

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-850		1609	0	39	6
<u>Committee Pages:</u>				<u>House Pages:</u> • 5928- 5966	<u>Senate Pages:</u> • 2750- 2755

H-120

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

32

THE SPEAKER:

Will you respond? If not, the gentleman from the 95th.

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to oppose this bill primarily because there's no money involved, allowed. The best information we have is that there will be current expenses of at least \$1 million and neither budget provides for this expenditure. There will be a bonding fund expense of \$17,200,000 and neither budget provides, neither bonding program provides for this expenditure. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we're creating another situation where we're simply here on this floor today appropriating money that no one has really thought about where it was going to come from and on that basis, I must oppose the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed?

The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1542, substitute for S.B. No. 1609, An Act Concerning State Employment, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A", in concurrence with the Senate.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Will the Clerk please read Senate Amendment "A"?

djh

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

33

THE SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk call Senate "A"?

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A" adopted by the Senate on June 3rd.

Strike out section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 5-245 of said supplement is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: The standard workweek of all state employees is thirty-five hours in five days. Any state employee who performs work authorized by his appointing authority for a period in addition to the hours of the employee's regular, established workweek, or the standard workweek, whichever may contain fewer hours, shall receive compensation as follows: (1) For that portion of such additional time worked which when added to the employee's regular, established workweek, or the standard workweek, whichever may contain fewer hours, does not exceed (thirty-five) forty hours, the employee shall be compensated at an hourly rate based on his annual salary: (2) for that portion of such additional time worked which when added to the employee's regular, established workweek, or the standard workweek, whichever may contain fewer hours, exceeds (thirty-five) forty hours, the employee shall be compensated at a rate equal to one and one-half times an hourly rate based on his annual salary."

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark on the amendment?

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, this means that state employees work

djh

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

34

a regular thirty-five hour week and then are paid overtime after forty.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. KING (48th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, does this apply to any elected employee in the executive department?

THE SPEAKER:

Does anyone care to respond for the executive department?

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Mr. Speaker, in the main part of the bill, it does change the original wording from classified service to the executive department and that means everyone.

MR. KING (48th):

I'm sure the Governor will be very happy to know that he's now on overtime.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The amendment is ADOPTED.

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Mr. Speaker, I think there are some other amendments.

MR. MASTRIANNI (119th):

Mr. Speaker, there's a House Amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. Mastrianni of the 119th.

MR. MASTRIANNI (119th):

Mr. Speaker, this amendment, if you wish I will summarize it. Mr.

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

35

Speaker, this amendment deals with time and a half after thirty-five hours for state employees. Now we are talking about employees of the state who have been working hard for the state, people who are working for the Veterans Hospitals and Southbury Training Center, Mansfield, those who are dedicated workers on our highways and so forth, these people should be recognized for the work they are doing after thirty-five hours. This is not, we're looking out to try to keep our state poverished, keep it ahead of other states, not regressive states. I believe we should take our state employees and give them the best for our state, not bring them back and put them on forty hours. I know I work in a factory myself and I believe, we at one time were trying to get a thirty-two hour week for people working in the factory and this would be a good thing. I think it would help unemployment in a lot of ways also. If the state feels though they can't put them on thirty-five hours, it may take some of our welfare people, put them to work, if they cannot, if they don't wish to pay time and a half after thirty-five hours. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's a good amendment and I believe that it should pass and I'd like to see everyone vote for this amendment. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Mr. Speaker, as Clerk of the Public Personnel and Military Affairs Committee, I very reluctantly oppose this amendment. I would love to give our state employees all kinds of benefits but we've already negotiated our budget, we've already negotiated our tax package, and I'm certainly willing to go along with it, but I don't think there's any place for it in what we've done. I, therefore, oppose this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. BADOLATO (30th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment and I disagree with the Chairman of the, the Assistant Chairman of the Personnel Committee. It isn't a question of giving the state employees anything under this amendment. It's a question of retaining something that the state employees have had and if it was an addition, I would say that his comments were right, but I would suggest to him that he read the file again and I think that he would recognize that this does not give anything to the state employees other than retain for them the present benefits. And I don't understand how this Assembly or any Assembly can enact any legislation that would be really regressive in nature and this is what this amendment is attempting to correct. Now, in its wisdom, the General Assembly felt that the state employees would be entitled to overtime payments after thirty-five hours. In its wisdom, the General Assembly felt that the state employees would be entitled to a thirty-five hour workweek. And I know you could say yes, in its wisdom, the General Assembly is changing its mind now, but with conditions as they are today, with the increase in the cost of living, with the number of people unemployed, I agree with the maker of the amendment that certainly this would help. I think that we are interested in providing the number of jobs that would take care of those people that are unemployed and a reduction in a workweek certainly creates more jobs. I think that this General Assembly is doing a great injustice to the state employees. I think that we have a responsibility to treat them as we would want others to treat us and I think that when the General Assembly starts reacting in the way that they are, I think they are not being responsible.

djh

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

37

The budget notwithstanding, I think this amendment ought to pass because this amendment will not cost anything greater than what is already provided for in the budget. The question of overtime payment is controlled by the management of the state, the administrative branch of government, so that there is nothing in addition here necessary on this particular amendment. If the administration feels that they don't care to have the employees work overtime and receive time and a half, then they don't have to have them work over thirty-five hours a week. Just simply require them to work the thirty-five hours and it would not cost the state any additional funds.

I think that we've been considering in this General Assembly the creation of public service jobs and if there's any way that we can create public service jobs, it's by retaining the thirty-five hour workweek for state employees and hiring those people who have been unemployed. I think that we would then be reducing also the number of people on the welfare rolls, so that this amendment certainly goes a long way toward retaining for the state employees those things that they have received in the past and the benefits that they have received and enjoyed and were entitled to. I certainly urge the adoption of the amendment.

MR. O'NEILL (52nd):

Mr. Speaker, reluctantly I rise to oppose this amendment. Mr. Speaker, in both budget documents, one proposed by the Governor and our Democratic budget document, the state employees were asked to do one of two things, bite the bullet or swallow it. I said the other night, we're not asking them to swallow the bullet, but we are asking them to bite the bullet. It is a question of economics. It is a question of economy. It is a question of solely money. We, on this side, are in no way, feel that we want to impair the work of the State of Connecticut, endanger jobs in the State of Connecticut, of the

state employees, and certainly don't want them to take any pay cut. But also, we, on this side, do not want to put them on a forty hour week. We do want them to be maintained on the thirty-five hour week, understanding that they will not receive time and a half until forty hours. djh

Mr. Speaker, these are serious times. These are grave budget times. We hate to reject this amendment but in sincerity and honesty to the taxpayers of the state and yes, to the state employees themselves, we have no alternative but to ask that this amendment be rejected.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. HANNON (16th):

Mr. Speaker, a question, through you sir, to either the proponent of the amendment or the Chairman of the Labor Committee, I should like to inquire as to the fiscal impact by reverting to the thirty-five hour week with overtime at thirty-five hours?

