

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-85		7661	1	13	7
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Labor 122</i> 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1044-1054 • 1096 • 3357 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 987 • 1947-1952

H-110

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 3
974-1450**

Thursday, March 25, 1971 40.

not for me to construct those words "to remain inviolate". It is for the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut to construct it. And I think that every person here can take solace in the fact that they are voting for an Act which will preserve the jury system in the State of Connecticut, and certainly we can say that the jury system in the State of Connecticut is the light of liberty, and, therefore, I will support this Bill. EPI

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". All those in favor will indicate by saying "aye". All those opposed. The Bill is passed.

JOHN A. CARROZZELLA:

Mr. Speaker, I would now move for suspension of the rules for immediate transmittal to the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on suspension for immediate transmittal to the Senate. Is there objection? Hearing none, the rules are suspended, and the matter is transmitted herewith.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 137, H.B. No. 7661, an Act concerning extending the Minimum Wage Law to public employees and educational and charitable, and like employees.

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

Mr. Speaker, I move for the acceptance of the Committee's

Thursday, March 25, 1971 41.

favorable report and passage of the Bill.

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill. Will you remark?

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk as an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk please read the Amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", offered by Mr. Badolato, of the 30th District. In Line 20, after the word "services" insert "are". In Line 21, strike out the bracket and place the bracket after the word "are", and after the word "basis" insert "to an educational, charitable, religious, scientific, historical, literary or nonprofit organization".

MR. SPEAKER:

You've heard the Amendment.

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

Mr. Speaker, this Amendment continues a provision in the present statute which exempts those people who volunteer their services to educational, charitable, religious, scientific, historical, literary or nonprofit organizations from coverage under the State Minimum Wage Law. It's an Amendment that the Committee inadvertently omitted and are attempting, in this case, to replace it, and I move its passage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Thursday, March 25, 1971 42.

Question is on House Amendment Schedule "A". Would you
remark further? EFH

ROBERT D. KING:

Mr. Speaker, through you a question to the gentleman
from the 30th.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please pose your question.

ROBERT D. KING:

Under your proposed Amendment, is it the thought that it
will exempt from the provisions of this Bill part-time students
and others who work for our libraries, historical societies,
churches, and the like? Your statement was "those who volunteer".
I am not thinking of those who volunteer. I am thinking of those
who are employed for a consideration but less than Minimum Wage
standards.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman from the 30th care to respond?

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

Mr. Speaker, this will not exempt anyone in that cate-
gory. They would be covered under the Minimum Wage Act. At the
hearing there was no one that appeared in opposition. We did a
study of the question that is being asked, and we find that there
are no agencies that pay lower than a minimum wage, even under the
poverty program, or under the Manpower Program of the State. They
all receive the Minimum Wage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Thursday, March 25, 1971 43.

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"? EFH
If not, all in favor will indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. The
Amendment passed. The Chair rules the Amendment is technical.

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as amended, will provide coverage
under the Minimum Wage Act of the State of Connecticut to those em-
ployees that are in State and public service. As I stated before,
at the hearing there was no opposition to the Bill...a great deal
of support on the Committee, and the Committee certainly urges
its passage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

GERALD F. STEVENS:

Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, a question to the
gentleman of the 30th, if he cares to answer. It is my reading
that this will also exclude...will also remove the present exemp-
tion that is now enjoyed by educational, charitable, religious,
scientific, historical, literary, or nonprofit organizations. Is
that correct?

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

Mr. Speaker, no. The charitable, educational, religious,
scientific, historical, literary, or nonprofit organizstions would
be covered under this Act. The only ones that would not be covered
in this category are those that volunteer their services.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

Thursday, March 25, 1971

44.

GERALD F. STEVENS:

EFH

Mr. Speaker, I would rise to oppose this Bill, and I would do so for this reason. It would appear to me that if the organizations which are named in the Bill and which are currently exempt are all paying the minimum wage, or more, there would be no need for the Bill. What concerns me is the...are the schools, charitable organizations, churches, synagogues, libraries and other nonprofit organizations that might have employees such as youngsters high-school age who they maintain on a regular basis for perhaps two or three hours a day after school and pay them less than the minimum wage. As I read the Bill, if this passes they would be required to pay minimum wage payments to these individuals. If that is the case, I think we might be doing a disservice to the organizations, one, and, secondly, to the people who are finding employment even though below the minimum wage. If the Bill passes as I understand it, they would have to raise the payments, and perhaps these people would no longer have these jobs.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Bill as amended.

