

SB 203

PA 766

1971

Corrections, Welfare and Humane Inst. 39, 68-69,
73-74, 105-109

House 5860-5861, 5877-5878

Senate 2713-2715

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**CORRECTIONS,
WELFARE
AND
HUMANE
INSTITUTIONS**

1-342

**1971
Index**

Lawrence Morastike, Chief of Social Services (cont'd): considered at that time for adoptive parents. We had been in the process of identifying other families and there are more families than there are infants or young white infants to be considered as adoptive families. Subsequently, we placed this child in July of 1970 with an adoptive family and that child has been with that family since that time. In fact, the adoption has been finalized in Probate Court as we feel that there would be a definite conflict of jurisdiction and perhaps some constitutional questions if this bill were passed. Thank you.

Chairman Brown: Are there any other statements regarding this particular bill before we get into programs Commissioner?

Commissioner White: We have no more. I think we could go— we will be perfectly happy to go on the regular schedule and we have prepared statements for the committee.

Chairman Brown: Why don't you proceed? We would certainly appreciate your summarizing any prepared statements and make them available to the committee so that it can become a part of the record.

Commissioner White: Right, this can be done jointly with my staff. If you would like to proceed on this list Representative Brown I would be very happy we will comment as we see fit.

Chairman Brown: Right. I don't think they can hear you very much.

Commissioner White: If you would like to proceed on the list we will comment as we go.

Chairman Brown: Yes, I would like you to proceed with your list and we will comment and follow you. I think we could begin with #1 and that's #5003.

Commissioner White: We have no statement on that.

Chairman Brown: No statement on that. Why don't we go from that point.

Commissioner White: All right. #5006 — That's the same really — that's for the towns to take

Chairman Brown: Can you bring the microphone a little closer — because it's not picking up —

Commissioner White: This ... we would rather have this mixed with Senate Bill #523 which is Senator Finney's and also Bill #202 and Senator Lieberman and #203 and Mr. Morastika will speak on this.

Lawrence Morastika, Chief of Social Services: We have prepared some estimates for the committee which we will share with you in relation to the assumption of this program again by the state. You will recall at one time that the State Welfare Department did administer this program and it was transferred to the towns by public action #720 in the last General Assembly. Our estimates are that if this program were assumed by the state completely,

Mrs. N. LeRoy from Madison (cont'd):

study we have consulted with several members of the Welfare Department, both in Connecticut and in other states, and both foster parents, psychologists and other professionals. We have studied the reports of other pilot projects. All reports and conversation substantiate our findings and most back this proposed bill. It is CCWA's help and the voice of Connecticut's children that salaried foster parents can be approved. Thank you.

Chairman Brown: We will have J. Cook and then Representative Beck.

Jean Cook, Middletown, Connecticut and I am prepared to speak in support of Bill #480.

As a member of the Federal Connecticut Chapter of CCWA and a taxpayer in the State of Connecticut who is mindful both of our current fiscal crisis and burgeoning welfare costs I urge you to seriously consider the bill before you. With natural families unable to care for them and foster families whose own experiences often do not equip them to handle the traumatic emotional experiences of the children in their care, today's foster children often find themselves in a hopeless situation. These foster children are desperately in need of foster parents who are selected to meet their individual needs, two - tain them in many areas of child development with emphasis on the needs of foster children and three adequately remunerated for the highly skilled job for which they are expected to do. Even this -- even though this pilot project calls for operating on a higher pay scale, it is still possible to save many thousands of dollars simply by keeping children out of institutions which are frequently non-curing, expensive ways of coping with the problem child, and placing them into homes designed to meet their needs. We believe that it is possible to substantially improve the quality of the services rendered to the foster child while at the same time reducing the long term cost of this care to the state. Thank you.

Chairman Brown: If you have a statement be sure that the secretary gets it. Representative Beck.

Representative Beck: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I very much appreciate your taking time just before your break and too in the public portion where the legislators are not supposed to speak. I have several bills. I'll summarize the statements with the committee.

