

HB 6682

PA 814

1971

Corrections, Welfare & Humane Inst. 110, 118-121, 146-147

House 4857-4864

Senate 3402

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**CORRECTIONS,  
WELFARE  
AND  
HUMANE  
INSTITUTIONS**

**1-342**

**1971  
Index**

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND  
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sen. Ciarlone: If you would please.

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

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

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

Mrs. McCall: Right.

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND  
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

- Mr. Morrison: James Morrison, Director of Health Administration, State Welfare Department. We have submitted a statement on this Bill, regarding the use of fiscal intermediaries. We favor this Bill since it might be helpful in the future. We have had successful experience using insurance companies as intermediaries for certain aspects of our Title 19 program. With the new methods of delivery of medical care, such as prepayment plans, we may want to avail ourselves of intermediaries in some of these situations in the future. Thank you.
- Mr. Bernstein: House Bill 6446 which concerns needy hospitalized persons who are being held for the police, we are against this Bill and I'm going to ask Mr. Bauer to speak to this Bill.
- Mr. Bauer: Maybe I will. I guess I will. M. B. Bauer, Director of the Bureau of Business Administration of the Welfare Department. The Welfare Department's position on this Bill is that we're presently reimbursing the town at the rate of seventy five percent of their Welfare expenditures and we not believe that the persons being held by the police are necessarily eligible for Welfare assistance and in this particularly austere budget year, we would urge that this Committee not act favorably upon this Bill. Thank you.
- Mr. Bernstein: House Bill 6447, concerning funeral expenses. Again I'm going to ask Mr. Bauer to speak.
- Mr. Bauer: The Connecticut State Welfare Department is opposed to this Bill and as I read the Bill and as I understand it, we would be required to make under one section, required to make separate payments to the funeral director and also the cemetery and in another part of the Bill, it calls for a determination of what the funeral director should be paid by the Hospital Cost Commission. I don't believe that this is a function of the Hospital Cost Commission and it would seem to me that if this Bill was enacted as presented, that some of the funeral directors would be paid a bonus for a poor director would be paying a bonus for doing a job and a bad job, and the good directors would be penalized. Therefore, I would hope that this would be tabled. Thank you.
- Mr. Bernstein: House Bill 6533, we have no statement nor remarks on this Bill. House Bill 6682, which concerns emergency housing, this Bill will also be discussed by Mr. Bauer.
- Sen. Ciarlone: Mr. Bauer, would you try speaking a bit louder so our recording device
- Mr. Bauer: Sure, I'll be glad to. The Connecticut State Welfare Department has many families dispossessed because of fire eviction and other forces, during, causes, during the course of a year. During the year August 1st, 69 to August 1st, 1970,

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND  
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

"

the cost of housing and feeding these families totalled approximately Seventy thousand dollars with no Federal financial participation in the expenditure as the payments were made directly to a third party. Expenditures of this type are not federally matchable unless they fall within the definition of protective payment as defined by the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Such payments would have amounted to a considerably more during this period of time, except that the Welfare had a Department had a one hundred percent federally funded demonstration project which provided for rentals to dislocated families in the Hartford area. The Connecticut State Welfare Department wants authority in law to enable it to lease housing in several areas of the State. In these facilities, we would house dislocated welfare beneficiaries until permanent rental housing could be found. Such a procedure would not require additional funds but would merely transfer from grant appropriations to appropriations for other expenses and equipment monies to the appropriations for other expenses and equipment. By this method of purchasing emergency housing, through Administrative funds, the expenditures would be matched by the Federal Government. Let's assume that the units rented in various localities in the State had an approximate cost of \$26,000 per year and that it cost a like amount to furnish these facilities, \$25,000 which would be mostly a one time cost. The total cost then, would be \$51,000. The Federal share would be \$25,500, the cost to the State is \$25,500, as compared to payments in motels of \$51,000 which is not matchable, therefore a saving, direct saving to the taxpayer of the State of Connecticut ofttwenty five thousand five hundred. There is, of course, will also be a savings in the food cost. The exact amount of savings of food is difficult to determine but the amount expended would be considerable less than the \$19,000 for the one expended for the one year period August 1st, 69 to August 1st, 70 and, in addition, such items would again be claimable for Federal financial participation. Thank you very much.