ROBERT D. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I think what Mr. Stevens has said is very significant, at least in the areas with which I am familiar, and I am quite familiar with the operation of small town libraries, historical societies, churches, and the like. I think the actual effect of this Bill would be to eliminate many students who now enjoy a part-time employment with these organizations for the reason

Thursday, March 25, 1971 45.

that if these particular organizations had to pay minimum wages there is no reason to employ student help, so that the hour and a half after-school job, the Saturday morning job, both in and outside...lawn care and so on...they're going to be eliminated. There is no incentive at all for hiring the students...for hiring the people who need the pin money. In some cases they need it for their own personal needs, which their families cannot supply. This has been true for many, many years. There is no particular hardship, in most instances, because this is extra money...this is extra money, which they enjoy, which they need. It provides a service to the town. They're not exactly in the category of volunteers, nor are they in the category of full-time employees. They come in between...in sort of a twilight zone. It's a service to the youngster. It's a service to the community. And this Bill would eliminate it. I think, Mr. Speaker, therefore, that I'm going to have to vote against the Bill on this ground, and I suspect that a lot of others in the hall, who know the situation in their own communities, are going to do likewise.

JOHN D. PRETE:

Mr. Speaker, I reviewed this Bill over the last few days and raised many of the questions that Rep. King is now raising, and I cannot for the life of me think of one stance, and I belong to a lot of clubs, organizations...I belong to a church...I cannot think of one single instance where the minimum wage is not now paid or exceeded. On that basis, I think that the Bill is relatively innocuous. I think that we're magnifying the problems that

Thursday, March 25, 1971 46.

that may be there, and I would urge its passage.

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Bill as amended. If not, then the question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". All those in favor will indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. The Chair is in doubt.

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

Mr. Speaker, I request that there be a roll call vote.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion for a roll call. All those in favor indicate by saying "aye". In the opinion of the Chair, in excess of 20% have supported the motion. There'll be a roll call. While we're awaiting the Members to return to the floor, are there any further announcements or introductions at this time. Are there any further announcements or points of personal privilege? Is there further business on the Clerk's desk?

THE CLERK:

Yes. Favorable report Joint Standing Committee on Banks. H.B. No. 7512, an Act authorizing the Town of Manchester to purchase and take the franchise and property of the Manchester Water Company and issue bonds to finance this acquisition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar and printing. The House will be at ease while we're awaiting the return to the floor of the Members.

JOHN F. PAPANDREA:

Thursday, March 25, 1971 47.

Perhaps while we're waiting, on Page 2 of the Calendar, I'd move that Calendar No. 152, H.B. No. 7330, File No. 127, an Act concerning distribution of unsolicited credit cards, be passed, retaining its place on the Calendar. EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion is to pass and retain until Monday's Calendar, Calendar No. 152. Is there objection? Hearing none, the matter is retained.

JOHN F. PAPANDREA:

Mr. Speaker, also on Page 2, Mr. Speaker, Calendar No. 161, H.B. No. 5225, File No. 141, an Act concerning reimbursement of tax loss to Glastonbury and South Windsor. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion is for a reference to the Joint Committee on Appropriations of Calendar No. 161. Is there objection? Hearing none, the matter is so ordered.

JOHN F. PAPANDREA:

And also announce, Mr. Speaker, on Page 4 of the Calendar, the first matter at the top, Calendar No. 171, substitute for H.B. No. 5546, File No. 130, an Act concerning the use of electronic surveillance devices by employers. It will be taken up by the House on Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair would reiterate the Deputy Majority Leader's statement referring to Page 4, at the top of the page. The Members

Thursday, March 25, 1971 48.

will recall that yesterday it was announced that this matter would be considered today, under suspension of the rules. There were further considerations in this matter. The joint leadership has agreed to retain this matter until next Tuesday. Calendar No. 171, substitute for H.B. No. 5546, File 130. Does the gentleman from the 78th have any further motions, Calendar business that could be disposed of at this time?

JOHN F. PAPANDREA:

Mr. Speaker, on Page 3, the middle of the page, I would move that Calendar No. 166, H.B. No. 6001, File No. 128, an Act concerning the use of names, portraits or pictures for advertising or similar purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on General Law.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would call the Members' attention to Page 3 of the Calendar, Calendar 166, H.B. No. 6001, File 128. The motion is to recommit to the Joint Committee on General Law. Is there objection? Hearing none, the matter is recommitted. Does the Clerk have additional favorable reports to read in at this time?