Mrs. Janet Billy -

First and perhaps one of the most crucial bills the Connecticut Child Welfare bills is interested in is S. B. #523. Let me make one statement for all of these bills and say that I am Mrs. Janet Billy testifying before you today as the Connecticut Director of the Connecticut Child Welfare Association, a nonprofit statewide citizens committee whose sole concern for 52 years has been updating of services of all children of Connecticut. We owe allegiance to no state department, no agencies, inaudable ---

Combine S. B. INAUDABLE --- 203 and 523. These bills have been studied by the citizens of our association and I have authorized by the Board of Directors to make the following statement:

Mrs. Janet Billy (cont'd):

INAUDABLE -- Item #1 -- the continued eligibility under 21 years of age of a child under AFDC family if he is full time in school. Education is one of the only proven methods of breaking up the cycle of poverty. Children in AFDC families must be not only permitted but encouraged to attend school through high school and beyond if possible. To deny education to these children is to encourage yet another family to become a welfare family. Further it makes a mockery of our community colleges and the technical schools in the State of Connecticut that we're so proud of.

Now in my public speaking engagements I have been pretty frequently asked why the ineligibility of the child 19-21 would make him drop out of school. I'm prepared to answer questions on that -- they are technical questions and I presume the committee has that information at hand. If they do not I will be happy either at this time or at a later date to answer them.

The second item -- Reinstatement of the Unemployed Parent Program-- We feel it is essential to reinstate this program to arbitrarily set up a situation to which a man can better feed and clothe his family by deserting them is indeed a very expensive program. If he chooses not to desert under the very -- current law then his family will apply to their town of residence for general assistance which receives seventy five per cent in state funds and no Federal matching funds at all. At the risk of encouraging your displeasure I am going to tell you a very short story which which vividly describes the situation we find ourselves in with the unemployed parent program.

It was described in a book by ??? in the early 1940's called the Triumph of Willy Pond. Willy was an undereducated, unemployed, husband and father of several children -- a no good. The family was destitute. They lived in a shack, frequently going through garbage pails for food, stealing and the children rarely attended school because they had no clothing. But one day it was discovered that Willy had tuberculosis. He was sent to a sanatorium. Then his family became eligible for public welfare. Suitable quarters were found, food was available and the children were clothed and they attended school. In about two years Willy recovered and welcomed home with great joy. Immediately Public Welfare was discontinued and shortly we find the family in its old shack, destitute, returning to the garbage pails, the children no longer attended the school. Now Connecticut changed that story to a happy ending in 1965. Rewrote the Willy Pond story-- INAUDABLE

And now in 1971 once again has the opportunity to make a happy end for that story.

In conclusion permit me to remind you that both of these items receive fifty to seventy five per cent matching funds. The continued eligibility of AFDC children in school full time and the aid to families of unemployed parents are fiscally sound, contributes to the development of healthy children whose chances of becoming productive adults are enhanced. We urge a favorable report on 202, 203, embodied in 523.

Mark Aronson (cont'd):

for the children of a large family. It also would bring Connecticut more into conformity with Federal law and regulations.

We are also supporting H. B. #6951 and S. B. #95 - to provide for reasonable visits -- visits only at reasonable times for members of the Welfare Department to recipient households. This apparently is the present state policy. The present statute also raises some question as to constitutionality under the recent James B. Wyman Decision that you are **INAUDIBLE** which does not permits visits at any time but only at reasonable times.

I'd like to quote that these are our positions on a number of bills. We also are going to be supporting the positions that will be shortly submitting to the committee by the attorneys of the welfare moms of New Haven and the attorneys for Meriden welfare rights. Thank you..

BEGINNING OF THIS TAPE #12 **INAUDIBLE**

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

The hospitals of the State of Connecticut support in principle the concept of transferred general assistance from state welfare departments to the State of Connecticut. This is not an area of prime concern to the hospitals but they do support it in principle on the theory that it will reduce the burdens to the town and cities in which many hospitals are located.

As a part of that and reviewing the bill before the committee, I think it's consistent for a hospital to take an opposing view to S. B. #737, which seems to take the contrary position to the concept of general assistance which we support.

