

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

<i>SB 581</i>	<i>PA 185</i>	<i>1976</i>
<i>House - 2947-2951</i>		<i>5</i>
<i>Senate - 1230-1236</i>		<i>7</i>
<i>State + Urban Development - 128-136</i>		<i>9</i>

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

21p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2012

H-178

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1976

VOL. 19
PART 7
2671-3172

Monday, April 26, 1976 120.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended by House Amendment "A" and "B"? Remark further? If not, please take your seats; the aisles will be cleared; the staff come to the well. The machine will be opened. The machine is still open. The machine is still open. The machine is still open. Will you please check the board and be sure the machine has registered your vote as you so desire it to be registered. The machine will be locked, and the Clerk will please take a tally. The Clerk will please announce the result of the vote.

The following is the result of the vote:

Total number voting	145
Necessary for passage	73
Those voting Yea.	122
Those voting Nay.	23
Those absent and not voting	6

The bill as amended by House "A" and House "B" is declared passed.

Thank you very much.

THE SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk return to the call of the Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Page 7, Calendar 804, Substitute for S.B. 581, an Act concerning a set aside program for small contractors.

ROBERT D. SHEA:

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Commit-

Monday, April 26, 1976 121.

tee's favorable report in concurrence with the Senate and as amended efr
by Senate "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on acceptance and passage. Will you
remark, sir?

ROBERT D. SHEA:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Clerk has Senate Amend-
ment "A", L.C.O. 3322.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk please call and read Senate "A".

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A". In Line 13, delete the
words "less than". In Line 14, delete the words "five per cent
nor". After Line 20, insert the following: "be awarded any such
contract or contracts the total amount of which exceeds \$250,000
in any one calendar year." Delete Lines 21 to 23, inclusive.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark on the Amendment?

ROBERT D. SHEA:

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Amendment, Mr.
Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on adoption of Senate "A". Will you
remark?

ROBERT D. SHEA:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. In explaining the Amendment, it does
two things. When dealing with small contractors in a set aside

TAPE
#17

Monday, April 26, 1976 122.

program, it eliminates the five per cent, so that there is no minimum percentage, but it does leave in that the set aside program will be no more than 25%. It also eliminates the figure of only one contract being awarded and leaves the figure at a dollar amount, namely, \$250,000. The purpose of this is so that it would be equitable, inasmuch as two small contractors could win awards. One might win a \$250,000 award, and the other win only a \$50,000 award, and under the way that the file copy of the bill was written, this would mean that both of them were excluded from any other bidding under this contract. Based on that, the dollar figure is fairer, and, therefore, I move adoption of the Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, the question is on its adoption. All those in favor will indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. Senate "A" is adopted and ruled technical. Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

ROBERT D. SHEA:

Mr. Speaker, this bill will permit both the Department of Public Works and the Department of Transportation to set aside up to 25% of the State-awarded contracts that exceed \$50,000 for construction or rehabilitation of public buildings or construction of highways, and this set aside would be awarded to small contractors, and small contractors would be that as defined in sub-section e of Section 1 of Public Act 75-606. Now, this program will be administered by the Department of Commerce. Contracts will be awarded on the basis of competitive bidding, and based upon the

Monday, April 26, 1976 123.

Amendment we just passed, no small contractor can be awarded more efr than \$250,000 worth of contracts in any given year. This is not new. In the country, other states have adopted legislation like this. The intent of this legislation is to assist small contractors with State awards, and I move passage of the bill as amended.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will the Members be seated; the staff come to the well. The machine will be opened. Have all the Members voted? Is your vote properly recorded? If so, the machine will be closed. The Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk please announce the tally.

The following is the result of the vote:

Total number voting	140
Necessary for passage	71
Those voting Yea.	<u>121</u>
Those voting Nay.	19
Absent and not voting	11

The Clerk please record the gentleman of the 1st in the affirmative.

ELMER W. LOWDEN:

Mr. Speaker, in the affirmative, please.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk please note. The Clerk please announce the tally.

The following is the result of the vote:

Total number voting	142
-------------------------------	-----

Monday, April 26, 1976 124.

Necessary for passage	72	efr
Those voting Yea.	123	
Those voting Nay.	19	
Those absent and not voting	9	

The bill as amended is passed. Are there further points of personal privilege at this time? If not, will the Clerk return to the call of the Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 806, S.B. 456, an Act repealing the motorcycle helmet law.

WILLIAM A. O'NEILL:

Mr. Speaker, may that item be passed retaining its place.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

THE CLERK:

Calendar 807, S.B. 569.

