to come back and speak to the subcommittee.
- Mrs. Federman: Thank you very much. I do appreciate your giving me this time. I do want to mention that I do have available the list of all our extension home

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TUESDAY

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

Mrs. Federman: economists, where they are located throughout the state and I have brought some bulletins that we have available for you to browse, if you have the patience when the hearing is over. I just want to mention one other thing, the White House Conference on Food Nutrition and Health cited the University of Connecticut Radio-TV Center as a model for other people in the Country for low income families. Thank you very much.

Rep. Klebanoff: Thank you Mrs. Federman. Alphonse Avitabile.

Mr. Avitabile: My name is Alphonse Avitabile, I live in Bethlehem, Connecticut, I am an instructor at the University of Connecticut in Waterbury. I've taught there for nine years. There are many bills I'd like to talk about today and will briefly touch on two. I'm personally opposed to any tuition rise for any state student, in fact I think current fees should be reduced and ultimately eliminated, let alone attaching and adding a tuition fee to their already overburdened financial situation. I'm also opposed to aid, to financial aid to independent and private colleges. It is their own private sector, they should seek funds in order to continue their own growth and that the state has to force a tuition on students in public institutions. How can it afford the additional sums of money to provide funds for private institutions. However I'm here primarily today to speak on SB302 AN ACT CONCERNING EXPANSION OF THE WATERBURY BRANCH OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT INTO A FOUR YEAR FULL CURRICULUM BRANCH. The only area in the state of Connecticut will a major population concentration without a single four year public institution of higher learning is Waterbury, Connecticut. Cities smaller in size than Waterbury have had four year public insitiutions for many years. Witness, Wilamantic with Eastern Connecticut State, Danbury with Western Connecticut State, New Britain with Central Connecticut State. When the Waterbury branch of the University of Connecticut became a reality about 25 years ago or so, the people of Waterbury looked at this as just a beginning and since have continously expressed a desire that the Waterbury branch become a four year college. During this 25 five year period, the branch has served the community adequately at best because of the many limits imposed upon it. Efforts by local legislators and citizen groups to make it

## EDUCATION COMMITTEE

TUESDAY

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

## Statement of Connecticut Home Economics Association

On behalf of the Connecticut Home Economics Association, an organization representing over 400 professional home economists in Connecticut, I would like to endorse bills HB5751 and SB 943. The establishing of a consumer education division in the cooperative extension service at the University of Connecticut.

If consumer education is to be effective it must help families to be competent consumers. A competent consumer is one who makes judicious decisions with respect to:

- a. spending money in the marketplace
- b. performing unpaid family services within the home
- c. saving and dissaving property to balance resources over time
- d. motivating the meaningful use of goods and services in ultimate consumption
- e. earning (acquiring) a flow of money income
- f. allocating resources of money, time and people and property to high priority uses
- g. interacting with local, state and federal government such as paying taxes and receiving social security benefits
- h. giving family resources to voluntary community efforts and receiving direct or indirect satisfaction in return
- i. educating (socializing) family members toward development of competence for the foregoing functions.

This educational process involves a great deal more than teaching buymanship, giving technical information and consumer protection although these are all inherent in the above. The process involves attitudes, beliefs, values, knowledge, understandings, decisions and actions.

We feel that the University of Connecticut and particularly its outreach function, the Cooperative Extension Service has been engaged in developing these competencies in families and can make an ever greater impact on Connecticut families with increased resources.

Marilyn Gunther, Legislative Chairman, Connecticut Home Economics Association

**H-120**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

279

ation, vote yes. If you are opposed, vote no. Those in favor of reconsideration indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Reconsideration is LOST.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, we should now proceed to the third item from the bottom on page 15, Calendar No. 1521, File No. 1404, and I move that that matter be recommitted to the Committee on Transportation.

THE SPEAKER:

Calendar No. 1521, third item from the bottom on page 15, the motion is to recommit. Will you remark? Is there objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

The next item, Mr. Speaker, the next item is Calendar No. 1522, substitute for S.B. No. 0282, File No. 1544, and I move that that matter be re-committed to the Committee on Appropriations.

(The Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on recommitment. Will you remark? Is there objection? Hearing none, the matter is recommitted.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we next go to the top of page 17, Calendar No. 1533, substitute for S.B. No. 0943, File No. 1181.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk please call the calendar item?