MR. BADOLATO (30th):

Mr. Speaker, there would be no impact. As I said in my remarks, the state administration controls when, if and when employees would work more than thirty-five hours. As I understand, there is now a sum of \$4 million in the budget to provide for overtime payments on a straight time basis. Certainly, if the state employees are required to work overtime, it can be, time and a half question can be absorbed within this \$4 million figure. The state then certainly has control on whether they should exceed that \$4 million and certainly can control it by just simply not providing overtime for those employees and work them on a thirty-five hour week, so that there's no additional, no impact on the present budget.

MR. HANNON (16th):

djh

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the gentleman's remarks, I have serious reservations as to whether or not there is fiscal impact. I have serious reservations as to whether or not that impact exceeds \$9 million from the present budget as adopted by this General Assembly this past week. That this amendment perhaps should have been placed on the appropriations act as placed before this body, there can be little doubt. That this amendment is germane, there can be little doubt. It would have been better had there been some criticism when the gentleman from Winsted brought out the appropriations act. As to our intention to restore the thirty-five hour week with overtime at forty hours, it would have been a fairer way to do it.

We are now placed in the position of being anti or pro labor. I was one of those gentlemen who was invited to sit with the AFL-CIO on a number of occasions to discuss, not only their plight, but the plight of the people of the State of Connecticut, and it was with a great deal of reluctance and it was after many hours of sitting and talking, that we did exactly what Rep. O'Neill said we did do. We bit the bullet and asked them to join with us in biting it and for that reason, I am opposed to this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. MORTENSEN (24th):

Mr. Speaker, my concern is, visiting the hospitals, especially the mental hospitals, I found that there were many in the lower pay grades who were receiving, working forty hours, I believe most of the hospitals do work forty hours, and have been receiving time and a half for the extra five hours. If you were to figure out the pay as I did down there, I found that without

djh

the extra time and a half, a man with four children would be better off on relief because of the fact that he was drawing anywhere from \$5,000 to \$5,300 a year, so this is my concern. I voted for, in our committee, for a thirty-five hour workweek with time and a half after forty hours but my real concern is of these hospitals that will probably continue working forty hours, instead of giving any raise or any consideration, we are simply giving all of these people in the lower brackets a cut in pay. Now, without the five hours overtime, if I were a man with the brains I have today, I wouldn't work at all because it would be far better for me to go on welfare, if I were working in some of these mental hospitals. I think some consideration, if I am wrong I would like the Clerk Mocco to correct me, but I found this out, it was figured out down in Southbury. I discussed it down there at the meeting we had and I found the same thing is applicable in Norwich and many other hospitals. I do go along with the thirty-five hour workweek with the forty hours, after forty hours overtime, but I would like to see these people considered who are taking care of these children in these hospitals. We had, they were up here many a time but I do feel when they are in the lower brackets, I believe the starting pay, I think, was \$5100 so as a married man, he cannot live on this. He would be far better off going on welfare and this is what we're encouraging when we pass these bills and don't consider these people.

MR. RITTER (6th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call. All those in favor indicate by saying aye. A roll call vote will be ordered.

The gentleman from the 6th has the floor.

djh

MR. RITTER (6th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment for the reasons just given by the previous speaker as well as others. In the first instance, I think it is only fair to the employee. Second, Mr. Speaker, and equally important, I think it is fair to the people of this state. We, as legislators, are able to do very few things in our short time here for the benefit of the people of this state. Perhaps the most important thing we're able to do is to help raise the quality of our state employees, to make sure that state employees are properly paid, that their working conditions are such that they will in the first instance wish to stay in their jobs, and the second, that they will wish to work hard in their jobs. Indeed also, to attract other employees when there are vacancies.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to one of the observations made by one of the assistant majority leaders. He stated that he thought that it was unfair that this amendment was introduced at this time. He said rather that this amendment should have been placed as an amendment to the appropriation act. I'd like to remind him and other members of the majority leadership that we, in Democratic caucus, were asked not to put on amendments to the appropriations act and that many of us who wanted to refrained from putting on amendments to the appropriations act with the full knowledge and awareness that we would be able to bring them up--

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 6th has the floor. Will the members who are in the hall please be seated. Will the aisles be cleared? The aisles please be cleared. The aisles please be cleared.

MR. RITTER (6th):

djh

It was made very clear to all of us that it would not be inappropriate, indeed the one appropriate way was felt to bring up these matters would be as separate items. So, I believe, it's inappropriate to say that anyone is in any sense breaking faith by bringing these in as independent, separate amendments by not having tied them in as amendments to the appropriation act.

Mr. Speaker, I have one further observation.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 6th has the floor.

MR. RITTER (6th):

I'd like to address myself particularly to the Democrats of this aisle, this side of the aisle, though I'm pleased to have our Republican friends listen. This same kind of legislation which we're trying to correct by amendment was introduced in California this past year by Gov. Reagan and in that situation, state employees were not asked by the Democrats who had the majority and do in both the House and the Senate, they were not asked to bite the bullet instead of swallowing it, the Democratic majority in the House and Senate in California took the position that Gov. Reagan was asking for something that they could not support nor would they compromise on. And I believe that that's the picture here, that we who are Democrats should act in the tradition of the Democratic Party. We should recognize that this is an opportunity to again draw the distinction between why we are Democrats, what we stand for and why people vote for us as compared to the other side of the aisle on such matters.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on House Amendment Schedule "A"?

MR. MATTHEWS (161st):

djh

Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that I understood Mr. Mortensen's comments to indicate that the people working thirty-five to forty hours would receive, or would lose their time and a half pay. Well, he is correct that they would lose the time and a half pay but they would receive straight pay between thirty-five and forty hours. They would lose only half pay, I think some thought has, it's a fact, and I think we shouldn't be left with the impression that people working thirty-five to forty hours will receive no pay at all. They will receive straight time pay. I would oppose the amendment. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on House "A"?