WILLIAM A. O'NEILL:

Mr. Speaker, may that item be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none, the bill is so referred.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 808, S.B. 637, an Act conforming Chapter 150 to the United States Supreme Court decision concerning campaign

S-115

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1976

VOL. 19
PART 3
856 - 1305

1976 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

TUESDAY

APRIL 20, 1976

11
LFU

THE CHAIR:

Having reviewed the Amendment, Senator, I would declare it to be substantive in nature.

SENATOR DINIELLI:

Mr. President, we haven't voted on the Amendment yet.

THE CHAIR:

Question now is on the adoption of Senate Amendment, Schedule A. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. Those who are opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. The Amendment, having been moved to be substantive will be reprinted, together with the Bill and will be back in the Senate.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 360, File 219, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations, House Bill No. 5563, AN ACT CHARGING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS TO EMPLOYER EXPERIENCE ACCOUNTS, as amended by Senate Amendment, Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Pass that temporarily please.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 373, File 349, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on State and Urban Development, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 581, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SET ASIDE PROGRAM FOR SMALL CONTRACTORS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Schneller.

1976 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

TUESDAY

APRIL 20, 1976

12
LFU

SENATOR SCHNELLER:

Mr. President, I move acceptance and passage and I believe there are some Amendments.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has Senate Amendment, Schedule A, File 349, offered by Senator Smith. LCO 3322.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Do you care to remark on it, Senator?

SENATOR SMITH:

Yes, Mr. President. I understood that copies of the Amendments were on the desks of the Senators and I can't seem to find mine. But in any event, Mr. President, this Amendment clarifies the amount of contract awards that could be awarded to any small contractor and I will save the debate for the main Bill after it's amended. There was a conflict on the amount of a major contract that the State Department of Transportation or the Public Works Department could set aside. Initially it had been not less than five percent no more than twenty five percent and it also stated that no contractor - total of contracts, could be in excess of \$50,000.00 in any one calendar year. What that did, Mr. President, we found out, was to negate the not less than five percent, not more than twenty five percent, so what we've done is to delete the five percent minimum limitation

1976 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

TUESDAY

APRIL 20, 1976

13
LFU

and left it at not more than twenty five percent of that contract. Then we changed it to state that the contractors or small contractors be awarded any such contract or contracts, the total amount of which exceeds \$250,000.00 in any one calendar year and that is the explanation of the Amendment, Mr. President and I would its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

All right. Now, the question is on the adoption of Senate Amendment, Schedule A. Are there further remarks? Senator Rome?

SENATOR ROME:

Mr. President, I rise in support of the Amendment, but I still have serious reservations about the Bill. I think the Amendment helps the Bill. My pre-occupation and concern will remain as to whether or not we're encouraging small contractors to produce a top notch job and, therefore, using the same small contractors when it's appropriate, as opposed to locking some of them out. I think this Amendment improves it. I am going to support the Amendment. I believe I'm going to oppose the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hennessey.

SENATOR HENNESSEY:

Mr. President, I rise to support the Amendment. I have conferred with the Commissioner of Transportation. He supports the Bill. He feels, as Senator Smith indicated, that it will be an assistance to people, especially in this time of the economy needing a little bit of assistance. I support it.

1976 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

TUESDAY

APRIL 20, 1976

14
LFU

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Schnelller.

SENATOR SCHNELLER:

Mr. President, briefly I would urge the Chamber to support the Amendment. What it basically does is to clarify the fact that a contractor, in the category of a small contractor, could not avail himself of more than one contract during the course of a year, if his total amount exceeds \$250,000.00. It places a limitation on the amount of contracts that a small contractor would be available to have in the set aside program. I agree with Senator Rome. It strengthens the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

All right. The question then is on the adoption of Senate Amendment, Schedule A. All in favor please signify by saying aye. Opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted.

SENATOR SCHNELLER:

I believe there are further Amendments. If not, I will speak to the Bill.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has no further Amendments.

SENATOR SCHNELLER:

Then, Mr. President, I would move acceptance and passage as amended by Senate A.

THE CHAIR:

You have no further remarks?