THE CLERK:

Page 17, Calendar No. 1533, substitute for S.B. No. 0943, An Act Creating a Division of Consumer Education in the Cooperative Extension Service

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

280

at the University of Connecticut.

ad

MR. O'NEILL (52nd):

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. O'NEILL (52nd):

Mr. Speaker, this particular bill appropriates \$50,000 to the Cooperative Extension Service at the University of Connecticut to establish a division of consumer education. Mr. Speaker, it's a good bill. We're all concerned in consumer education at this particular time and I move for its adoption.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

MR. STEVENS (122nd):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I don't think this consumer education belongs at the University of Connecticut. We have legislation that allows this to be done under the Commissioner of Consumer Protection. There's enough to be done at the University of Connecticut. Enough money is being spent without getting involved to a greater extent in consumer education. It doesn't belong there. I think it's a bad bill and would urge its defeat.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

MR. LA GROTTA (170th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill. It seems that any problem that we have, we seem to throw at the university. They have problems enough.

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

281

Their basic problem is to educate youngsters for their future lives. I don't think this belongs at all at the university. I think it would be much better to keep it with the people who will be working on the very problem. I urge the defeat of this bill.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

MR. HOGAN (177th):

Mr. Speaker, I don't know too much about this bill but I think the remarks of Rep. LaGrotta pretty well outline my feelings and I might say, in reading an article about this in the Hartford Courant of last Saturday, referred to this bill being passed in the Senate and in the article it says Democrats who supported the bill, S.B. No. 743, U Conn. Extension Service has already worked out a successful program. And I think this article where the Democrats had supported the bill is a pretty good statement.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill? If not--the lady from the 50th.

MRS. BECK (50th):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the bill. The division, the consumer protection educational services at the university are already established, they exist throughout the State of Connecticut. This would make possible the improvements and extension of that service. This particular group of people at the university have worked with such people as welfare mothers, has trained people in the welfare area, is dealing directly in education rather than the action of protection, and there is a difference, has people trained to educate in consumer protection, and this is the logical place for the service to be provided. I would point out to the people here that the Democratic

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

282

Party has made this platform pledge and had done so because there had been so many requests for this service throughout the State of Connecticut. The people who are providing this educational service have outstanding qualifications and have brought to the State of Connecticut in fact a great deal of money in federal grants and are, in fact, providing education through the mass media. I very strongly support this piece of legislation and urge passage of the bill.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

MR. BLUMENTHAL (56th):

Mr. Speaker, may the record reflect that I'm ruling myself out under Rule 18, conflict of interest, on this matter.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Clerk will so note the gentleman from the 56th will absent himself under Rule 18. Will you remark further on the bill? If not, the question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. All those in favor will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The Chair will try your minds again.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question of a roll call vote. All those in favor of the vote be taken by roll call will indicate by saying aye. The Chair will try your minds again. Those in support of a motion for a roll call vote will indicate by saying aye. In the opinion of the chair, the necessary 20% have supported the motion. An immediate roll call will be called in the hall of the House.

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

283

The House is at ease.

ad

MR. CARRAGHER (2nd):

Mr. Speaker, can I have a point of personal privilege while we're at ease? A point of personal privilege for the purpose of introduction, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 2nd please proceed.

MR. CARRAGHER (2nd):

Mr. Speaker, seated in the gallery this evening is the son of our colleague, Rep. La Rosa, Tony LaRosa, who learned today that he's been appointed to the Connecticut All State Swimming Team and along with him is a lovely young lady, Miss Pat Brady. I know if they'll stand, the House will accord the usual welcome.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Are there further points of personal privilege?

MR. VICINO (34th):

I'd like to address myself to the bill, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Chair had asked if there were any further points of personal privilege. We will return to debate on the bill in just a moment.

MR. O'NEILL (52nd):

Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

MR. O'NEILL (52nd):

Mr. Speaker, seated in the gallery this evening is Mr. and Mrs. Joe

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

284

Kane. Joe is the CDAP coordinator of the Town of Marlborough and I feel sure that if he and his lovely bride will stand, they would receive a warm welcome by the house.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The House will come to order. The Chair understands there is business on the Clerk's desk.