Now, in particular in my review of the bills which are before you, I draw your attention to H. B. #7050 which seems in our judgment to probably do the best job of the bills which are before you, in that it not only deals with questions of fiscal response by the state on the one hundred per cent basis, but also seems to deal with the transfer of administrative responsibility which I think in our judgment is important. Thank you very much.

Chairman Ciarlone: We will now hear from Mr. William Clendennon, Attorney for the Moms Organization.

Mr. William Clendennon, New Haven Moms **INAUDIBLE**:

S. B. #427 is the work incentive program of Connecticut. This is the only bill which would allow Connecticut to cover the conformity with the Federal Law. If the recent conformity hearing **INAUDIBLE** -- In support.

We would also like to support S. B. #202, 203 and H. B. 5006 and 523. We submit also that these bills will save Connecticut money. What happened in 1969 was that the towns had to bear the burden that the state was bearing on the 19-20 years old children on the unemployed parents. By function -- returning these functions to the State Welfare Department we will be able to get the fifty percent matching money from

Mr. William Clendennon (cont'd):

the Federal Government. Now Members of the New Haven Moms are here today. They came up on a bus to testify to explain their individuals fact situations and how these bills affect them in their own personal lives.

I would like to add that S. B. 202 and 203 --legal guardians are included. By including them in the state program we are relieving a financial burden on the town and also providing to families the support of services which are necessary today. I thank you.

Chairman Ciarlone: Mr. David ? please come forth and identify yourself on the record.

David Lesser - Lawyer from New Haven also speaking on behalf of the New Haven Moms and the Fairhaven Neighborhood Corporation.

I would like to speak in regard to three bills. The first of these we support.... H. B. #5003. This bill would repeal the current statutory requirement that the Welfare Commissioner discontinue assistance to a person convicted of Welfare Fraud. Under the current law discontinuing the mother's share of aid harms the children most of all since the needs of the family have not changed. Discontinuing the mother's share of the family grant will mean there's insufficient aid to meet the need of the family..... particularly since the mother's already been punished by a Court of Law, termination of assistance would appear to be a double jeopardy type of punishment which most gravely harms the innocent victims -- the children.

The second bill we oppose -- H. B. 5262 requiring stepparents the support of stepchildren. Under the bill this legal duty would be so expensive -- with the natural parents duty toward his natural children. As has already been pointed out two years ago the General Assembly overwhelmingly rejected a similar bill. As has already been pointed out also this bill before has the same defects as that that was rejected in the last session. The bill would severely inhibit the marital prospects of divorced, widowed, unmarried mothers either on welfare or from lower economic classes. Secondly, the bill would encourage dissolution of those families which are already headed by stepfathers. I would like to point out that under current law under which there is no stepparent liability marriage of mothers -- re-marriage is encouraged. This results in acost savings to the state. Because if a welfare mother marries an employed individual, she is generally taken off the welfare rolls entirely. This means the state saves money, by a policy which encourages marriage. Putting obstacles in the way of remarriage will be INAUDIBLE and will end up in costing the state more money.

Finally, we are presenting to you our argument of Section 172^F of the General Statutes. This should be repealed. That statute requires the Welfare Commissioner to make all rental payments to a Welfare Recipient's landlord in the case that his rent is more than ten days late. This arrangement continues for as long as the tenant remains in the premises. The major point to be made -- one which has already been made by the Representative of the Welfare Department, is that Section 17 2 ^F endangers

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

Mr. McArthur: I would like to testify for myself, my family, also for the members of our organization. We have all, we were all present Tuesday and was not heard due to the time limit. Some mothers had to return to Meriden to meet their children returning from the schools. All that spoke to the, all that I spoke to approved of the following bills. Bills 202, 203, and 427 and they oppose of the Bills 5259, which consist the black man, also 5003, 5262 and 1156. However, however since we didn't have the benefit to speak yesterday, we had a busload of people that was able to come up from Meriden, and they were unable to testify, I beg the Chairman's indulgence and the meeting and the Legislators, if I should extend this three minutes to allow me to some of the things that they had participated in to testifying in. On these particular bills I will keep it short as I possibly can. First of all

Sen. Ciarlone: Excuse me one second, sir. Would you try speaking a bit louder? Some of the members of our Committee are having difficulty trying to hear you.