MR. CHAGNON (97th):

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this amendment. Mr. Speaker, if we were to do in private sector what we're trying to do to our state employees here, we would have one of the darndest strikes on your hands that you would ever want to handle and I don't think we should do that to our state employees because they serve us just as well as anybody in the private sector does.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks? If not, will the members--

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Mr. Speaker,

THE SPEAKER:

Will the members please be seated. Will the staff come to the well of the House. May I ask the Sargeant-at-Arms to begin enforcing the restriction that no one except members and staff be on the floor except those guests who are here presently? I had hoped we could refrain from doing this until

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

44

early this evening but apparently not. Except for those guests who are already on the floor, may I ask that no more guests be brought on to the floor of the House.

MR. COATSWORTH (76th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly in support of this amendment. I would contend that members of this General Assembly in years past granted the state employees that are affected by this amendment a thirty-five hour week and a time and a half provision for hours over thirty-five hours per week. I would contend also that reducing that in the face of rising state expenditures is the wrong place to reduce a budget, that because the Governor has no particular interest in the needs of working people, I would ask that members of this General Assembly not knuckle under to the demand for a forty hour week from the Governor nor reduce the amount of pay level that state employees presently have, time and a half for over thirty-five hours per week. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a step in the wrong direction. I support this amendment. It is a much needed amendment just to keep state employees at a decent standard of living. I ask support of the amendment and the roll call vote.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I would just take this opportunity to respond to the remarks made by the last speaker about the Governor having no feeling for the working people in this state. I don't have to remind the members of this body that the Governor's budget included a 5% pay raise for state employees.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

djh

MR. VOTTO (116th):

I realize that the time and effort has been put in by the leadership on this side of the aisle, that honest efforts have been made to protect the state employees. Unfortunately there is an aura, an atmosphere that's been established in this legislature since I entered on January 6th. It's rung true and it's hit both sides of the aisle. I'm not critical of anyone but I want to stand and rise and say that I had occasion before I became a legislator to sit on the Personnel Appeals Board of this state and my experience there indicated to me that we can be very lucky of the quality and caliber of state employees we have. Some of the extra efforts that are required, such as snow removal duty and things like that, they have to stay home and be on call on weekends. In view of what I've experienced, I have to take exception to some of the remarks of the leadership and I'm going to vote for this amendment. I think the state employees are deserving of this.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. LENGE (13th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment and I find a very serious and a very vexing cruelty about it all. Very frankly, I think that it's totally out of context to say that the Chief Executive is insensitive to the need of the working people. Let's not play any games about this amendment at all. By voting for it, you don't express any more concern for the morale, the rights and the social justice which the state employees are entitled. They're here. We know they're being hurt and everyone else is being hurt by the severity and the reality of what we are being compelled to do at this time. The Governor has been forced to hold up a mirror to us. The

djh

austerity of the times is a reality that affects everybody. There are programs that we are for that we have been unable to deliver on and I think that to play games with this one at this point when you know the money is not there, is really pushing it one step too far. And the roll call isn't going to prove a thing. The only thing and the only way you can deliver to the state employees is to get this ship on an even keel. If we get things in shipshape once again, then we'll really be able to do what we should do for the state employees. So let's stop this game playing. We had enough of it yesterday. Let's not make it a cruel and a very bitter hoax today. And as far as either party being more concerned and more, having more feeling for state employees, I don't think that anyone can carry off any banners on that one.

MR. GAFFNEY (80th):

I rise in support of this amendment. I don't see how the previous speakers from the other side of the aisle can call a, call this a 5% pay raise in light of the cut back on overtime as well as the cost of living. I don't feel that the employees of this state should have to bear the complete burden as they are asked to do here for the problems that we are confronted, as legislators. They are not responsible for this situation. I don't think they should be asked to bear that kind of burden. I would ask to turn the, I would ask that Mr. Stolberg speak on this issue next.

MR. STOLBERG (112th):

I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the need for austerity that exists in the state today and under other circumstances I could support this, I could vote against this amendment. However, this amendment cuts at the people that need this pay. If indeed it were consistent to cut these salaries by doing it up and down the line, I could support such

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

47

a move but the salaries within the bureaucracy that are at the \$35,000 and the \$30,000 and the \$25,000 level are the ones that are going to stay there and it's the people that are eking out enough to support their families that would be hurt by this move on overtime. This amendment should pass. If it doesn't pass, we're not cutting the fat out, what we're doing, is cutting out the bones and leaving the fat, therefore, I hope the amendment passes.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I've heard a lot of arguments here today and I think, as has been apparent, I've been deluged with a lot of changes of heart. It was not that long ago that this august body adopted a budget and that budget was predicated on a position which means necessarily opposition to the amendment before us. Not only should we be concerned with the very serious problems within this state, not only should we keep all of the people and all of the taxpayers and the general welfare of this state first and foremost in our minds, not only should we have a concern for austerity because this is what all of the people of this state are telling us is necessary, we should also bear in mind that there are plenty of people in this state, 120,600 according to the statistics released just this week by our own Labor Department, 120,600, the most serious unemployment problem in this state in a decade, the second most serious problem in this century. These people would gladly work forty hours and they would gladly work those forty hours at straight time. No one wants to retrogress. No one wants to go backwards. No one wants Connecticut not to be able to accommodate its state employees but what we're called upon to do is to weigh and balance the equities. No one could be prouder than the Democratic Party of what it has

djh

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

48

done in the past sixteen years for the state employees and all of that cannot be forgotten because when the scales are put in balance, that must be one of the first and foremost considerations. And not only that, but the consideration of what can be done in the future when things stabilize and when Connecticut has solved its fiscal problems and is again on the road to being able to be a leader in benefits and salary ranges and scales for its state employees. Now no one is unmindful of the very serious problems that this will inflict on many families. I think it's quite obvious that our state institutions, our hospitals are presented with very serious burdens because of this. There is also absolutely no question that it is very difficult for families who have been accustomed to the overtime after thirty-five hours to adjust their standard of living but I say to you, that this is in microcosm of what the problem is for this very state as a whole because any way you slice it, the State of Connecticut has many many needs which we must forego, many things which we know are for the benefit and betterment of all of our people that we cannot go forward with because we simply cannot afford to. These affect all of our people. They affect us individually. They affect people within our district and together, yes, we have called upon, both Republicans and Democrats, we have called upon our towns and our cities, we have called upon all our citizens to bear with us as we go through this fiscal crisis. And for us in a state where there is no thirty-five hour workweek, except in state employment by and large, for us to say that we are for this amendment would be a betrayal of our trust and our faith with the people that we are here to represent. I call upon labor, I call upon all of us here who have looking down on us from the gallery the people who are interested in the passage of this legislation, to put aside the very compelling reason that in ordinary times would convince each and

djh

every one of us here not to do what must be done because of necessity put upon us and thrust upon us by the vicissitudes of the times. I ask for a brave, a bold, a courageous self denial in the name of the State of Connecticut and its beleaguered taxpayers and to vote for this amendment is a betrayal of the trust of that oath of office that we each took here on inauguration day.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