THE CLERK:

Business from the Senate, favorable from the Joint Standing Committee on Banks, substitute for S.B. No. 463, An Act Concerning Participation by Savings Banks in the Provision of Housing for Connecticut Residents.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will the members please be seated and will the aisles be cleared? Will the members be seated? Gentleman and ladies, the later you delay, the later we're going to be here. For the benefit of the members who have returned to the Chamber, we are on page 15, page 17, Calendar No. 1533, substitute for S.B. No. 943, File No. 1181. There have been no amendments. The issue pending before you is acceptance and passage. Will you remark further?

MR. VICINO (34th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. The establishment of a division of consumer education in the cooperative extension service at the University of Connecticut, cooperating with the Department of Consumer Protection, this program will enable consumers to cope with misleading advertising, mislabeled products, defective merchandising, and adequate service. Mr. Speaker, what I have just read is one plank in the consumer rights portion of the State Democratic Platform which I was chairman of. I rise in support of this. We will be cooperating with the Department of Consumer Protection and

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

285

it's a fine bill.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill? If not, will the members please take their seats. The machine will be open. Have all of the members voted? Is your vote properly recorded? Will you please check the machine to make sure that your vote is properly recorded? The machine will be closed. The Clerk will take a tally.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting . . . . .	161
Necessary for Passage . . . . .	82
Those Voting Yea . . . . .	86
Those voting Nay . . . . .	65
Absent and Not Voting . . . . .	16

(Rep. Blumenthal of the 56th left the House when the vote was taken in accordance with Rule 18).

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The bill is PASSED.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

The next item should be Calendar No. 135, substitute for Senate Bill No. 1042, File No. 960.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk please call the calendar item?

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1535, substitute for S.B. No. 1042, An Act Concerning a Location Study for a New Connecticut River Bridge, File No. 960.

MR. O'NEILL (52nd):

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

ad

**S-81  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

June 3, 1971

Page 30

or conducting its activities in or outside the state.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I move passage of the amendment. This is relatively self-explanatory amendment. It assures that any campaign organization whether it is organized within the state of Connecticut or outside the State of Connecticut and I'm giving particular reference to Washington, D.C., should also be included under this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on the amendment, will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye", Opposed, "nay". The amendment is adopted. Senator Dupont on the bill, as amended.

SENATOR DUPONT:

I move passage of the bill, as amended. This bill strengthens Connecticut's corrupt practices act by placing the responsibility for filing a report of contributions and expenditures upon a campaign treasurer. I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Remark further on the bill? If not, all those in favor of passage, signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 837. File No. 1181. Favorable report of the joint committee on Appropriations. Substitute for Senate Bill 943. An Act Creating a Division of Consumer Education in the Cooperative Extension Service in the University of Connecticut.

SENATOR HOULEY:

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

June 3, 1971

Page 31

\$50,000. It appropriates \$50,000 to the Cooperative Extension Service at the University of Connecticut, to establish a Division of Consumer Education. The duties and the responsibilities of the division, will be, to provide in service training to community leaders in Consumer Education. To conduct educational programs relating to consumer problems, including but not limited to the use of credit, door-to-door salesmen and money management. To interpret the existent consumer laws and to develop illustrative materials, visual aids and teaching tools effective for reaching economically disadvantaged families as defined in Title 10 of the General Statutes as amended. The existing extension offices and personnel throughout the State shall be used as the core of this program.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose this bill. This bill came to the Education Committee, we considered it and did not bring the bill out favorably. It is my own opinion and the opinion of many people in this legislature that the Department of the Consumer Education programs, should be in the Department of Consumer Protection. I think it is clearly indicated that it should be in the department of the Government. The Department of the Executive Branch of this government. I oppose the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not,

SENATOR HOULEY:

Not to prolong this, Mr. President, but, I do want to clarify to some degree the remarks of the previous speaker. I ran a punch out on the Senate Bill 943, and I don't see where there was an unfavorable report on the committee of Education. I do see where a public hearing was held on the 23 of

June 3, 1971

Page 32

February, where it was filed with the Legislative Commissioner's office and on May 3, it had a change of reference favorable to the Committee on Appropriations. Wherein a public hearing had already been scheduled, the Committee was favorable and we're here.