1976 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

TUESDAY

APRIL 20, 1976

15
LFU

SENATOR SCHNELLER:

Yes, I would remark on the Bill. Basically, this Bill permits the Department of Public Works and the Department of Transportation to set aside from five to twenty five percent of State awarded contracts over \$50,000.00 for the construction and rehabilitation of public buildings or construction of highways. This set aside will be awarded to small contractors as defined in Public Act 75-606 that we passed last year, wherein the Department of Commerce has defined small contractors as those doing a volume of less than \$1 million a year. The purpose of the Act is to allow small contractors to compete in a portion of these contracts and it sets aside this portion and puts the small contractors who are eligible and the Department of Commerce would pass on the eligibility, into a pool and then they bid competitively for these contracts. Several other states, as well as the Federal government, have adopted this Legislation. I think what we have to look at here is whether we have a philosophy that says we're going to try to preserve some work for our smaller contractors so that all the work, particularly in these very competitive times, will not be gobbled up by your large major contractors. And I have no doubt that there may be a small cost to the State, over a period of time, under such a program. But I think we have to balance that cost against the economic desirabilities of maintaining some business in the contracting field for the smaller contractor.

I think it's a good concept. I think it's a concept that should be considered favorably by this body and I would ask for its passage.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Rome.

1976 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

TUESDAY

APRIL 20, 1976

16
LFU

SENATOR ROME:

Mr. President, through you to Senator Schnelller, a question. Will the State still be requiring in all instances, payment bonds and performance bonds of these small contractors?

THE CHAIR:

Will you respond to that, Senator Schnelller?

SENATOR SCHNELLER:

I would say yes. I would say yes. All other requirements and State statutes will be adhered to. It will just set up a pool and they will bid competitively.

THE CHAIR:

What is your pleasure?

SENATOR SCHNELLER:

Mr. President, if there are no objections, I would ask that it be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing none - Senator Lieberman.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, I believe that there are some Senators who wish to be recorded on the Bill.

SENATOR SCHNELLER:

Then, Mr. President, I would ask that we be recorded on the Bill. And I would ask that we vote by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

All right. Please announce a roll call.

1976 - GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

TUESDAY

APRIL 20, 1976

17
LFU

THE CLERK:

There will be an immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate. Would all Senators please return to the Chamber. An immediate Roll Call vote will take place in the Senate. Would all Senators please take their seats.

SENATOR ROME:

Might we have that at some later time? I'm not sure all the Senators are here and I'd like to satisfy myself on one point that I raised as well. I'm wondering, we'll have later roll calls and I wonder if we could just defer for just a few minutes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Schneller, do you have objection to passing this matter temporarily?

SENATOR SCHNELLER:

Mr. President, I think the roll call vote has been called for.

THE CHAIR:

I understand that. I believe Senator Rome - do you withdraw your request, Senator? All right. Now, the Roll Call is going to be on page four, on Calendar No. 373, as amended by Senate Amendment, Schedule A. The machine is open. Please cast your vote. The machine is closed and locked. Clerk please tally the vote.

TOTAL VOTING	32
NECESSARY FOR PASSAGE	17
YEAS	24
NAYS	8

The Bill, as amended, is adopted.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

PUBLIC PERSONNEL
AND
MILITARY AFFAIRS
STATE & URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

1976

mw
44

PUBLIC PERSONNEL & MILITARY AFFAIRS

MARCH 11, 1976
1:00 p.m.

officers that are out in the field that are subject to real attacks from the public, their families are put throughattacks of being called in the middle of the night and their families threatened. I think that the need is there, the cost would be minimum to the state because like I said it's only 48 employees. The majority of these employees are member employees so the cost to the state for this twenty year retirement would be very low so I am supporting that bill.

And the other bill that we would support is protecting our retirement system and the retirement fund and any raise on the retirement fund. I want to go on record as being in favor of that and if I could just mention to you, Mr. Chairman, we had a bill or intent of a bill filed with your committee, but I haven't seen it put in bill form and that is one which would give state employees more political freedom and the bill concerning state employees giving us the right to have binding arbitration or best final offer. We would like to see a hearing on those two bills. Thank you very much.

REP. MOTTO: Let me say, we didn't raise those two bills, that's why you don't see them.

MR. MAROTTA: Can I ask why you did not raise them?

REP. MOTTO: Because we heard that the commission would only hear raised bills.

MR. MAROTTA: And the committee refused to raise them. They don't intend to, your committee didn't wish to raise either one.

REP. MOTTO: Is there anyone else who wants to testify? Then I declare the hearing closed.

1
eac

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS
MARCH 23, 1976

6:30 P.M.

PRESENT:

CHAIRMEN: Senator Baker; Representative Motto

SENATORS: Barry

REPRESENTATIVES: Ahearn, Anastasio, Mesite, Julian, Campbell,
Tiffany, Truglia.