MR. LA ROSA (4th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the amendment and I don't consider myself betraying anyone. The question is, I think that what is happening here today is that the lower eschelon, or the people in the lower incomes of the State of Connecticut, in five, six and seven thousand dollar bracket who depend on this extra eight or ten dollars every two weeks that they normally receive in their paychecks, I think this is where it's going to affect. If my memory serves me right, Mr. Speaker, all the new commissioners that were appointed by our new governor started at the top and they, themselves, I think that didn't practice austerity at that top of the income level. Mr. Speaker, I say that we'd be doing the people of the State of Connecticut an injustice because we're not only going to limit, we're going to take away some of their income. But you know, it's just like the man who has a store who pays \$50 a month rent and does no business, that rent is too high. It's the same thing on the other hand where that same man who does \$200 a day in business and pays \$50 a month in rent, now his rent is unequal with the amount of money that he's taken in. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment and I urge its adoption.

THE SPEAKER:

djh

Further remarks on the amendment?

djh

MR. MARTIN (68th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment and I do so without any feeling whatsoever that I am disloyal or sacrificing or moving away from my responsibilities as a member of this House. I would remind this august body that because of previous actions taken at this General Assembly, you have placed the responsibility through collective bargaining on cities and towns which does not, do not have the opportunity to move away from agreements made in good faith. Previous members of this General Assembly have entered into an agreement with our state employees. I feel we can do nothing, no other today than honor that agreement. If we want to recognize the true issue that we have here, I think we can all accept the responsibilities in the knowledge that if you have a fiscal crisis in this state and in this country, it's in the cities and towns of the state and the country. But we constantly continue to enact legislation that binds the cities and towns to collective bargaining and agreements. The cities and towns cannot default in those agreements. Because you have an agreement of faith rather than an agreement of collective bargaining, I don't think the state can default that agreement also. I support the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Let me announce an immediate roll call. The gentleman from the 30th, Mr. Badolato, speaking for the second time.

MR. BADOLATO (30th):

Mr. Speaker, there are several things I think that should be corrected so that the membership here will be fully aware of everything that has happened up to this point. And I take exception with many remarks that were

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

51

made and I think that I'll start on the other side of the aisle and I'll wind up on my side, so that we might correct some erroneous impressions that were left.

There's no question about it, that the Governor proposed in his budget the elimination of overtime from thirty-five to forty hours a week. There's no question about it that he also proposed a 5% wage increase for the state employees. But there certainly is no question about the fact also that he proposed a 9% cut in their income so that let's clear the record on that one. The Governor did, yes, propose a 5% increase but the reduction of time and a half or any payment from thirty-five to forty is a 9% reduction in take-home pay of the people that are serving the State of Connecticut. So that the Republican Party is not serving the interest or not interested in or not concerned with the state employees.

Now as to the concern of the people on this side of the aisle. I think that there are many people on this side of the aisle that are concerned about what is happening to the state employees and I think they've gotten up and expressed themselves on it. And I think I'd like to correct for the record the question of biting the bullet. You know we've asked the state employees to bite the bullet and I think they're the only people that we've asked to bite the bullet because we have taken care of everybody else in the State of Connecticut. There's a great deal of concern about what we're doing for the communities and we've talked about telling the communities that this is a time of denial but we're yet providing for them many improved benefits to the communities and rightfully so. We're providing increase in the aid-to-education to a tune of now \$225 which is an increase of \$25.00. We're providing for the unblocked grants to the tune of about \$10 million and also

djh

changes in the formula on aid-to-the-road programs and other things that we're doing for the towns of the State of Connecticut, and we're saying that this is a time of denial but we're saying it only for the state employees, not for anybody else. So I think that we ought to be concerned about it. If it's a time of denial, then it's a time of denial for everybody. djh

Now you talk about what will the roll call prove. It will prove, yes, Mr. Lenge, it will prove who is concerned with the people that are serving us as employees, as our employees. It certainly will prove that. And we're not playing any games with this, believe me, because I think that all of us on this side of the aisle that have a concern are not interested in playing games. We're interested in seeing to it that there is fair play and that the state employees are treated fairly. We talk about a time of denial and we talk about betrayal. I think that we are betraying our state employees when we provide for them a benefit that is arrived at through compromises over the years and when they were given a thirty-five hour workweek, there were many compromises on their part so that they might be able to achieve a thirty-five hour workweek with time and a half after thirty-five. So that, we are the ones that are betraying, not the state employees. we, the Assembly, if we don't enact this amendment.

I'd like to point out to you really some things that are happening throughout the country on situations such as this. There was a betrayal in New York and you saw what happened, a betrayal on a matter that was resolved in so far as a pension plan.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 30th has the floor. May I ask that some of the members clear away from the door and take their seats. May I ask the members please take their seats and the aisles be cleared. Will the members

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

53

please be seated? We won't proceed until they are. Gentlemen, I'd ask that you be seated. You're keeping 170 people waiting. The gentleman from the 30th.

djh

MR. BADOLATO (30th):

Mr. Speaker and members of the House, we talk about, or there are those that talk about betrayal and good faith and I'd like to point out to you a situation where there was betrayal and there was a rejection of good faith. In the State of New York, the employees of the City of New York have the same problem as the employees of the State of Connecticut have at this present time where there was a betrayal and you all recognize what happened when the General Assembly of New York denied an improvement in a pension plan that everybody in the City of New York felt should come to pass. And as a result, because of the denial and because of the betrayal and because of the lack of good faith, the employees took it upon themselves to react and, of course, for every action there is a reaction, and they reacted. And we had a tie-up in the City of New York that you have not seen to this day in any other community of the State, or of the nation. And I think that is to the credit of the state employees that we don't have a similar type of a situation in the State of Connecticut. And if there is such a situation, I think that it's the fault of the General Assembly because we are not acting responsibly when we take away something that we have given them, when we take away something that they have had over the years, when we take away something at a time when the dollar value is reducing and shrinking every day because of the increase in the cost of living. And I think it's our responsibility and we ought to act responsibly. And we talk about again, about a time of denial. But, yes, what we're saying is that everybody must tighten their belts, everybody, you know, must tighten their belts but we also require that the state employees, they must provide their services and must subsidize the services that the people

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

54

of the State of Connecticut are demanding. And I don't think that this is fair and I don't think that anybody here really thinks that it's fair for us to expect that state employees will subsidize the services that the public demands. So, I think you ought to seriously think about this amendment. I think that you ought to really consider what we are doing to the state employees and we ought to vote yes if we are really to have good faith with our state employees and if we are to expect that they will trust in us in the future. And if we deny this amendment, I don't blame them at all for whatever may happen if it's denied.