THE CLERK:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

For the benefit of the Members who have just returned to the floor, the Chamber is considering on Page 2 of the Calendar, Calendar No. 137, H.B. No. 7761, File 122. The action to this point has been House Amendment Schedule "A" has been adopted on a voice vote and ruled by the Chair to be technical. The question

Thursday, March 25, 1971 49.

before the Chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable and passage of the Bill as so amended. The request for a roll call vote has been favorably entertained, and are we prepared to return to consideration of the Bill at this time?

EFH

ROBERT D. KING:

Mr. Speaker, may I request, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill be passed retaining. In the interim, I have talked with Rep. Badolato. It would seem that the differences are not beyond some adjustment, and it has been suggested that an Amendment meeting the objections, which this side has raised, would meet with some favor by the Representative from the 30th.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman from the 30th care to withdraw his request for a roll call vote?

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

If it's with the thought in mind of pass, retaining, I would.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes indeed, sir. I think that the Chair should pose this question. We have adopted the Amendment Schedule "A". Is the request, or the request, that will be made for a pass, retaining, to be the Bill in its present status, as so amended, or ob initio prior to any action on the Amendment? I think that should be clarified.

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

Mr. Speaker, I would have no objections to starting from

Thursday, March 25, 1971 50.

scratch, if it's agreeable to the House.

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

First, the motion has been made to withdraw the request for a roll call at this time. All those in favor. That disposes of that. Now, if the Majority Leader will kindly make a motion to retain the matter until Tuesday, in as much as Monday is a non-controversial day, the Chair would like to entertain that motion.

JOHN F. PAPANDREA:

So moved.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? The matter is retained...will be retained again Monday and considered on Tuesday.

JOHN D. PRETE:

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire to the Chair as to the status of the Amendment. Did we pass the Amendment? Will that be a matter for Tuesday?

MR. SPEAKER:

It was my understanding the comment made by the gentleman from the 30th that he would entertain the motion to pass retaining would be ob initio, and to use his phrase, he would start from scratch. So to answer your question, any amendments will be reconsidered on Tuesday.

JOHN D. PRETE:

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there further business on the Clerk's desk?

that we can proceed with the Calendar business.

djh

MR. PRETE (114th):

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the Resolution.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

MR. PRETE (114th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The resolution simply changes the name of our State and Urban Development Committee to State and Community Development Committee which more accurately reflects the responsibilities and activities of that committee. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? I'd simply remind the members that in view of the fact that this is a rules change, that a two-thirds vote is needed. All those in favor, indicate by saying aye. Those opposed? The resolution is ADOPTED.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 137, H. B. No. 7661, An Act Concerning Extending the Minimum Wage Law to Public Employees and Educational Charitable and Like Employees, File No. 122.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair recognizes the Chairman of the Labor Committee, Dominic Badolato from the 30th.

MR. BADOLATO (30th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

H-114

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 7
3011-3376**

Thursday, ~~May~~ 20, 1971 161.

report and passage of the Bill as amended by House "A" and Senate "A". All those in favor will indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. The Bill is passed. EFH

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 137, H.B. No. 7661, an Act concerning extending the Minimum Wage Law to public employees and educational, charitable and like employees. (As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A" and House Amendment "A".)

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

Mr. Speaker, I move for the acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A" and House Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on acceptance and passage as amended by House "A". The Clerk...does the gentleman care to have the Clerk read Senate "A", or would the gentleman care to have an opportunity to summarize.

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

I can summarize it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Without objection, the gentleman from the 30th will summarize Senate "A".

DOMINIC J. BADOLATO:

Mr. Speaker, when this Bill passed the House, there was an Amendment placed on it to provide that minors between the ages of 16 and 18 would receive a minimum wage less than that provided for full-time employees. Somehow or other, that Amendment didn't

**S-78
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 3
957-1456**

April 13, 1971

31.

SENATOR SMITH:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, this bill simply removes the employees of state and municipal.. sorry I have the wrong bill.

This bill simply adds helpers to those drivers who are now presently exempted from the provisions of our state statutes 3-176B to 31-76J of the Connecticut General Statutes. The Secretary of Transportation is added to the Interstate Commerce Commission in having the power to establish qualifications in maximum hours of service in accordance with provisions of applicable federal law. I don't need to go into additional details unless there are some further questions on it.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 178, File No. 122 Favorable Report Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations H.B. 7661 An Act Concerning Extending the Minimum Wage Law to Public Employees and Educational Charitable and Like Employees as Amended by House Amendment Sch. A.