When the vote is taken, should there be further discussion or not, I move for a roll call vote, Mr. President.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, in further clarification of the last speaker's remarks, when I said it did not receive a favorable report from the Committee on Education, I was referring to the joint committee. We usually bring out our bills jointly. This was a favorable report from the House Committee on Education and not on the Senate Committee. It split for this vote and did not go along with the favorable report.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, I rise in support of what I deem to be a vital piece of legislation. Remarking on the statements by Senator Hammer, it may be that the job that the extension at the University of Connecticut is and has been doing and has proven that it can do it in the future, it may belong in the State Department of Consumer Protection but, the State Department of Consumer Protection is not equipped and it would take several years for the State Department, the present State Department of Consumer Protection to do all of the kinds of things that the presently be done by the extension service of the University of Connecticut. One of the most important aspects, of the job that is being done at UCONN., is that there are many students who can work with the extension service as a part of a work study program. There are hundreds of volunteers which have been gotten by the University, which the

June 3, 1971

Page 33

State Department just can't do and may have been getting down in the communities where the State Department can't get down into, and if, you call the State Department of Consumer Protection, today about many of the basic kinds of consumer problems that the set families every day, you would not be able to get help. As a matter of fact, the State Department of Consumer Protection refer people to the University of Connecticut Extension in Storrs.

SENATOR DUPONT:

Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with Senator Houley's and Senator Smith's remarks. I'm familiar with this extension service and they are doing a good job in Consumer Protection and other areas. I think this is a worthwhile bill and a worthwhile appropriation for them. I urge passage.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Speaking for the third time, Mr. President, with your permission. Mr. President, Senator Smith remarked are directed, they have to be directed at the old Department of Consumer Protection. It may be that you couldn't get any service of the old department but, we expect with the whole change in administration that this will be a different Department of Consumer Protection.

I cannot help but remark that in the last session, this bill, which was before us and this request for money was very urgently made by the University Service, was turned down by that legislature. I don't know why it comes up now, but, it does. I think it will better, in an efficient, under an official executive branch of the governor which has the authority to put into action the necessary programs. I oppose this bill.

SENATOR HOULEY:

With your permission and the circle, Mr. President, for the third and

June 3, 1971

Page 34

and last time, referring to the specific remarks that perhaps we were talking about the old Consumer Protection, I have here, Mr. President, which anybody may inspect, some 20 odd letters involving the current commissioner, stating in effect, and they are open for anyone to review if they wish, that if they would please contact, Consumer Education Division of the Cooperative Extension Service, that perhaps they would be in a better position to provide the information. For example, I have here letters signed by The Director of Food and Drugs of the State of Connecticut, which I won't name. We don't have to get into proper names. I have here a letter from the current Commissioner that says, our department does not have the kind of literature you desire. By a copy of this letter we are forwarding your letter to, Dr. Elsie Fetterman and she may be able to help you in your educational publication literature in time. I can go on and we have several requests to this office regarding generally educational pamphlets in the way of Consumer Education. We do not have it at this time, but, it's available and on and on. These letters are open for anyone to see.

The point is, I think, if I may try to briefly sum up. What is important here is that the job must be done. The administrations saw a method of doing it and requested \$100,000 placing the responsibility within the existing Commissioner and creating three or four new positions. Upon analysis we felt that, with the availability of some 62 field staff people, already to go, that know the material, now the background have the facilities, that are located in the field, in the ghettos in many cases, in the lower income brackets if you will, in the non-english speaking centers of some of our cities, and again we'll be very happy to provide a roster and a list of that, with the fact that legal advice is available within the system. With the fact that

June 3, 1971

Page 35

student labor is available here, under a funded work steady, Federal funded work study program. With the consideration that business and industry such as, Avon Products, Sears Roebuck, Ford Foundation, Commission of Higher Education. Each can contribute and do contribute and have contributed to this agency, with the fact that, visual materials, television, radio, public service time, six times weekly is available, with the public utilities cooperation it is our feeling that the job can best be done at the present time, and implemented the quickest with the least amount of money, Mr. President, by using this road. And that is the purpose of the bill before us. I urge passage.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, Senator Houley has made it abundantly clear that my earlier remarks were not directed toward the past administration or even the present administration. My remarks have to do with the fact that this State has not by legislation given the present state department of Consumer Protection the responsibility or the authority to deal with the basic gut issues that the set low income, particularly low income families throughout this State. In every City, urban centers and large urban centers and even the small cities, like in Willimantic around in that area where there are a lot of people who don't even know enough to call the State Department of Consumer Protection. Only to call them, and have them referred to some local agency which has had to deal with the consumer program at UCONN. And again, as I said before, we don't have the staff, no sense in pouring a lot of money into a possibility to a promise to do something. Why not expand on what has been proven to be the best kind of job that can be done anywhere. Not only in this State but in this Country.