Mr. McArthur: I'm awfully sorry. Thank you very much. First of all, I will get to the proposal consisting of the age limit to children. I believe that's on the Bill 202 or 203, I'm not sure if I have them right. The children should receive help from the State up until the age of twenty one years instead of the age of seven, eighteen which is now being gone into process. And second there was adequate hearing on these particular bills that I mentioned, 202 and 203, I don't wish to go into any a whole lot of details, I'm sure you're familiar with it and I must pardon my to the Chairman and to the Legislators, that I'm not qualified, that I don't have the vocabulary of a college professor and in translating some of these bills, I'm also limited. But, however, I do want to be concerned with this. Now I do feel that in this 427 bill here you have, this is the one referring to the fathers taking care of the step-father becoming responsible for the children. No, no, no, no, no, I'm wrong, that's eleven If you will bear with me just a moment. I believe that is correct. 427, I believe that Bill consists of step-fathers becoming responsible for the children. Now, I don't think any father wants to step into a family of four and has to become responsible for that child. When anyone in the Welfare situation believe me, have a problem. However, I do say and I've said many a time before me, that it is not necessary to give birth to a child to become a good pediatrician, but it helps. We, the Welfare reciprocant knows what our problems are and we have calls many times on many of the committees and I've asked some of the Legislators in regards to clothing. If you will pardon me for going from one to the other, I will do so in that manner to be as brief as I possibly can. On clothing, bringing the children up to standards. On housing and the cost of living, I think that all of this should come in to one category, due to the fact, you have here, I have here brochures, printed out and left to me and left to my

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

disposure. A family of three is allowed \$105.00 for an apartment, add \$1.00 extra for gas and heat. I've had personal experience with this and Meriden hasn't been brought up to the standards and I find that in a lot of states, and the State of Connecticut, that they have different standards. I feel this is wrong. Right in Meriden itself, there are some reciprocants receiving up to \$150. I had an opportunity to speak to the Commissioner in the hall myself and he says, hey, I can't understand this and I was told myself and I know of a few other cases being the President of the Welfare Rights Organization, they bring these problems to me. I was refused an apartment because it paid, \$110.00 or \$125.00 a month. It give me all the utilities. It gave me a decent, it was on a decent street and they refused to pay that amount of rent. It included the hot water and the utilities as I said. But, they said go out and find another apartment for less money. This particular reciprocant went out and found one in the ghetto area which Meriden doesn't like to consider itself having a ghetto area. Believe me, they have a breeding ground if they don't call it a ghetto area. They said rent a house for \$77.00 a month, this is all right, but you have to buy, we'll buy the utilities, a used gas stove, a used refrigerator, a used gas heater, gas heater, space heater, whatever you want to call it, and we'll pay the gas bill. Now, this to me, as a commoner, I speak to myself as a commoner, and the education ability, I'm unfortunate enough not to have been able to finish college. But I can add. And when I see that you say that it's all right for me to take a \$77.00 apartment, buy me a refrigerator, buy me a stove, buy me a space heater, pay for the gas bill, which comes to eighty to ninety dollars a month. Hey, if you add that up, you're spending in the neighborhood of \$165.00 month rent. This to me is segregating. This is putting you in areas that I want you in. And in those cases of a family of three that the same Welfare Department has been paying rent of \$150 a month but they was of a different nationality and I don't want to go into a racial thing. This is not the proper time and place but I do feel that some of the Department of the Welfare itself has to be looked into. I've asked the Commissioner and we was allowed \$20 for clothing. I asked the Commissioner and I've asked some of the Commissioners I've asked anyone from Hartford, anyone that set up this budget, to \$20 for clothing. I have a boy, he's thirteen years old. He weighs two hundred and fifteen pounds. They allow me \$20 to give him food, clothing for school. I'll give anyone in the State Capitol or the State Legislature or anywhere else that that \$20 and let him go out and supply that boy for clothing for the school for the school year. Now at that weight, he wears out a pair of pants within one or two months and the shoes are the same thing. The doctor says because of his weight, he has to have

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 197;

orthopedic shoes. We have a standard here which we have to go by so forth when it comes to clothing. And, if you'll be patient, I'll bring that up to you.