Sen. Ciarlone: One second. I have a question here. You say this would cost the Welfare Department no additional funds in their budget?

Mr. Bauer: Well, currently we're paying for two motels and hotels or the lodging of our recipients from our grant appropriations. All I'm suggesting sir, that an amount of money be transferred from the grant appropriations to appropriations for other expenses and a, therefore, there would be no need for additional monies and a, by this technique of giving the Welfare Department the authority to lease housing and pay for it through the other expense appropriation, it would be federally matchable. This is a technical matter but it's a, that's what it boils down to. And it would be less cost overall.

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND  
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

Sen. Ciarlone: Senator Finney has question, if you would please.

Sen. Finney: Mr. Bauer, there's one thing I worry a little about. This is apparently temporary housing for people as a result of an emergency, which the Department would furnish. Do you have the feeling that it could stay temporary? I mean, suppose a family were put into what I would expect would be reasonably good housing, if the Department were running it, how could you move them out? Or is this to give you time to find some other place?

Mr. Bauer: Well, the concept, Mrs. Finney, is that it would give us time to help them find another place, to which they would be removed and relocated. And a, I'm sure your query is very excellent and that we would have difficulty in some cases getting them to remove them from these premises. But, nevertheless, Mrs. Finney, if we did keep them in this type of housing and paid for the housing through this technique, it the expenditure would again be federally matchable. Whereas if we continue on with the sort of arrangements that we have with Public Act 299, the payment is directly to a vendor and through our grant appropriations, there is no federally matchable funds. And if we did have a series of these facilities, maybe more than we envision, I would see no harm.

Sen. Finney: I take it too, that some the temporary housing that you expect to have, might be better than some of the temporary hotel accommodations.

Mr. Bauer: I think it would be one hundred percent better, Mam.

Sen. Finney: Thank you.

Sen. Ciarlone: Are there any other questions by members of our Committee: Jim, do you have a question?

Rep. Lowell: Representative Lowell of the 38th District. Mr. Bauer, actually, as I have visualized this, what would actually occur would be you would have to be going out to get temporary housing always in advance, because I don't see how you're going to end up getting these people out once you've got it loaded or filled, you're going to have to take the next step to find another place to bring it up to standards.

Mr. Bauer: That, we have been successful in moving people out of the emergency housing that we've been providing under the Hip Program in the City of Hartford. Now, I will concede that not in all cases will we be successful. But, I think that it will be successes and it will benefit the taxpayer of the State of Connecticut to give the Welfare Department this authority.

Rep. Lowell: Well, this goes a little bit further afield, but would it

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND  
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

be bad if we were upgrading in this way, the housing. Because as we've listened to people they have indicated that their present housing is pretty inadequate to start with. And if you're now going out to find better housing, you would continually be looking for better housing.

Mr. Bauer: Yes. Yes, sir. I think it would be upgrading the housing of the recipients by this technique.

Rep. Lowell: Well, I think that takes us into another area. But, anyways, it could be a benefit no matter how we work it.

Mr. Bauer: That's right, sir.

Sen. Ciarlone: Thank you, Representative Lowell. One more question, Representative Colucci.

Rep. Colucci: In the temporary hotels, you have to feed and maintain them?

Mr. Bauer: Yes, sir.

Rep. Colucci: And in this type of housing I think they would maintain themselves.

Mr. Bauer: That's true, sir.

Rep. Colucci: I think there'd be quite a savings

Mr. Bauer: There would be considerable savings, sir.

Sen. Ciarlone: Are there any other questions before we proceed? Proceed Mr. Bernstein.

Mr. Bernstein: Thank you. House Bill 7044, which is a statement of purpose bill concerning shelter supplements for elderly persons. I would just like to make one observation about those elderly who are on public assistance. We, of course, in the Welfare Department do meet their rentals even if they are increased up to specified maxima, so insofar as we're concerned, within the maxima, we believe that we are meeting the statement of purpose of this Bill. We have no observations on the last Bill, 7047. On behalf of Commissioner White, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the members of this Committee and we are now through with our presentation, subject to any questions that members of the Committee may have.