June 3, 1971

Page 36

May I make this last remark and that is, simply to say that, having been associated with Consumer Protection, one of the first Consumer Protection agencies funded by the Federal Government in this State and that was in Hartford, I spent a year and a half, trying to work with the state agencies, and the state agencies ended up asking the neighborhood organizations for information because that's the only way you can get it.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose this bill. I think unquestionably the agency at Storrs, is doing an outstanding job. But, I don't think that's really the issue here. The issue here is, that we have a Consumer Protection Agency. We're being asked to appropriate money and we should appropriate that state money, establish the branch within the agency which has to deal with the enforcement and which cannot but help know the problems and investigate them at the same time, that they are investigating their problems.

It isn't a question of whether the one agency or the other, this will be the State Agency, representing the State of Connecticut and the consumers in which they are trying to protect.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? A motion has been made for a roll call vote.  
All those (interruption by Senator Houley)

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, with your permission, may I withdraw my request for a roll call vote and ask rather that we have a standing vote on the question?

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection. It is so ordered.

June 3, 1971

Page 37

SENATOR IVES:

I move for a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

A motion has been made that there be a roll call vote. All those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, nay. More than 20% having moved for a roll call. An immediate roll call is ordered in the Senate.

THE CLERK:

The following is the roll call vote:

those voting yea were:

SENATORS FAULISO

BURKE

PAC

CIARLONE

CUTILLO

BUCKLEY

CALDWELL

DUPONT

MONDANI

SENATORS SMITH

JACKSON

ALFANO

LIEBERMAN

SULLIVAN

MURPHY

STRADA

DINELLI

HOULEY

Those voting Nay were:

SENATORS ODEGARD

EDDY

ZAJAC

GUNTHER

MACAULEY

DOWD

RUDOLF

SENATORS ROME

HAMMER

CRAFTS

CASHMAN

PETRONI

RIMER

POWER

June 3, 1971

Page 38

SENATORS IVES

SENATORS DENARDIS

FINNEY

THE CHAIR:

The results of the roll call vote:

Whole number voting	35	
Necessary for passage	18	
Those voting yea		18
Those voting nay		17
Those absent and not voting		1

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 850. File No. 1015. Favorable report of the joint committee on Labor and Industrial Relations. Substitute for House Bill 7428. An Act Concerning Cost of Living Adjustments to Beneficiaries Entitled to Workmen's Compensation Death Benefits.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill is a supplement to our present statutes and persons who are wholly dependent on employees who die as a result of injury sustained or and after October 1, 1971, shall be entitled to receive death benefits which will be adjusted to the cost of living increase. The purpose of this bill provides for a cost of living increase to persons who are wholly dependent on a deceased employee through their receipt of death benefits under our present section in compensation of those who are fully dependent. The cost of living increase will effect those dependents who are dependent on employees who died as a result of injuries sustained.

**S-83**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 8  
1-468  
SP.SESS  
INDEX**

August 2, 1971

44

THE CLERK:

Page 3, please, sixth item from the top, File No. 1181. Public Act No. 681. Sub. for Senate Bill No. 943. An Act Concerning Creating a Division of Consumer Education in the Cooperative Extension Service at the University of Connecticut..