MR. AUGER (55th):

Mr. Speaker, prior to my election to this General Assembly, I was a state employee for four years. I worked in salary groups four, five, six and seven. If it had not been for the overtime that we received from thirty-five to forty hours, I would have been better off collecting unemployment. I urge approval of this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks? The gentleman from the 13th speaking for the second time.

MR. LENGE (13th):

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, in response to Mr. Badolato, if there is any betrayal, it occurred by excesses of the past. It occurred by errors of the past because that is what we are all paying for today. If there is any denial, I'm sure the gentleman from New Britain would not expect anyone in this chamber or anyone outside of this chamber to believe that there has not been a denial to the towns and the cities of this state. Certainly, the mass and massive infusion of dollars that are needed are not being delivered. They

djh

are only getting a part of what they not only need but what they are entitled to. What is at stake is the stability of the economy of this state, the places for employment for everyone. I think that it's beyond question that everyone here has concern for what is happening to the state employees. They are being denied to some extent. We want them to have more but can we, can we in fairness go beyond the fat that has been given to them in the budget? I think that what you're calling for is truly an excess.

djh

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, I don't like to but I must oppose this amendment and I say I don't like to because I feel especially for the plight of the people who work in the institutions of our state and do society's dirty work for it and I can think immediately of the guards in our prisons and jails and the people who work in our hospitals. However, I'd like to remind this body, particularly those members who voted yesterday for a budget for the State of Connecticut, that budget included certain things. While some of us might like to make changes in it, I think all of us would if we had our druthers, well we don't always have our druthers. It seems to me that we've got a responsibility to be consistent and I intend to meet that responsibility. I can't be for one thing yesterday and something else today, it seems to me. So I would ask everyone to consider his vote of yesterday concerning a budget and voting for this amendment today which does violence to that budget, it seems to me, in the disservice to us and to the state and also particularly to those state employees. I'm one who is hopeful that there is some chance that something can be done in this area. I don't know whether or not it will be by the time that the budget debate and meetings are concluded eventually and ultimately. However, it seems that it's always nice to get up and be for what brings you

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

56

applause and credit from those whose favor you seek. We've got more responsibility here today and I think it weighs heavily on some of us, but let's meet that responsibility.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Are we ready to vote?

MR. STEVENS (122nd):

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I just would like to join in supporting the Majority Leader in opposition to this amendment. And let me say that quite often there is criticism of those who sit in the Hall of the House or Senate as being people who are there for political reasons and who do what is the expedient thing to do. And in joining in opposition of this amendment, I think both parties are realizing a higher obligation than to any one single issue and the obligation we all have this year is to the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut. None of us like opposing this amendment. I think it's being done, the opposition is being done out of the highest principle and I commend those on the other side who have joined in opposing the amendment. It is not the easy thing to do but I think there is no doubt that it is the proper thing to do.

MRS. CLARK (101st):

Mr. Speaker, I came on this scene as a new legislator with no commitments. I would like to point out that 10% of the budget of this state goes to debt service and it doesn't seem to be included in some of the budgets that were presented here yesterday. I think that state employees are taxpayers too and that we have to balance what they are going to be paying to pay off this debt as well as what they might be cut by the claimed 9% decrease. I would like to point out that the budget will be adopted hopefully within the next

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

57

week, is that a budget that will only be for one year and until we know what kind of revenue we're going to be able to develop and what kind of a tax package will be produced, I think we should oppose the amendment. I am hopeful, and I say this to my leaders, that the state employees as well as the other people in the state who are bound by low or moderate income, I hope that they will not have to pay as high a sales tax as the Governor's budget calls for and I hope that they will be protected from having to pay a burdensome income tax so I think the income tax should be adopted and that it should be part of the tax package and I really think we have to stand fast this year and we all have to make a few sacrifices in order to get this state straightened out.

THE SPEAKER:

Are you ready to vote?

MR. ESPOSITO (168th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment. I take exception to the gentleman from the 78th when he says that I should be proud of the past Democratic record for the state employees. He stood today and asked me as a Democrat to take away something that we gave them that they deserve. I also ask you opponents of this amendment, when was the last time, during our economic strife that we're in in the State of Connecticut today, were your services rendered that you said to your client, well, things are tough, unemployment is on the rise but I won't charge you the same money because things are difficult. These people need this additional money just to survive, not to get ahead.

MR. CASSIDENTO (106th):

I echo the statements of Rep. Esposito. The issue here is a very simple one. Without this amendment, this means they cut pay for the state

djh

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

58

employees. As soon as I'm assured that every single person who receives any money from the State of Connecticut will also accept a pay raise, I will support the amendment.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Are we ready to vote? Will the members please be seated and the aisles be cleared? Will the members please be seated so that after this speaker, we can vote.

MR. CLARK (14th):

Mr. Speaker, I think you recognized me, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Yes, but I won't recognize you until the members are seated.

MR. CLARK (14th):

Thank you. I'm not up here to make a speech.

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman please refrain until all the members are seated.

MR. CLARK (14th):

I'm only up here to point out this.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman is not recognized until all the members are seated.

The last days are difficult enough without this. Rep. Clark.