REPRESENTATIVE MOTTO: Everyone that is here tonight should be able to have the opportunity to speak if they are on the list. We know, we have been through this hearing before. I am the Chairman of the House. I am Nick Motto. My Senate Counterpart is Senator Wayne Baker over here to my left. I think we have a complement of our committee. Aloysius Ahearn sitting here. And I am sure there must be others coming because they are probably unable to reach the Hall. Oh, and I am sorry, Charlie Campbell being right here. He looks like a state employee.

As is our custom, we will have legislators testify first and I don't know whether I have a list of legislators or not. If there are no legislators present to testify, I have a list of speakers and I am going to turn, the three major organizations, or four, or probably five by now, and the first one - I flipped a coin - and the first one that came up was Mike Ferrucci. So we have two microphones. One is over here at the Major Leader's Desk and the other is at the Minority Leader's Desk and I will try to read a couple of names ahead so you can get into position. We have Mike Ferrucci first, and then we will have Al Marotta, Sal Ferruccio, and we will sort of alternate back and forth. So Mike Ferrucci you are first on the list.

MIKE FERRUCCI: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Public Personnel Committee, my name is Michael Ferrucci. I am the Executive Director of Council 16 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO. I would like to quickly point out something that is very important. I think important to all of the state employees that are in the Chamber and those who are not able to be in the Chamber and those who for some reason are not here - most of which are that many of us people are working on second shifts and will be going to work on third shifts.

H.B. 5282 Clearly, we have a difficult situation because of the action taken by the Chief Executive of the State of Connecticut, but I don't want you to confuse who has brought about the problem. This Public Personnel Committee that we are appealing to tonight, don't forget, is the same Committee that in the Special Session several months ago, in its wisdom, voted to kill this bill.

2
eac

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

MARCH 23, 1976

6:30 P.M.

That was a belated thank you in unison and now we ask you to kill it again. I think it should be pointed out that this kind of a proposal is really an insult. It is an insult not only to the workers that would be affected by it, but it is an insult to the legislative process by trying to muscle and intimidate the legislative process in our government and to rubber stamp this kind of a proposal, and I think - and I am convinced that for some reason Governor Ella Grasso who we went to the wall for, most of us, because she worked on a campaign that was going to restore decency and dignity to state employees as she went on and on to point out the indecencies imposed upon us by the Meskill Administration and pledged that we would be receiving a much fairer treatment with her administration. She got elected and for some reason she is out to get a piece of our flesh.

And she is not going to be satisfied until she gets that piece but on the other hand I would point out that state employees are not going to be satisfied until Ella Grasso gets off our backs and deals with us as she should be dealing with us.

For five months, for five months now the Administration has led an attack on state employees that has been cheap and has been full of extortions, and it seems that the program was one to alienate the public from the public worker, and those who have opposed our position would dare take advantage of these hard times, the depression, high unemployment, record unemployment, and make it seem that because we work for a living for some reason we come off looking like we are selfish - and we are not. But if you look close at those who are fighting us and those who are getting the mileage, and those who are crying for us to get on a longer work week, and those that are talking about us being tax-eaters of this society, if you look close you will see that they are really the self-interest groups, the larger newspaper editorial sections, the so-called taxpayers' associations, and our friends from the Connecticut Public Expenditures Council. Well, let's use them for an example. Man, I'll tell you - if anybody can massage figures it's the CPEC - I mean number figures. But they would lead the public to believe the most outrageous figure they come up with is that the average state employee earns over \$10,000 a year. And you don't hear them talking about the real wages folks, the true bottom line. You know what bottom line that is - the bottom line on the pay stub, the money that you take home and try to stretch and spend to provide for your family needs and the other needs that are necessary to live with - that is the bottom line.

And when you look at some examples in that category - the clerical field Typist II is a common job. I don't mean common in the sense that it is performed by common job. It is a

3
eac

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

MARCH 23, 1976

6:30 P.M.

very necessary part of our government operation. The average Typist II brings home - brings home \$100.00 a week or less, not \$200.00 as the CPEC would lead you to believe. In the field of Health Care, the Aide series, which really is a backbone in that delivery whether they be Mental Retardation Aides, Psychiatric Aides, Nurses Aides, again we are talking about an essential work force who really have to come to the work in a desire and a courageous way to do the kind of work they do, working with the unfortunate. What do they take home? Again we are talking about approximately \$100.00 a week, less in many cases and a few dollars more in some cases, not \$200.00 a week.