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President. I move for repassage of this bill. Rather than to go over the long record that was before this body when the bill first passed, I simply want to reiterate a few of them. We pointed out here where the argument that much of what the extensive service at the University of Connecticut was doing, did in fact, or should have belonged to the province of the State department of Consumer Protection. I would be one of the first to commend the (inaudible) job that the new State Commissioner of Consumer Protection has been doing, Commissioner Barbara Dunn. I want to point out one of her own complaints and one of her more recent complaints was that she wished that the Legislature would license grocery stores so that her department would be better able to follow through on the many complaints than have been coming in to her department and also/where she would be in a better position inasmuch as she is in that field and has authority in that field to regulate such businesses that are so closely associated with the consumer. We pointed out before the news media that it made themselves available to the University of Connecticut's extension service, of the packages that are being put together for other colleges, and high schools throughout the state, teaching youngsters the advantages and

August 2, 1971

45

SENATOR SMITH:

of the market of the consumer and I just simply want to call upon this legislature, or this body rather, to look at the Governor's own message in vetoing this legislation and he says that it is commendable but it belongs properly within the State Dept. of Consumer Protection. I want to place emphasis on what the Governor himself said, it belongs properly in the office of the Department of Consumer Protection. However, the Governor erred by saying in his message that it was taking away something from the State Dept. of Consumer Protection. On one score we had to agree that it belongs there but on the other it has to disagree it is not taking away anything from the State Dept. of Consumer Protection because the field in which the University of Connecticut's Consumer Extension has been long engaged, that field has not been covered by the State Dept. of Consumer Protection. It is not now and under present law it is impossible for them to cover it. I think if all of us are aware of the dire need of this affiliation with U.Conn. and until such time as the legislature does get around to doing something about it's consumer loss, I pray that this body will repass this measure.

THE CHAIR:

Questions on repassage. Will you remark further? Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President. A couple of points, we won't belabor them simply because in this particular instance this veto almost positively will not be overturned simply because this matter unfortunately has become a raw

August 2, 1971

46

SENATOR HOULEY:

political implement. It is unfortunate that it has developed that way but it has developed that way. I do want to highlight just two or three interesting points. To begin with, initially there was just one hundred thousand dollars appropriation in the Governor's February Budget for the purpose of establishing a Consumer Education Department within the Consumer Protection for \$100,000. In the perusal of this we found that the Extension Service of the University of Connecticut was in fact doing quite an outstanding job in this area itself and for an appropriation exactly half of the Governor's recommendation or \$50,000 that it could by purchasing particular materials do a very excellent job. So there is that consideration of a differential between a \$100,000 expenditure and a \$50,000 expenditure. Now I ask where is the additional \$50,000 going to come from in this particular case. If this veto is allowed to stand, remember we are knocking \$50,000 out of the budget and \$100,000 was not in the budget. So it is an interesting question and I am sure the answer will be forthcoming. Doing it through the Extension Service of the University of Connecticut and after all that is our objective and that is to do the job, there would be no additional staff requirements. Under the proposal that is because of this override, we will now find six new people being added to this department and that is a very interesting observation I think. Under the existing program handled by the Extension Service at the University, it functions as a non-governmental agency and is therefore eligible for the United States Department of Agriculture grants which under the proposed procedure is not subject to F.D.A. grants. Speaking of grants, as a government entity, as proposed by the Governor, it is very doubtful in my opinion Mr. President, that private non profit corporations, such as the

August 2, 1971

47

SENATOR HOULEY:

Ford Foundation, the Chrysler Corporation would be asked to provide funds for the purpose of Consumer Education. With the setup under the Extension Service at the University of Connecticut, they have in fact, received substantial grants and would continue to receive substantial grants from private funds. So there is an area that I think we ought to consider. As a government agency under the Governor Meskill proposal, it is very doubtful that the television and radio stations because of the nature of it being a governmental agency would be apt to give of its free time that it currently gives to the Extension Service, that amounts to some forty hours a week of free television and radio time aimed at the ultimate objective of providing consumer education and that I believe raises the question now that of whether or not, it is government agency whether or not that time will be available. Probably the most pressing argument and one of the last is that at the present time, the University of Connecticut Extension Service is ready to go. It is manned, it was funded, it is ready to implement the legislation. Under the new proposal I suspect that it will be some time before the organization of that particular subsection of consumer protection will be ready to go. I think that it is also important that we understand that the University of Connecticut Extension Service is not per se the University of Connecticut. Perhaps one of the shortcomings in this bill, Mr. President, was the use of the term University of Connecticut in its language because it seems any time the University of Connecticut or any other Higher Education entity in the State of Connecticut comes before the administration's mind and eyes, immediately there is a rebellion to whatever thought it is. Most especially with reference to the University of Connecticut. The veto is my opinion, Mr. President, like so many others

SENATOR HOULEY:

is based on a misunderstanding or perhaps is based on bad advice by the Governor's advisors, or perhaps it is based on a burning desire to control every action in government, or perhaps all three, Mr. President, As I stated at the onset it is extremely doubtful that this particular veto will be overridden and I think it is unfortunate because the important thing here is to get the job done, to get it done effectively in the shortest amount of time and with the procedure that this General Assembly had in fact enacted, it would have been possible we would have already been at the presses and as it is now, we are going to be delayed anywhere from two to three months.