Sen. Ciarlone: To save some time sir, I might say, I think everyone on the Committee has probably that same form that you're probably, that you probably have there so we might save some time and just proceed. I'm sure that we have that.

Mr. McArthur: Yeah, well anyway, what I'm trying to say I think they allow me something like \$3.50 to buy a pair of pants and I'd like to see anyone go out and buy a size 42 pair of pants to fit a child of that particular age and that particular size on this pants. Now, we'll get to this flat grant. This flat grant says that this will hurt an awful lot. As I find it now, I find that we are not even up to the government standards. If you'll notice to the Nixon plan, he says that it is adequate for a family, minimum, for a family of four, and I have this document right here, if anybody wants it, they can have it, that if a, the minimum that a family of four can live on is a \$55 a year. I mean \$5500 a year, I'm awfully sorry. And I quote now, I read from this, It is inadequate, it is inadequate that the Nixon plan would give the family of four only, \$1600 up to \$2300 if they can get food stamps. The government itself, the Bureau of Labor Statistics says that it takes a minimum of \$5500 a year for a family of four to live. Recipients of most states will get the same amount they get now. I say we are not even up to the government standards and I say that something should be done about it. I talked to Mr. White, the Commissioner the new Commissioner we have, and he seemed a little shocked at the some of the problems that I had an opportunity to tell him. I invite Mr. White and any of his Committee, to Meriden, to its Welfare Office there in Meriden and to look into these problems personally. I heard it mentioned yesterday that where many people say why should we come up here. I'm glad to come up here. And a, for one simple reason, there's a lot of things that I could sit here all day, telling of what we need to keep us. Now a lot of people when they refer to a Welfare Recipient, right away they refer to the taxpayer's money. My family goes back four generations and I've been paying taxes all my life. My mother, my mother and they is still paying taxes. My mother, unfortunately, I lost. My mother worked in this State. I was born in this State. I was born in Middletown, raised in a I left here for twenty years and went to New York and I got sick and tired of that rate race there and I came home. I find myself in an unhealthy condition. A very unhealthy condition. I work for the Board of Education. This took me out of work due to the fact I was in a hospitable, in and out of a hospitable ninety days during the time that I was working. I could have kicked up and raised a fuss and said hey, keep me here but you're holding a job and staying in a hospitable ninety days. I went to work before the doctor says so. Listen, there's something wrong. I now become eligible for Social Security Disability. Which I will apply for. I have applied for the main factor that I mention

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

to you that I, I want to mention to you the fact I paid taxes all my life and so have my parents. I can go back four generations in the State of Connecticut. Now, I reply for my disability, I have a year's back pay coming the Welfare Department will take every penny of that money and say you will stay on your same basis. You don't go nowhere. You stay put. I'm not complaining so much about that. It just means that I will have to stay where I am. I am in favor of some program to train people in other fields, because of my health. I feel because of my health I am a maintenance mechanic by trade. I have a bad back, bursitis in both arms and just had an operation that some doctors termed their was a blockage and it was a blockage and gall bladder stones and it affected my pancreas and what have you. Now, there are been many a programs that the government had put forth in Meriden that said and it stated, it was from the government, and the government says that this is an incentive program. It pertains to people that are receiving Workmen's Compensation, Welfare Recipients and people who are living, these two people are referred to, they would give you \$20.00 a week in addition to go to school \$10.00 for transportation, \$5.00 for each dependent and it would not interfere with any Welfare check, any unemployment compensation or, your rent if you was living in the housing project. However, this school had to close because the minute they set up the school and many people were interested in it, there was an extra dollar coming in, there was an extra incentive given to them to out and learn and to become a citizen, God knows I hate standing here this day and tell my child he needs a pair of pants today. I have to keep him home a few days because he is dressed properly enough to my satisfaction, not to be ridiculed. Well, a child weighing two hundred and some pounds, not too many children gonna ridicule it. Because I believe I know better because, like I say, he's a good sized boy, five foot nine. But, however, there are children at a younger age, that they do ridicule it because of their clothing and because they are not brought up to standard and they're going to the same school that the middle class are going to and they are able to change clothes every day and some of them are riding to school in five and six thousand dollar cars. God bless them. But I do say that realize that these children have to be clothed and try to help them. Now, in the project. I mentioned the project I heard nobody mention that now, anyone who lives in a housing project, under the Government standards, if a window is broken, I think it costs you something like three or four dollars. If a toilet is stopped up, it's \$5.00. This the reciprocant has to pay, not the Welfare Department. I says you pay, the Housing Authority says you pay this bill. I haven't got nothing to do with it. You go to the Welfare Department. Forget it. We send you certain amount to eat by. We figured what you eat by and this is all. And I have myself been put on