S-80
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL.14
PART 5
1921-2435

May 14, 1971

27.

THE CHAIR:

It may be passed retaining.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Thank you very much.

THE CLERK:

Page 23 under the heading Recall Cal. 178, File 122. This is the favorable report of the Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations on H.B. 7661 An Act Concerning Extending The Minimum Educational, Charitable and Like Employees.

The Clerk has an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, would you please guide me on the procedure for this. Its a Recall.

THE CHAIR:

Well recall is back before us. For consideration. The Clerk has an amendment. Then we would ask the Clerk to read --- the amendment. And then if you wish to do so you would move the passage of the amendment.

Senator Ives do you wish to be recognized at this time?

SENATOR IVES:

I believe its my amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Oh. I didn't understand that. Thank you.

SENATOR IVES:

Would you please read the amendment?

THE CHAIR:

I wondered what you were doing standing up there. Senator Smith, the Senator offering the amendment rises to be recognized. So that we can dispose of the amendment in adverse order of their filing before taking up the main bill.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment A. as offered by Senator Ives.

May 14, 1971

28.

THE CLERK:

At the beginning of line one, insert the word Sec. 1. After line 24, add the following to the end of Section 31-58, except Sec. j.

Section 2. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained. Minors between the ages of 16 and 18 years of age who are employees of the State or any political subdivision thereof shall be paid a minimum wage of not less than 85% of the minimum fair wage as defined in Section 31-58.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ives.

SENATOR IVES:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, when the original bill was passed. At the last minute we questioned whether the extension of the minimum wage to all state and municipalities hit the so called summer employment. This amendment excludes 16 to 18 from full minimum wage. But requires that 85% minimum wage. Its a compromise worked out with the House Labor Chairman and I think it does at least most of what we would like to do.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, as also a co-chairman of the Labor Committee we concur with the compromise. I support the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thats a very salutary way to end up the week. The question is on the amendment. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of passage of the amendment signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Senator Smith.

May 14, 1971

29.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, I move for adoption of the bill as amended?

THE CHAIR:

The amendment is ruled technical. You may proceed on the adoption of the bill as amended. Will you remark? Senator Odegard.

SENATOR ODEGARD:

Mr. President, I would like the senators in the circle to consider a no vote on this particular bill. And the reason is as follows. I think the logic to the bill is that we would extend to ourselves as the state employers and to local employers, the same obligation that we extend to employers in the private area. And that is sensible. In inquiring to some degree after the passage of this last bill. As to how it would affect those towns that I am most familiar with. And I think would probably be applicable to most of the towns represented here in the state of Connecticut. It would seem to me that there are very few. None that I could determine, positions in public standard positions in public employment that pay less than at least the present minimum wage. There are several programs though that would be helped by the amendment that we just passed. But this would take a degree away from, of freedom away from the towns in instituting these programs. And some of those. There are so many I could think of. But some of those that I specifically refer to are basketball clinics that are held in some of our elementary schools during the winter. Very often what they are doing in this kind of program and specifically I refer to the town of Glastonbury. Is there having senior high school students, athletes on the basketball team coaching junior high school students. Another program that comes to mind that's applicable is the program that the town of Glastonbury is thinking of setting up for future year. And that is what they call a police cadet program. Where a high school student. In some cases it would be post high school students would serve with the local police force as an aid. The youngster as an aid to the policeman. And it would have a number of benefits. One

May 14, 1971

30.

would be police youngster relationships. Which are so important today in understanding. Secondarily I think would be any assistance that the force were to receive from the youngsters. In particularly the policing of summer recreational programs. Dances and that sort of thing. And there are others. There is just one other major area I would speak to without talking to a specific program. That major area would be what we have come to call ecology in the programs where we might have as the purpose primarily providing employment for young people. In for instance the clean up of a wild area. A natural area perhaps an improved park in any one of our towns. Or perhaps, although I think less likely through the state of Connecticut.