Sen. Ciarlone: Do we have any questions here of the Welfare Department representatives, before we dismiss them? Representative Lowell?

Rep. Lowell: On a 63339, it had to do with the limits of the Commissioner had filed and I would assume that you would have them here. We had a question before from the audience which was concerned with

Rep. Chagnon: Mrs. Williams. Are you talking into the

Mrs. Williams: I'm Eliza Williams of Waterbury, Connecticut. I speak on behalf of the Connecticut Welfare Rights as Vice Chairman of Waterbury Welfare Rights, as Chairman of Waterbury Welfare District Office Advisory Committee and as State Representative to National Welfare Rights. We support House Bill 5005 which provides child day care centers in municipal housing projects. We strongly feel that this will help welfare clients. We have to go out of our way to get services. With no place to leave our children. There was a fire in Waterbury the other day. The mother wasn't home. One child died. Everyone says the mother should have been home. How do you know if she was at the store up the street? There's no day care at all in Waterbury except private ones. This could happen to anyone. This also would provide some with jobs and others with needed services. I am connecting this with H. B. 5949. When people can find jobs they have no day care service and vice versa. We strongly oppose H.B. 5949. What makes you think that you have the answer to million of questions. Where can I find a job? What kind of jobs will people have to take? Street cleaners, laundries, clean toilets, sweeping the streets? People are tired of these back breaking jobs with little or no pay. Will the maximum wage be paid? If no to these questions I suggest that the people who drew up this get their own relatives to do the work. Why do people feel that recipients are lazy and don't want to work? If that was true, why are there so many cases of so-called fraud, where people have gone to work to help make ends meet and workers have not written it down? Or better still, why is the win program going so good in different states? Think about it. Only a few people will beg by choice. My last question. Where are you going to find jobs? We know jobs are very hard to find and you're going to tell us that you will become a miracle worker. A healer of a sickness, unemployment? Well, since you've become second to God, we want to be in on all your actions to see how you perform your healing tricks. Okay? We support H.B. 6682, an act concerning temporary dwellings for dispossessed tenants. To go one step further, not only for these but for all emergency housing period. Why is it that people have to resort to newspapers to get action taken or necessary action. In New York, a lady was put up in a luxurious hotel at sky high prices. In Connecticut, you're put up in crummy hotels with sky high prices. When both stories hit the headlines, the world exploded. Little still is done with either case. Recipients have had sit ins in Mayor's offices as was done in Waterbury and at the Welfare Office as was done in Stamford in the Councilman's office in New York City. Nothing still has been done. Be it temporary or not, recipients need housing. Along with bad heating, bad plumbing, goes nasty attitudes of the owners. We are the only ones to suffer. Why should you care about us when you have your own warm home to go to. We feel that as bad as things are now, you don't need to pass another bill to do something, just do it. Nowadays, it's either put up or shut up. Last but not least, we support H.B. 6447 concerning funeral expenses of

WEDNESDAY

CORRECTIONS, WELFARE AND  
HUMANE INSTITUTIONS

MARCH 3, 1971

welfare beneficiaries. What kind of funeral can you provide for \$250.00. People on Welfare don't get enough to live on then when they die, you can't even bury them decently. If you want to take them back home, down South or anyplace outside of Connecticut, how far would \$250.00 take you or even five hundred? Better still, provide enough money to cremate them. This would eliminate lots of problems. Thank you.

Rep. Chagnon: Miss Gatling. Would you hold that mike up to your mouth? We're not getting you. Is that shut off? Is the button on, John? Will you try it now please.

Miss Gatling: Eliza Gatling, NOWR, from Waterbury. House Bill HWB 6682. An Act concerning temporary dwellings for dispossessed tenants. I am supporting this bill because there are too many people who are being burned out or either convicted by some means to have to be placed in hotels paying extremely too much too much and being separated from their families when they are a large family. Also, it is very inconvenient for a large family to be living in a hotel to be paying this large sum. There should be houses where there should be families placed so that the whole family could stay together. And would be much convenient for the family. Also, it is very inconvenient for a mother that has a baby to be living in a hotel and have other small children along with that. Thank you.