MR. CLARK (14th):

I feel in all justice to all ourselves to just think about this proposition. Now, if you've got a pencil, put it down. I did hear talk of more employment, unemployment, but take somebody that's on thirty-five hours a week, if they're at the low base, \$3.00 an hour, that's \$105.00 a week. If they are working five hours over that at straight time, that's \$15.00. Now

we're up to \$120.00. If the half time is \$1.50 an hour times five hours, that is \$7.50 a week. Now this isn't a matter, and I don't know how I'm going to vote on this, but I am saying if you hired more employees, if there were more employees hired, this has nothing to do with the gallery, this is a fact, you are going to have to hire more employees. How many, at an hourly rate, plus fringe benefits, plus pensions, plus allof the other factors and maybe we will come to a more casualty of higher cost in the end. I really don't know but just consider it. I'm going to vote my conscience. It has nothing to do with politics or anything else but I submit running in to a more costly item if this work has to be done, if the services had to be performed, how are we going to do it? If it's taking forty hours for many employees to do this work, certainly if you don't give them the overtime, it seems reasonable you would have to hire more help and I submit it might be more costly.

THE SPEAKER:

The machine will be open. Has every member voted?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, there--there it is, thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the members please check the board to be certain their vote is recorded in the fashion they wish? The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting	167
Necessary for Adoption	84
Those voting Yea	61
Those voting Nay	106
Absent and Not Voting	10

THE SPEAKER:

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

60

The amendment is LOST.

djh

MR. COHEN (59th):

There will be an executive meeting of the Appropriation Committee at 3 o'clock, House members only. Everybody please attend.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will call House Amendment Schedule "B".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B" offered by Mr. Badolato of the 30th.

Make section 3, section 4 and add a new 3 as follows: Sec. 3. The sum of \$14 million is appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

THE SPEAKER:

Will those members who are going to leave please do so so the aisles can be cleared? Will the aisles please be cleared? The Clerk will complete the call of Amendment "B".

THE CLERK:

Sec. 3. The sum of \$14 million is appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 to provide a salary increase of 5% for all state employees except those whose salaries are set by statute.

MR. BADOLATO (30th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "B". Will you remark?

MR. BADOLATO (30th):

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is an attempt to correct some of the injustices that were done when the amendment "A" was rejected. If House Amendment "A" had passed, there may have been some doubts about whether this

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

61

amendment would have been submitted. But there is some feeling that we ought to consider what we did--

THE SPEAKER:

Will the aisles please be cleared and will the House stand at ease until it's done?

MR. BADOLATO (30th):

There is some feeling that we ought to--

THE SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman from the 30th please restrain his remarks until such time as the aisles are cleared? The gentleman from the 30th.

MR. BADOLATO (30th):

Mr. Speaker, there is some feeling that we ought to correct the injustice of the denial of House Amendment Schedule "A" and I point out to you that again, the state employees are being requested to survive in these days when the cost of living is increasing at the rate of somewhere around 5.8%. We're requesting them to not only accept a cut in pay by a denial of the time and a half provisions after thirty-five hours a week, but we are also saying that they should not be given any consideration for any adjustment in their rates of pay to take care of the increase in the cost of living and we're saying that we should provide this denial for state employees except for the privileged few. And I want to recall, or bring to your attention, something that happened earlier in the session when appointments were made in the executive branch of government. Employments were made that provided for wage increases of somewhere in the neighborhood of 20% and we don't think that it's fair that we provide this increase for only the privileged few. And I'm not saying that we should increase the wages of the state employees by 20%, all

djh

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

62

I'm saying is that we ought to increase it by 5%, something less than the increase in the cost of living. Those of you that paid attention to the appointments that were made in the front office to my left, I'm sure you all recall that the number of people in that office were increased from the previous administration, the pay rolls were increased anywhere in the neighborhood of \$2500 for each employee, and there was no concern about an austerity program, but when it comes to the overall masses of the state employees, we say that there should be an austerity program. I think that we here have an opportunity to restore some of that faith and trust that the state employees had in us by adopting this amendment and providing for that wage increase that they so justly deserve and I certainly hope that this amendment will get your support.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MRS. GRISWOLD (109th):

Mr. Speaker, through you a question to Mr. Badolato. How much would this amendment cost?

MR. BADOLATO (30th):

Mr. Speaker, it's in the amendment and, of course, everyone doesn't have it. The figure is \$14 million.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. AJELLO (118th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment on the same basis that I opposed it before but let me say one more thing in reference to a remark that was made earlier. No one knows better than all of us who sit here that these are difficult times and no one likes the things that we have to do here,

But I rather resent when some member stands up and say, who of you who are collecting your fees take into account the plight of the poor people. I say to them that there's not a month since I've been a lawyer or in business anywhere that I haven't done that sort of thing. I do more work for nothing than most of the state employees or anybody else around here and I resent that kind of treatment at their hands. I'm opposed to this as a matter of principle.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The amendment is LOST.

Does the Clerk have further amendments on this bill? Question is on acceptance and passage as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark further?

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move passage of this bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A". I think we've discussed this bill long enough. Let's vote on it.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended? If not, all those in favor indicate by, excuse me, the gentleman from the 148th.

MR. BROWN (148th):

Mr. Speaker, an inquiry to you. I believe I had an amendment to this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the Clerk have further amendments?

THE ASSISTANT CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "C" offered by Rep. Brown of the 148th.

djh

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

64

After line 46, substitute a new section 4 as follows. Sec. 4. The sum of \$35 million is appropriated for reimbursement for local government fire and police protection on a pro rated basis.

MR. BROWN (148th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark on Amendment Schedule "C"?

MR. BROWN (148th):

Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to try the patience of the men in this, and women of this chamber on this last day. I certainly have had enough experience about last day affairs for the last three sessions of the General Assembly. This is an amendment, however, Mr. Speaker, that I would rather have had to have come up on appropriations than budget but I respected the crown of thorns perhaps placed on the brows of many on both sides with respect to this whole affair and as a result, at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer this amendment. I would like to make sure that it is understood that I am not for the forty hour week for state employees and that I am certainly for any additional assistance that we can provide. As I said before, in respect I supported my party on the budget both procedurally and substantively but I must indicate at this time, that that budget and the appropriation is not a document that is sacrosanct. I believe that what man has made, man can change and I believe that I'm consistent as we present this amendment. As a matter of fact, I think one of the philosophers said that consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds.

What I'm really talking about, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm concerned about the price on both sides of the aisle about how poor this state is, so I have some reluctance about asking for any more money because I certainly

djh

Wednesday, June 9, 1971 65

wouldn't like the state to enter the welfare rolls. But what I am making an appeal for is to be, something to be done to aid at the crisis centers of this state which affect state employees, which affect the whole citizenry of this state. As many of you know, that 85% of the monies used to pay for the state police, for an example, is taken out of the State Highway Fund. I've always been a believer in revenue sharing that some of this should come back to the cities to help cities support the police and fire departments, so that we might be able to take care of this valuable municipal service. And so, I'm saying that this Assembly should not adjourn today without providing a substantial increase in aid to our cities and towns. I, along with many constituents of my constituents, members of organized labor, state employees, members of this chamber, believe that another \$35 million in aid is essential. This kind of increase would enable our cities to hold down the sharply rising property tax.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, a point of order sir. I would, I just received a copy of this amendment and I question whether or not it's germane to the bill before us.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair has examined the amendment prior to its being read and in his opinion, it is germane.

