

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-77		6769	3	1	2
<p><u>Committee Pages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Labor & Public Employees 106-107</i> <i>Labor & Public Employees 110</i> 				<p><u>House Pages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 832 	<p><u>Senate Pages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 944-945

H-109

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 2
449-973**

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

5

with our rules, this item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and placed on the regular calendar and retained for consideration tomorrow. Are there further items. ad

MR. SARASIN:

Mr. Speaker, may I read the list of bills to be passed on today's Consent Calendar.

Calendar No. 128 - House Bill No. 5159 - An Act Concerning Municipal Appropriations for Military Organizations, Public Health Nursing Organizations and Hospitals, File No. 107.

Calendar No. 130, House Bill No. 5472 - An Act Concerning Voting on the Consolidation of Governments, File No. 108.

Calendar No. 131, House Bill No. 5852 - An Act Concerning Tax Collectors' Fees, File No. 106.

And on Page 2 -

Calendar No. 135, House Bill No. 6769 - An Act Concerning Annual Reports of Labor Organizations, File No. 121.

Calendar No. 138, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 0214 - An Act Concerning Contracts Under Seal, File No. 54.

Calendar No. 139, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 0343 - An Act Concerning Licensing and Supervision of Commission Sales Stables, File No. 49.

Calendar No. 176, House Joint Resolution No. 145 - I'm sorry, those are the items on the Consent Calendar, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

S-77

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1971

VOL. 14

PART 2

474-956

April 7, 1971

13.

passage of the resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, Mr. Morano I think is known to many members of this circle. Active in the political field for many years, having served as a Congressman. As an aid to two other Congressmen. And as a special assistant to a U.S. Senator. Married and a resident of the town of Greenwich. I trust that he will be confirmed as a member of the Board of Parole.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Business on the Calendar. Turn to page 2 please. The first item, Cal. No. 148, File No. 121, House Bill 6769 An Act Concerning Annual Reports of Labor Organizations. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill, in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

April 7, 1971

14.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, this simply is a bill which the Secretary of State had requested be taken out of their jurisdiction. And inasmuch, at least our information is that there has only been one request for information of the Secretary of State's Office since passage of the bill. And the Labor Commissioner does not object to taking over that responsibility.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

On page 2, the second item from the bottom. Calendar No. 168, File No. 191, Favorable Substitute Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Public Health and Safety on Substitute S.B. 389. An Act Concerning Persons Cared for at the Veteran's Home and Hospital.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR PAC:

This bill is technical in nature. All it does is delete the reference to resident of the Rocky Hill Hospital as inmates. And hereafter we will call

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**LABOR
AND
INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS**

1-347

**1971
Index**

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

10:00 A.M., PUBLIC, ROOM 408

MARCH 1, 1971

J. Bober: labor for a few days and find out if it's really as nice as they think it is going to be.

I must remind you that Case Law and Statute Law are different. Now, this bill has not been here for the first time this year. It has been here two years ago and, I think, it has been here four years ago. I am just wondering why it didn't have our State laws upset by the court rather than try to do it in statutory sense.

Now, we in the labor movement represent a great number of females, in fact, I think, we represent more females than any organization who appeared before you today testifying in support of these bills. We have never heard our women ask to be permitted to work more than 9 hours a day or being permitted to be dumped out on the street about 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock in the morning without any means of transportation to get home. I am not talking specifically on this bill as bar-girls going home at 2 or 3 o'clock, but there is a bill before another committee that will be heard Friday on this same subject. They never appealed to us and, believe me, we have female delegates attending our convention. All they have to do is put a resolution in and if this is what they want, I am sure that the convention would act in their support.

The history of these protective bills go back to the early days when women worked. They had the privilege of men and they didn't enjoy that privilege because they were worked down to the skin and bones. If you recall, all you have to do is read the history of the working people in this State in the early days. All these laws weren't being tempered by some individual who wanted to discriminate against females. They found it was necessary and this all revolved during the course of time. I think, gentlemen, this bill should deserve the same treatment you gave it two years ago and four years ago. Thank you very much.

Chr. Badolato: Thank you. Anyone else in opposition? If not, Mr. Hammer, did you care to speak on a bill? The Deputy Secretary of State.