Rep. Chagnon: Thank you. William Hoff.

Mr. Hoff: My name is William Hoff. I'm from Waterbury, Connecticut, Chairman of the Black Coalition of Waterbury and also a Director of the Pearl Street Neighborhood House. I would like the record to show that I would like to say ditto to what Mrs. Williams, the last two previous speakers have said regarding their particular bills and just a word regarding my dissatisfaction with Bill 5949. We wish to bring to the attention of the Commission that there's a joker in that Bill and that joker deals with the word meaningful employment. When we look at the national trend, we know that we have qualified workers who are not able to find jobs in the labor market. Yet and still, we pick upon the welfare recipient who is less trained and less qualified and we're talking about getting him some meaningful jobs. Let's look at this joker meaningful jobs very closely. And I think we got to get away from the idea of we feel that every man must work. You know that was allright years ago when there was plenty of work to do. But, when we look at the trend, we find that we have a lot of people in fact we can have five percent of the people doing all the work that's necessary to be done in our work forces. But we have to bring the new trend of thinking up to the modernization as to where we are now. It's not enough for us to say everyone must have a job. Jobs must be provided. But they must be provided with dignity and sweeping streets and cleaning latrines and doing other things are

**H-118**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 11  
4831-5162**

Friday, June 4, 1971

27.

ordered.

EFH

CARL R. AJELLO, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, we intend to caucus during the afternoon, and I would advise the Members on this side of the aisle that at approximately 3:30 we expect to recess for that purpose, and we would appreciate their attendance.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk will begin with the call of the regular Calendar.

THE CLERK:

On Page 8, Calendar No. 500, Substitute for H.B. No. 6682, an Act concerning the temporary dwellings for dispossessed tenants, File No. 1352.

OTHA N. BROWN, JR.:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

OTHA N. BROWN, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, there are two Amendments, and I call for the reading of House Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk call Amendment Schedule "A".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", offered by Mr. Cohen, of the 41st.

MORRIS N. COHEN:

Friday, June 4, 1971 28.

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of Amendment Schedule "A" EFH  
...House Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on adoption. Noting it to be a short Amendment, would the Clerk please read the Amendment.

THE CLERK:

In Section 1, Line 6, delete the comma and insert a period. In Line 6, delete the words "by" through "otherwise," inclusive, on Line 9.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A".  
Will you remark.

MORRIS N. COHEN:

Mr. Speaker, in order to explain this Amendment, I must explain the Bill. It's not very lengthy. The purpose of this Bill is for the Commissioner of Welfare for the State of Connecticut to purchase or rent dwellings and furnish them in many of our large cities of the State. The purpose of doing this is to supply or make available for people that are on welfare when they are dispossessed or when they are displaced by a fire or catastrophe. This Amendment eliminates the need for such apartments by people that are dispossessed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I suggest we're dispossessing Dr. Cohen. Could he please have your attention.

MORRIS N. COHEN:

My reason for it is as follows. The people that are

Friday, June 4, 1971 29.

dispossessed means that they are being evicted...either for failure of rent or for any other reason. When they are dispossessed for this reason, they usually have anywhere from one to three, or four, or five months before they are dispossessed, and the Welfare Department has one to three, or four, or five months to find them another place. So the need for having available apartments is eliminated if the Welfare Department will start looking for apartments when they get notice that they're going to be dispossessed. That's reason No. 1. Reason No. 2 is that according to the statutes the Welfare Department is not supposed to find places for them anyway, because they're supposed to find their own apartments, and the Welfare Department is only supposed to pay for them. I think this helps the Bill to be a good Bill, and I move the adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment Schedule "A".

LEONARD G. FRAZIER:

Mr. Speaker, through you to Dr. Cohen...normally I'm in the forefront seeking aid for disadvantaged people. Now my question that I'm posing to Dr. Cohen is that if a person is dispossessed for nonpayment of rent, what happens when the Welfare Department places them in another abode, and they don't pay rent there?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 41st care to respond?