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

a diet. My entire family is on a diet. My wife is a cardiac case, she has a heart condition and these medications. She needs, I was told by a doctor I should have an oxygen tank in my house continuously. I can't afford it and I don't know where I can get money from the Welfare Department. And there are many situations where like I spoke about the people in the housing project. Now the housing project, they say I was able to go to work. I said look honey, I am tired of this Welfare bit. I want to go to work without the doctor's consent. I'll go down and try to pass the examination and if I pass the examination, I'm gonna take this job. I took the job, working for the Board of Education and I was living in the housing, low income. At that time they said to me, well Mr. McArthur you're working now. They brought me to the standards of my pay which was \$116 a week, gross, they looked at. Not, now the \$116 a week grant you sounds pretty good, but they did not, it was not deductible. My income tax. I'd be silly, being an unhealthy an unhealthy family, not to have Blue Cross and CMS. This was not deductible. Any man's working today and doesn't have a hospital insurance is absolutely out of his mind and I do believe every senator in this house has some hospitalization. Because a hospital now and particularly the Meriden-Wallingford Hospital I believe went up to \$71.00 a day. That's for board alone.

Sen. Ciarlone: Mr. McArthur, excuse me one second, you've been testifying for approximately twenty minutes now. Would you try to summarize. We're starting to get

Mr. McArthur: I appreciate the board and I beg the board and I apologize.

Sen. Ciarlone: We know some of the facts that you're telling us but if you can summarize, we'd appreciate it.

Mr. McArthur: I wanted to get into that particular area, this is why I said that I would like to and I'll be glad to yield the floor. And if any issue should come up in regard to what you have on the agenda today I would highly appreciate it if the Committee would allow me to speak in regards to that. And I thank you very much and that should have been said yesterday and the mothers would have been here to do their own testifying and it would have been pretty lengthy but since it wasn't that's all I have.

Sen. Ciarlone: At the risk of seeming somewhat redundant, at this point I want again to caution some of our speakers to try to contain their remarks to three minutes if at all possible. We granted Mr. McArthur some additional leeway because of some confusion yesterday. But we certainly don't want to have this be a precedent. The next speaker is Gertrude McCall.

H-120

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

306

saying aye. Opposed? The bill is ADOPTED.

ad

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, at the top of page 15, the first item, calendar No. 1516.

MR. COATSWORTH (76th): SB 203

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman care to summarize or have the Clerk read the amendment?

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Yes, I'll summarize.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Without objection, the gentleman from the 76th.

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Mr. Speaker, for the most part the amendment is in fact the bill. This amendment is, provides that a dependent child is defined as needy child under the age of eighteen unless that child is under twenty-one and a full time student at a secondary school, technical school, college or state accredited job training program. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MR. STEVENS (122nd):

Mr. Speaker, could we either stand at ease or could this be passed

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

307

temporarily. I'd like to see the amendment, please.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Chair would suggest that the matter be passed temporarily.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

May we then, Mr. Speaker, proceed, go back to page 6, the last item?

THE CLERK:

Page 6, Calendar No. 722, H.B. No. 6091, An Act Concerning the Adoption of a Connecticut Environmental Policy Act.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, may that matter be passed retaining its place on the calendar?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none, the matter is retained.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

May we then proceed to page 7, the second item, Calendar No. 975?