Now as a practical matter if this passes. Even with the amendment. If a town wants to institute a program of this type. It will do it for one of two reasons. Either because the program is a marginal sort of thing. And the town would not consider it high enough on priority to institute it under normal procedures. But would perhaps have great community interest from the area of budding a park or a wild area of this type. Secondly it may very likely be what we call a charitable purpose. I suspect that is providing employment for young people. In the two specific cases I referred to the town in question now pays in some of these programs between \$1 and \$1.25 and sees no reason to increase as they have great success. They plan on keeping it at the same. They have tremendous response. And they don't feel the need to improve it. And further as a practical matter. There are those of us that have served, so many of us here, have served in local government. Realize that often when we are doing our budget and trying to set up a program of this type. Well unmotivated, we feel that it is something that we want to do. We can go for it to some extent. And usually that extent because of the fiscal problems we have amounts to a dollar value. In other words we can put \$1000 into this kind of a program and \$2000 into the other. Or another arbitrary figure that I might

May 14, 1971

31

pick. And that if we do not require the estates to fall under our minimum wage legislation and as amended. We are essentially, I think dropping out the number of youngsters that can be served. We are either killing the program or dropping out the number of youngsters. But I think the program would have a bad affect for the community particularly. Where it has a manager or a mayor or councilmen, selectman perhaps, who has the interest and the desire to institute something like this. It really ham strings him to some extent. He will not have a beneficial effect to my knowledge in very many cases. And in these specific cases would tend to be very harmful to really important and innovative for the service of our young people. And for that reason I'd like the Senators to consider this reasoning. And no vote. Even though I realize it was quite heavily passed before. And this would require some changes of mind. Thank you Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Senator Crafts.

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Mr. President, I believe I have just received a message that we only have one minute to conclude our business.

THE CHAIR:

Senator, you have all the time in the world.

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Thank you very much. Mr. President, members of the circle. I rise to support this bill. And would say to the Senator from the 4th District that the community project that he refers to could very well be handled with better disregard for this particular law by giving them a title of Youth Improvement Program and giving that program an outright grant from the town finances. Thereby eliminating salary requirements. I think this bill does give a great deal of service to communities all over the state. And it should be adopted.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further?

May 14, 1971

32.

If not all those in favor of passage, signify by saying aye. AYE.
Opposed nay. No. The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

No further business on the Clerk's desk at this time.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

If there is no further business, I move that we adjourn
until Monday at 1 o'clock.

THE CHAIR:

There being no objection. The Senate will stand adjourned
until Monday at 1 o'clock.

THE SENATE ADJOURNED AT 4 P.M.

dq

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**LABOR
AND
INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS**

1-347

**1971
Index**

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

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

MARCH 1, 1971

Chr. Badolato: Is there anyone else in favor of either or both of these bills? If not, then we will hear from the opposition.

J. Bober: Joseph Bober, Secretary-Treasurer of the Connecticut State Labor Council speaking in opposition to S. B. 1215 (Sen. Odegard of the 4th District) AN ACT CONCERNING WAGE RATES ON CONTRACTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OR REPAIR OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, which would exempt contracts for public works projects of less than \$50,000. from statutory requirements regarding payment of customary and prevailing rates of wages.

Again, this is another type of bill that would reward the contractor who could pay the lowest wages. The purpose of prevailing rates of wages is to take wages out as a basis of competition. In other words, any contractor would have to, at least, pay them the \$1.60 an hour and I think a \$50,000. contract is not a small contract by any stretch of the imagination. I would recommend that the Committee leave it at \$5000. This is, again, an attack on the wage structure of the workers of this State of Connecticut and I think it is to be abhorred.

Chr. Badolato: Is there anyone else in opposition? If not, we will move on to H. B. 6821 (Rep. Klebanoff of the 9th District, Sen. Blake of the 14th District) STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE THROUGH PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT UNDER A STATE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM. Anyone care to speak in favor? Is there anyone in opposition? Then, we will move on to H. B. 7661 (Rep. Badolato of the 30th District) AN ACT CONCERNING EXTENDING MINIMUM WAGE TO PUBLIC EMPLOYEES AND EDUCATIONAL, CHARITABLE AND LIKE EMPLOYEES. Is there anyone in favor? Is there anyone in opposition? If not, we will move on then to S. B. 700 (Sen. Ives of the 32nd Dist.) AN ACT CONCERNING HOURS OF LABOR ON STATE BRIDGES. Anyone in favor of S. B. 700?

W. Huntington: Mr. Chairman. My name is William L. Huntington. I am the Director of Construction Maintenance in the Connecticut Department of Transportation.

We don't believe that Section 31-56 of the General Statutes was ever intended to impose the restriction of limitation on highway contracts that it does. The present Statutes limits the work week on bridges to 48 hours which, we believe, was intended in an attempt to reduce accidents and in which we are in full agreement with. However, the language of the Statutes