MR. BROWN (148th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We advocate that to do the most good for the hardest hit citizens, whether they be state employees or the general citizenry of the state, that this aid be distributed on the basis of a pro rata share of the cost of municipal protective services. Now, our policemen and our firemen perform an increasingly hazardous and essential service,

especially for the score, the core of our cities and the cost of these services, Mr. Speaker, is necessarily rising, but the tax capacity is shrinking.

djh

And so, at this time, there is no program of revenue sharing or any other program at this time that will meet the total needs of our cities. I'm sure that no one is going to welcome the increased taxes in this climate of recession but they will be less objectionable if they are coupled with some revenue sharing by the state which will help hold the line of local property taxes. Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that the cost of all local police and fire services in the state is about \$100 million a year and just a small grant of \$35 million on a pro rata share would, therefore, represent an average pickup of 35% of the cost of such services. And so, I would say the budget should be amended to provide this additional aid to our hard pressed municipalities. It is time that this rich state, this great state, the Constitution State, of this country get out of the poorhouse and I recommend the adoption of this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with all of the remarks made by Rep. Brown. However, \$35 million has not been considered by this House or appropriated in either budget or appropriated in the budget adopted or even considered to be recommended in either budget that has been presented. As I understand the Speaker has ruled on the germaneness of this thing, it certainly has no connection with the thirty-five hour week. I think that however laudable the purposes, we must take into consideration the remarks of the Majority Leader and the Deputy Majority Leader in the position of the budget as it now stands and that this House, at least the other side, voted

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

67

on and passed. This money simply isn't there and there's no sense holding out a false hope to the people of this state. djh

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. O'NEILL (52nd):

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise reluctantly to oppose this particular amendment. It is a \$35 million amendment, Mr. Speaker, and the \$35 million, as Rep. Sarasin said, is not there. It's not there in our taxing program nor is it there in Governor Meskill's 7% taxing program. Yesterday we did adopt a budget. We did adopt a budget that increased ADM, Day Care, Community Development, Block Grants, Tax Relief Grants to Cities and Towns throughout the State of Connecticut. That increase, Mr. Speaker, was \$25 million. We wish that we could support Mr. Brown's amendment. We feel that eventually this will be the solution to many problems in the cities and towns throughout our state but at this time, we have no alternative but to oppose this amendment.

MR. RITTER (6th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment. I'll say that if we were to pass this today, it would then be clear to the, to all sides of the aisle, our leaders and the Governor, when we sit down to resolve our ultimate appropriations and our tax position, that we, as a matter of policy, have made this decision and since we do understand there will be a special session, that the enactment today, we will then have to come up with the additional \$35 million to be returned to the cities and towns as indicated. I, therefore, support this amendment.

MR. MAHANEY (92nd):

Mr. Speaker, I rise and congratulate Rep. Brown for the beautiful play

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

68

to pass this amendment on the last day of the session. Opposing this amendment is somewhat akin to being opposed to motherhood and the flag, particularly since I come from a large city in this state and would like nothing better than to be able to go back with this kind of money to my town or to my city. However, I think we all have a good deal of responsibility here to the State of Connecticut since we serve in a representative capacity from our towns and cities and I think in good conscience there isn't anyone in the Hall of this House today that should vote favorably on this amendment. I oppose it.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the amendment?

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th):

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, and I stayed in my seat on the last bill, but frankly, the remarks that were made then and the remarks that are being made now are getting a little bit wearing and tiring on the ears, at least on mine. I'm a little bit tired of hearing that some of us over here are abandoning Democratic philosophies and I'm also a little bit tired of hearing that we're in an austerity program and in an austerity era strictly because of that deficit we keep hearing about. I reject this, Mr. Speaker. I feel that we're taking very good care of a multitude of our citizens right now by enacting a budget which does in effect represent an austere budget because of the fact that we're in an economically difficult time, not because of our deficit but because of other reasons. We've got 115,000 people out of work. We've got many marginal industries and in my own community, I've got 5,000 people that went into a three year moratorium, without pay increases. I believe that as their representative, I'd do better here today and have done better here in accepting our budget, truly in the spirit of the Democratic philosophy by keeping down their overhead. They're not getting any pay raises in my town for

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

69

three years, and they pay the property taxes, they pay the state tax. It's my obligation to keep the budget down for that reason. It's my obligation to give them a reasonable tax program and not because of a deficit and not because I'm abandoning a Democratic philosophy, but because I truly believe in the Democratic philosophy. I oppose this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Are we ready to vote on the amendment?

MR. FRAZIER (10th):

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of this amendment. Rep. Brown has covered most of the aspects that I would speak on but very briefly, sir, I'm primarily concerned with our city essential services, just naming one, the bus service. There's a possibility that it may go out of service on weekends and possibly to various remote places within my town. This money, sir, would assure us of good bus service. I support this amendment. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on adoption of Amendment Schedule "C". All those in favor--the gentleman from the 148th.

MR. BROWN (148th):

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I just want to say that I do appreciate the Chamber for allowing some debate on this matter. I still think that it is our responsibility to continue to look at our appropriations and our budget to meet the needs of the people. I am not unmindful nor unaware of some of the difficulties in this area. I do take some issue that I am simply having, making a political ploy on the last day. If this is true, then it's been true since I've been here. I would only say this, that I think it is an important amendment. I'm very glad that both sides of the aisle recognize the

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

70

need and to put it on the record that we need this. I hope it still passes but I do hope, if it does not pass, that we will rededicate ourselves to do something about this. And let me finally say, Mr. Speaker, that I did campaign on the issue of revenue sharing and if that is political ploy then I plead guilty. And I also say this, is that southern Fairfield County is not Waterbury and if you look at the amount of money that is paid by southern Fairfield County as compared to some other states, what we're really doing is trying to respond and provide an act of charity for them.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of Amendment Schedule "C". All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The amendment is LOST.