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 975, substitute for H.B. No. 5715, An Act Concerning Work and Recreation on Sunday.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, I move that this item be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

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

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, may we then proceed to page 9, the third item, Calendar No. 1307.

ad

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

323

THE CLERK:

Page 15, Calendar No. 1516, S.B. No. 203, An Act Concerning the Definition of a Dependent Child, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

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

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

In lines 21 and 22, delete the words "or with his legal guardian".

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Mr. Speaker, there was some confusion before on what this Senate amendment was and we have cleared up this matter. The reason why the legal guardian is excluded under this bill is because it is already covered in the existing statute. I move the adoption of the amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

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

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that a dependent child is defined as a needy child under the age of eighteen unless that child is under twenty-one and a full time student in a secondary school, technical school, college or state accredited job training program. I move the passage of this bill as

ad

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

324

amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A" in concurrence with the Senate.

ad

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

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

THE SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR

MR. MAHANEY (92nd):

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct the Clerk's attention to page 6, Calendar No. 427? 6108

THE SPEAKER:

I think the Clerk might find that item.

MR. MAHANEY (92nd):

Well, should he stumble upon it, I think it's a matter that was earlier passed retained, and I would like at this time to move for reconsideration of our earlier action.

THE SPEAKER:

Were you in the prevailing vote?

MR. MAHANEY (92nd):

Yes, I was.

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection to reconsideration? Hearing none, the item will be reconsidered.

MR. MAHANEY (92nd):

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would then ask that we accept the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

**S-81
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

June 2, 1971

Page 11

that back into the act. I move the adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the adoption of the amendment. Any further remarks? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. You may remark on the bill, as amended. I rule the amendment technical.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, the bill sets up a little quicker speed in the State or Public Service taking over land formerly when it involved open space land. Two hearings were involved then and now they can have a joint hearing on whether or not to take the land and they can meet all the requirements. If the requirements stand changes, they can combine a hearing.

The second big change is that the legislative body in the Community, must within 90 days of the hearing, take an action and reject such, if not the commission can proceed. It's a bill that would speed up all the appeal sections that are left in and so on. It would make it easier in resolving some of these problems that hang on and on and on forever.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 832. File No. 1183. Favorable report of the joint committee on Appropriations. Senate Bill 203. An Act Concerning the Definition of a Dependent Child.

June 2, 1971

Page 12

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. The Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT A, OFFERED BY SENATOR CIARLONE:

In lines 21 and 22, delete the words, or with his legal guardian.

SENATOR CIARLONE:

Mr. President the amendment merely is a technical change in the law. It brings the Connecticut Statutes in conformity with Federal Regulations. It's a good change and I urge adoption.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Remarking further, Mr. President, if I may on the bill? This simply (interruption by the Chair.)

THE CHAIR:

We haven't disposed of the amendment, yet, Senator. Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, all of those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The amendment is adopted. Ruled technical, you may remark on the bill, as amended.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Thank you, Mr. President, it simply redefines and clearly the dependent child, age and in effect their attendance at schools and who shall be so defined as supporter and so forth. It's a request bill by the Commissioner of Welfare or whatever the new name might be. I urge the passage.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?

SENATOR CIARLONE:

June 2, 1971

Page 13

Mr. President, this is another bill that our committee was proud to be associated with. This bill brings our statutes into conformity with Federal regulations. Under the definition of a dependent child, the Welfare Commissioner shall continue to pay benefits for a child up to 21 years of age. Providing that said child is attending a technical school, college or state accredited training program. Providing that such dependent is living with his mother, father or approved relative. Its a good bill and we're happy to be associated with it. Again I say, I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1026. File No. 1312. Favorable report of the joint committee on Liquor Control. Substitute for House Bill 7015. An Act Concerning Wholesalers Permits.

SENATOR DUPONT:

Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. I believe the Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT A, offered by Senator Dupont:

At the end of line 24, delete the word a and insert in lieu thereof the word the.

In line 25, delete the words the products and insert in lieu thereof the words any product.

In line 27, delete the word or.

In line 28 delete the word curtailed.