H. Hammer, Deputy Sec. of State: Harry Hammer, Deputy Secretary of State. I hate to go from the ridiculous to the sublime. I am speaking on another bill before the Committee that I discussed briefly with your House Chairman. It is H. B. 6769 (Rep. Mastrianni of the 119th, Rep. Badolato of the 30th) ANNUAL REPORTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS, and it's a bill that I don't know whether it's a legislative administrative bill but it requires that any financial reports of labor organizations

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

10:00 A.M., PUBLIC, ROOM 408

MARCH 1, 1971

H. Hammer, Deputy Sec. of State: be filed with the Secretary of State. I believe that this practice has gone on for about 6 years. We presently have 103 financial statements of various labor organizations in the State on file in our office.

Now, one of the reasons that we have requested the change in the place of filing is that it did not seem to us that it was the logical place for these reports to be filed. It would seem to me that the average union member who wanted to know the fiscal status of his union would be more likely to go to the Labor Department or the Labor Commissioner to determine just exactly what the financial status of his union was.

I should also point out that this bill does not provide for complete public inspection of the various records the way it is now on the statutes. It is a restrictive bill. In other words, it's open only to limited inspection by members of the labor union. Now, I don't feel that a public office such as the Secretary of State should be required to maintain any records that are not completely public. It is very difficult to explain to the general public why they cannot see a record which is on file in our office. I am sure there are very good and substantial reasons why these strict restrictions on inspection was placed and, I think, that is one of the reasons why it should be the assumption of the Labor Commissioner.

I should also point out, as I say I don't know the legislative history of this bill, but in the past 6 years, I believe, we have had only one individual who has come into our office to examine these financial reports. Now, maybe there is some Federal requirement that is involved here which I am not aware of. As I say, we have had only one inquiry in the past 6 years. I am sure there is a reason for the bill. I don't presume to suggest that this requirement be eliminated. I am merely asking the Committee to make the repository of this particular information where it belongs and my feeling is that it belongs in the Labor Department. Thank you very much.

Chr. Badolato: Thank you. We will move on now to H. B. 6659 (Rep. Carozzella of the 81st District) AN ACT CONCERNING ESTABLISHING MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR STATE-APPOINTED MEDIATORS AND ARBITRATORS. Is there anyone in favor of this bill?

R. Krause: Mr. Chairman. My name is Robert Krause, Personnel Director

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

10:00 A.M., PUBLIC, ROOM 408

MARCH 1, 1971

D. Van Winkle: that is, a person who has offered himself for employment two or more times in a labor dispute situation. There is legislation, also, in other states which prohibit the importation of people who come bearing arms or come for the purpose of inciting violence, but there is no way that I can see that our present legislation could be extended without violating the very basic right of one individual to move from Connecticut to another state to take a job or to move from some other state into Connecticut to take a job. This, I think, would be the most flagrant assertion of the attitude of the State of Connecticut in opposition to the creation of jobs in the State than I could possibly imagine. Thank you.

Chr. Badolato: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

K. Decko: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. Ken Decko, speaking for Connecticut Business and Industry Association. We are opposed to this bill for two main reasons. One, as Dale pointed out, it is clearly unconstitutional. It denies equal protection of the laws to our out-of-state citizens. Second, a more mundane reason, 31-48a forbids the recruitment of professional out-of-state strike breakers and since this is already on the books, there is no need for this present bill. Thank you.

Chr. Badolato: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

H. E. Snoke: I am Harmon E. Snoke, Executive Vice-President of the Manufacturers Association of Bridgeport. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. I think we still have one mention that should be made here. We don't have to have passports to go from one state to the next and I don't think any restriction like this should be put on anybody who is willing and able to accept employment. You don't want them to go on Welfare. You don't want them to go on Unemployment Compensation and if someone wants to come here from another state that has some skill and wants to provide, he should not be discriminated against by such legislation.

Chr. Badolato: Is there anyone else in opposition? If not, then we will move on to H. B. 6769 (Rep. Mastrianni of the 119th District, Rep. Badolato of the 30th District) AN ACT CONCERNING ANNUAL REPORTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS. Is there anyone in favor of H. B. 6769? Is there anyone in opposition? If not, then we will move on to H. B. 6897 (Rep. Iwanicki of the 79th) AN ACT CONCERNING PREFERENCE TO AMERICAN FABRICATED STEEL AND IRON PRODUCTS. Is there anyone in favor of H. B. 6897?