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Mr. Speaker, if there are no more amendments, I move passage as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A" of this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

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

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1543, S.B. No. 1753, An Act Concerning a Fee for Referral to a State Referee, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. LISKOV (135th):

Mr. Speaker, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A" in concurrence with the Senate.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will call Senate "A".

djh

**S-81
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

June 3, 1971

Page 23

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill, will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "Nay". Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. ~~838~~⁷⁹⁷. File No. 831. Favorable report of the joint committee on Appropriations. House Bill 6818. An Act Concerning Scholarships for Students attending School on a part-time basis.

SENATOR HOULEY:

I urge acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This particular piece of legislation, the money for it is in the budget. And in effect, the bill repeals Section 10-116 of the '69 general statutes and substitutes in part, the language adding the words, on a part-time basis. In effect it merely defines, if you will, what is a part-time student.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 790. File No. 1124. Favorable report of the joint committee on Appropriations. Substitute for Senate Bill 1609. An Act Concerning State Employment.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I believe the Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

In line 7, delete (interruption by the Chair;)

THE CHAIR:

June 3, 1971

Page 24

Just a minute, it hasn't been moved yet. Will you move adoption, Senator Ives:

I would defer to Senator Houley and take his amendment first.

THE CHAIR:

I didn't know how many amendments there were. No one has informed me.

THE CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT A, offered by Senator Houley;

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment A.

Strike out section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Section 2, Subsection (a) of section 5-245 of the said supplement is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: The standard work week of all state employees is thirty-five hours in five days. Any state employee who performs work authorized by his appointing authority for a period in addition to the hours of the employee's regular, established workweek or the standard workweek, whichever may contain fewer hours, shall receive compensation as follows: 1, for that portion of such additional time worked which when added to the employee's regular established workweek, or the standard workweek, whichever may contain fewer hours, does not exceed (thirty-five) forty hours, the employee shall be compensated at an hourly rate based on his annual salary: 2, for that portion of such additional time worked which when added to the employee's regular, established workweek, or the standard workweek, whichever may contain fewer hours, exceeds (thirty-five) forty hours, then the employee shall be compensated at a rate equal to one and one-half times an hourly rate based on his annual salary

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment. This bill and the

June 3, 1971

Page 25

amendment offered, clarifies and removes the ambiguities of the present statutes regarding the hours of work for state employees. For approximately 25 years, the majority of state employees were on a uniform standardized 35 hour work week. In 1967, Mr. President. the General Assembly moved to unify the workweek and to treat all employees on a equal basis provided that those few employees who where on varying work schedules, schedules varying from less than 35 to and in some cases more than 60 hours, were gradually to be brought in to a uniform work arrangement. History of this legislation discloses that some government employees were taking the same merit system examinations and receiving exactly the same rate of pay, but, were working different workweeks, depending largely on their agencies or in what geographical location the agency was located in.

They may happen to be working at, at that particular point. Therefore, in 1967, legislation was enacted which gradually brought in to uniformity all state employees. Brought them into the same pay the same number of hours to work with on the same classification. For the next two year period, from the period of '67 to '69, difficulties and problems in administrating work week were expressed. And in '69 in order to resolve some of the scheduling problems, in the institutions for the physically and mentally ill and in such institutions, as our state prisons and correctional centers, section 5-238 of the general statutes was enacted. This section which has been law for over two years, now provides that the standard workweek will be 35 hours and five days. But, it also provides that the agency head, may rearrange his working schedule so that some weeks may contain more work days and more work hours than the standard. Providing, that over the eight week cycle, the average will be maintained. This statute has been utilized by some agencies.

June 3, 1971

Page 26

and has worked extremely well.

I think particularly of our state police, which has a modified form of this schedule and I think of our state prisons which similarly provides a modified form.

The present administration has indicated that, as an economic move, changes in the workweek for all state employees are necessary. We, Mr. President, of the Democratic Party are reluctant to see any backward change in the far reaching and social and economic advantages that have been made over the years. At the same time, we take particular note of the company's right here in Connecticut, Mr. President, and one has just recently announced, in the city of New Haven, as looking forward to the full day work week with greater efficiency be obtained in such short work week schedules. We also recognize the great financial stress the state of Connecticut is now faced with. We have, therefore, and I must give credit to members of both sides of the aisle, sought to accommodate the needs of the progressive social and economic legislation of the financial needs of the state and the welfare of the men and women who do state work.

We, therefore, propose this mortification for the existing work hours for government employees. The standard workweek is clearly spelled out as a uniform 35 hours for all members of the state work force with very limited exceptions such as, the State Police and those temporary employees, who are brought in for summer employment. We then, provide in those rare cases in which the existing 8 week averaging provision of the law, cannot be invoked and where emergency overtime is required, that employees will be paid at the same hourly rate for each hour they work from the 35th hour of employment until the 40th hour of employment. And that, for each hour they work in excess

June 3, 1971

Page 27

of 40 hours, they will receive an hourly rate equivalent to one and one-half times the hourly rate.

This you can see, Mr. President, is an accommodation to both the financial needs of the state and the preservation of the standard and equitable work week for the employees. It is my hope and I say this with a smile, but at the same time, I recognize that there is a trend for tomorrow, as our country advances in technology and social progress that this legislation will in fact, be the forerunner of a four day and possibly a 32 hour workweek. And perhaps a social development not too far in the distance. I move adoption of the amendment and the bill, as amended.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on the amendment. Will you remark further?

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment and before I forget it, will the Clerk, throw away my amendment?

This Senator Houley has explained, is a compromise. It provides it very simply and very basically that the workweek is 35 hours and any the first five hours beyond the 35 will be at straight time and time and a half will not start until 40 hours. I think it's a good compromise and I sincerely hope the bill passes.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President. I move for passage of the amendment as well as the bill.

June 3, 1971

Page 28

The amendment itself contain the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on the bill, as amended. The amendment consisting substantially the contents of the bill. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of the bill signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay".

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 801. File No. 892. Favorable report of the Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations. House Bill 8511. An Act Concerning Effective Date of Participation in Policemen and Firemen Survivors Benefit Fund.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. It simply is providing for the opportunity for those joining a policemen and firemen survivorshp fund that is now given those under the municipal employment benefit fund. The present statutes make reference to policiemen and firemen regarding agreements reached during negotiations. It does not recognize existence of the two distinct funds presently it is subject to referendum. And this is to allow this fund to be disbursed through negotiations. I move for passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 815. File No. 631. Favorable report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Substiutue House Bill 6247. ~~An Act Concerning the Appointment~~