MORRIS N. COHEN:

I don't think this has anything to do with this

Friday, June 4, 1971 30.

particular Amendment, but he does...he has to keep doing the same thing for as many times as they're dispossessed. The Welfare Department has taken the responsibility, although I don't agree that it is their responsibility, but they have been doing it, and if he's dispossessed a second time, they have to do it as many as he's dispossessed. It seems to me there's no reason for him being dispossessed, if he pays the rent or keeps his apartment in proper shape, because it costs the landlord a tremendous amount of money to get him dispossessed. The landlord isn't too anxious to dispossess his tenants, because it's not profitable to him.

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment Schedule "A".

LEONARD G. FRAZIER:

Mr. Speaker, I still didn't get the answer I'm looking for. I'm concerned about this, because if there's a habitual... persons that are habitually dispossessed, then what do we ultimately do? I'm posing this question through you to Dr. Cohen.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 41st care to respond?

MORRIS N. COHEN:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I can't answer his question. Perhaps the answer lies with the Welfare Commissioner.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there further remarks on Amendment Schedule "A"?

JOHN D. PRETE:

I speak in favor of the Amendment. I think it's a good Amendment. This has been a matter of consultation between many

Friday, June 4, 1971 31.

people who feel the same as Dr. Cohen and the Committee. We're prepared to accept this Amendment. In answer to the question that was raised concerning the payment of rent, I can't speak for the... for any other purpose for which a family may have been dispossessed, but it's very unlikely that a family will be dispossessed because of rent, simply because the Welfare Department has, of this day, anyway, pays the rent in the case of nonpayment of a family. Whenever rent is missed for one month, as a matter of fact, the Welfare Department then pays directly to the landlord, so this is not really a problem at all. The problem perhaps that Representative Frazier refers to is the family who, because of destructive behavior, if you will, is dispossessed, then that's another matter altogether. But I think the thrust of this Amendment is with reference to the family in...where there's a nonpayment of rent...and this is a very, very tiny percentage of people that would be covered.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Amendment Schedule "A". If not, all those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. House "A" is adopted. The Clerk will call Amendment Schedule "B".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B", offered by Mr. Coatsworth, of the 76th, Mr. Brown, of the 148th. In Line 13, after the period, insert the following: "No person may occupy such temporary dwelling for a period longer than three months, and any person who fails to quit such dwelling may be evicted by the Commissioner."

OTHA N. BROWN, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, I move for adoption of the Amendment.

EFH

Friday, June 4, 1971 32.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on adoption of Amendment Schedule "B". Will you remark.

OTHA N. BROWN, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, this is an Amendment which gives the Commissioner the power that in the case of temporarily placing a tenant in emergency quarters that if such tenant does not quit such quarters within a...the time specified, that the Amendment says... indicates that the Commissioner may proceed with activities of eviction. And I would like to stress the verb "may" rather than "shall", because, Mr. Speaker, under some circumstances it may... the Commissioner may deem to be the proper quarters, and that the persons now occupying it should remain there. The Commissioner simply has the power. We support the Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Amendment Schedule "B".

JOHN D. PRETE:

Mr. Speaker, I would support this Amendment. The real thrust of the Bill is to provide emergency housing...that's short term housing...where an emergency exists. The Amendment would cover this problem and would also cover the problem of a family who would like to stay in "emergency housing" for a period greater than three months. It also gives flexibility to the Commissioner by including the word "may". If, in the event, in the determination of the Commissioner this is good housing...it should be permanent housing...then he is allowed under this Amendment to have the family continue in that residency.

EFH

Friday, June 4, 1971 33.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment "B".

NICHOLAS A. LENGE:

Mr. Speaker, through you, sir, a question. As I understand this Bill, the thrust of it is to provide temporary housing, and I've heard the words "permanent housing" mentioned. My question, sir, through you is whether or not putting the three-month limitation, which is a bar on the tenant, the thrust of it being the tenant may not and the Commssioner shall have disgression... whether or not that would jeopardize matching funds from Fed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 114th care to respond?

JOHN D. PRETE:

No. I can't answer with authority. I feel rather certain that it would in no way jeopardize Federal funds to provide emergency housing. In fact this Bill was modeled on the existing legislation in many other states.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment Schedule "B". If not, all those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. Amendment "B" is adopted.