THE CHAIR:

Questions on repassage. Senator Hammer.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President. I have a question for either Senator Houley or Senator Smith. This was such a splendid setup, why wasn't it established in a firm and legal legislative way before this session.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Houley, if you will.

SENATOR HOULEY:

By way and through you, Mr. President, I can't answer the whys and wherefores. I just know there was legislation passed in this session that perhaps could not have been passed in the session before or the session before that. I know there was legislation that failed in this particular session that perhaps in another session will be timely. The area of

August 2, 1971

49

SENATOR HOULEY:

Consumer Protection happens in this year, this particular year of 1971 to be a Consumer Voter Issue, an issue where it is the popular thing to do and I suspect that is part of the reason why this bill ended in this particular section.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on repassage. Will you remark further? Senator Ives.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the passage of this bill. I think it has been pretty adequately covered that consumer education should be in the agency which is charged with consumer protection, but if the extension service is not a part of the University, there is nothing that would prevent them from carrying on consumer education without state funds. They can still get the funds from the Ford Foundation. They can still get funds Chrysler Foundation and they can also get matching funds from the Federal Government. But as far as state putting money into the educational program, it rightfully belongs in the Department of Consumer Protection and the veto should be sustained.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks on repassage. Hearing none, a Roll Call is ordered in the Senate.

ROLL CALL ON P.A. 681. Sub. Senate Bill No. 943. An Act Concerning Cost of Living Adjustments in Salaries of Retired State Employees.

The following is the Roll Call.

August 2, 1971

50

<u>SENATORS</u>		ABS	<u>SENATORS</u>		ABS
FAULISO			DOWD		
SMITH		ABS	RIMER		NAY
BURKE	YES		STRADA	YES	
ODEGARD		NAY	RUDOLF		NAY
JACKSON	YES		DUPONT	YES	
PAC		NAY	POWER		NAY
ALFANO	YES		DINIELLI	YES	
ROME		NAY	IVES		NAY
EDDY		NAY	MONDANI	YES	
CIARLONE	YES		DENARDIS		NAY
LIEBERMAN	YES		HOULEY	YES	
HAMMER		NAY	FINNEY	YES	NAY
ZAJAC		NAY			
PRETE	YES				
CUTILLO	YES				
SULLIVAN	YES				
BUCKLEY		NAY			
CRAFTS		NAY			
MURPHY	YES				
CASHMAN		NAY			
GUNTHER		NAY			
MACAULEY		NAY			
CALDWELL	YES				
PETRONI		NAY			

August 2, 1971

51

THE CHAIR: Results of balloting on File No. 781  
The following is the Yea and Nay Vote:

Whole Number Voting	33
Necessary for Passage	24
Those voting Yea	15
Those voting nay	18
Those absent and not voting	3

THE CHAIR:

The bill is not repassed. The veto is sustained.

THE CLERK:

Page 3, second item from the bottom. File No. 1509. P.A. No. 705.  
Sub. for Senate Bill 1308. An Act Concerning the Powers of the Commissioner  
of Transportation.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lieberman:

SENATORLIEBERMAN:

Mr. President. I move for repassage of this bill. I would have to call this bill my sentimental favorite of the session, a kind of Lee Trevino type bill, not wanting to dwell too much on the past, I recall the night about 11:50, Senator Smith stood up to begin a mini philabuster on a residency bill and about thirty seconds to twelve Senator Ives stood up and said he wanted to interrupt. I thought this bill was long dead and I was much thrilled to hear him move for the passage of Senate Bill 1308, and it did in fact pass and became Public Act 705, only to be vetoed later on. The moment of excitement certainly makes this my sentimental favorite. Having said that, may I say briefly that the bill does three things. It allows