OTHA N. BROWN, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the Bill as amended by House Amendments Schedule "A" and "B".

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on acceptance and passage as amended by House Amendments Schedule "A" and "B". Will you remark.

EFH

Friday, June 4, 1971 34.

OTHA N. BROWN, JR.:

EFH

Mr. Speaker, with the Amendments this is a good Bill, because hopefully Connecticut will not get the reputation as some other cities and states have of having to use motels and hotels in excess for temporary dwellings. This will give the Commissioner the power to anticipate and to prepare for these eventualities. This is a landmark Bill. It is a Bill of high priority for our Committee. I move its adoption.

JOHN D. PRETE:

Mr. Speaker, briefly. I speak in favor of this Bill. This is a matter which the interim Welfare Committee considered and deemed wise as an addition to our welfare laws in this State. Finance and Control Department tells us that the Bill will save the State of Connecticut \$25,000 a year. So I think this is good legislation...good for the people...and good for the State...and good for the General Fund as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 569, at the bottom of Page 8, Substitute for H.B. No. 5567, an Act to review and study the composition and powers of the Metropolitan District.

CARL R. AJELLO, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, may Calendar No. 569 be passed retaining its place?

MR. SPEAKER:

S-82  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1971

VOL. 14  
PART 7  
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 73

File 1608; Cal. 1365, House Bill 5578, File 1444; Cal. 1366, House Bill 5697  
File 666; Cal. 1367, House Bill 5824, File 775; Cal. 1369, House Bill 6180,  
File 1580; Cal. 1371, House Bill 6687, File 1290; Cal. 1372, House Bill 6731  
File 1469; Cal. 1373, House Bill 6842, File 1659; Cal. 1375, House Bill 7031  
File 588; Cal. 1376, House Bill 7237, File 1629; Cal. 1377, House Bill 7493  
File 1623; Cal. 1379, House Bill 7907, File 1446; Cal. 1380, House Bill 7960;  
File 1306; Cal. 1381, House Bill 8093, File 1663; Cal. 1383, House Bill 8170  
File 1621; Cal. 1386, House Bill 9220, File 1635; Cal. 1387, House Bill 9252,  
File 1672; Cal. 1389, House Bill 5154, File 913; Cal. 1390, House Bill 5286,  
File 1271; Cal. 1392, House Bill 5661, File 919; Cal. 1394, House Bill 6380  
File 1386; Cal. 1395, House Bill 6908, File 1442; Cal. 1396, House Bill 6914  
File 1388; Cal. 1397, House Bill 7438, File 890; Cal. 1398, House Bill 7450  
File 1198; Cal. 1399, House Bill 7889, File 1441; Cal. 1296, House Bill 5036  
File 746; Cal. 1297, House Bill 5147, File 1437; Cal. 1298, House Bill 5157  
File 1466; Cal. 1299, House Bill 5216; File 744; Cal. 1300, House Bill 5219  
File 949; Cal. 1301, House Bill 5247, File 1429; Cal. 1303, House Bill 5561  
File 1431; Cal. 1304, House Bill 5577, File 1289; Cal. 1306, House Bill 5754  
File 1554; Cal. 1308, House Bill 5918, File 937; Cal. 1309, House Bill 5953  
File 1445; Cal. 1310, House Bill 5957, File 1563; Cal. 1311, House Bill 5958  
File 1299; Cal. 1312, House Bill 6123, File 1468; Cal. 1313, House Bill 6292  
File 1456; Cal. 1314, House Bill 6376, File 833; Cal. 1315, House Bill 6423  
File 1458; Cal. 1316, House Bill 6470, File 923; Cal. 1317, House Bill 6512  
File 1428; Cal. 1318, House Bill 6525, File 1475; Cal. 1319, House Bill 6547  
File 1266; Cal. 1320, House Bill 6606, File 933; Cal. 1321, House Bill 6837  
File 1353; Cal. 1322, House Bill 6682, File 1352; Cal. 1323, House Bill 6885  
File 1348; Cal. 1324, House Bill 6939, File 1330; Cal. 1325, House Bill 6963