And another major category is the whole Maintainer series, whether they be highway maintainers, institutional maintainers, some 8,000 of them, some 8,000 of them and again the same holds true. We are talking about pay ranges of less than \$100.00 a week to somewhat more than \$100.00 a week and if you want to earn the blood money - and I am telling you the blood money by plowing snow during some of the winter storms that we have, then you might bring home a few dollars, but you pay the price for that. The workers that do that pay the price. Sure they get a little more in their pay check but they have to sacrifice their home needs. They have to be on call and the whole rest of the litany that goes along with it. So the CPEC, which likes the public to think that they are some kind of an official body, they call themselves the watchdogs for the State. I call them the fat cats.

When we talk about manipulating statistics, I don't want you to forget the real artist - Jay the juggler. His budget reminds me of a contraption. And he is somewhat experienced in this sort of thing because there is a record on his experience. We took time to look at that record. In Ohio, after getting into a running battle with the opposing forces, he was claiming a deficit. Those on the other side were seriously in doubt and felt that he was wrong and that there would be a surplus and he kept saying there could not be a surplus and until the last days of the close of the fiscal year, the State of Ohio there suddenly emerged a \$40 million surplus, and a lot say that Jay fortunately turned over the right rock at the right time and he came up with it. We would like Jay to turn over a few rocks in Connecticut. But you know something, this kind of testimony is testimony that comes from frustration. We want to talk about the issues. The issue is clear. Is this proposal fair? It is not. But I purposely chose to make this kind of a testimony because out of frustration the powers to be that are proposing this reckless posture are doing such a disservice not only to those who work in government but those who receive government services and they should be called for it, and they should be put on notice that what ought to be done is not get involved

4
eac

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

MARCH 23, 1976

6:30 P.M.

in this game playing of how bad we are and the kind of things we don't do, but what really should be done is to talk about the things that we do do and really what we deserve, and the most incredible part about this whole problem is that here where we have staggering inflation, damn it, we are up here to do nothing more than to hold the line on what we've got. That is a shame in this day and age. We should be talking about wage increase. We should be talking about positive things.

But let me conclude and I conclude and get back to the point I raised at the outset. We've been working very close with the members of this Committee on a day-to-day basis, often finding out how they feel and I hope that the kind of thing that I am reading from talking to individual members of the Committee is going to hold true because, by God, we are right on this issue and I know you want to support something that is right for workers and I hope that you do. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MOTTO: Thank you Mike. Al Marotta.

AL MAROTTA: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Public Personnel Committee, my name is Al Marotta, President of the Connecticut State Employees Association. I rise in opposition to Bill No. 5282 which is sponsored by Representative Kennelly from the 1st; Representative O'Neill from the 34th; Senator Fauliso from the 1st District; and Senator Lieberman from the 10th, and any bill that would increase the hours of work for state employees without increasing their pay proportionately.

We would like to commend the Committee on Public Personnel for their actions first in passing a bill giving state employees collective bargaining; second for its actions last December in voting down the forty-hour week. It was obvious you kept in mind the democratic principle and the fact that state employees have collective bargaining since last October and the proper place for any changes in conditions of employment should be made at the bargaining table where both parties are considered to be equal.

As a state employee with over twenty years of service, I have witnessed a repeated attack on me and my co-workers. Today the state employee benefits have been equalled and often surpassed by those in private industry. We have seen employees in the private sector move ahead with pay increases, cost of living increases to keep up with inflation, but not the state employees - no, they are a different kind of an employee. They are over here. State employees are providing services that have been mandated by this General Assembly in a democratic fashion and by the citizens of the State of Connecticut. Our services are needed today more than ever. What shape would

5
eac

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

MARCH 23, 1976

6:30 P.M.

our State be in without the services provided by state employees. Everyone forgets the services that state employees provide. They are not political hacks. They provide services in Social Services Department of the State, the Labor Department, Public Safety, our institutions, on our highways, and services to the elderly of the State of Connecticut.

State workers are attacked constantly in the public eye and this is why they are attacked daily. We are blamed for the State's fiscal crisis. We are called upon to sacrifice so that the State can balance its budget. We are asked to accept a special tax of 12%. This is what the extra five hours a week means. It means that the state employee will be called on to work the entire year, five hours a week for just a compensation of \$300.00 per year which would amount to working for \$1.20 per hour. The minimum wage under the Federal laws and the laws of the State of Connecticut are well higher than this standard. If the Administration thinks that by putting state employees on a 40-hour without a corresponding pay raise to increase productivity, I want to inform you and inform them that the reverse will be true. Our morale, the morale of state employees, has been diminished and state employees can not stand to work five additional hours for \$300.00 and I know that the productivity of state employees will go in the reverse. State employees have been attacked, degraded, and they've been cleaned over the past five years until all that remains now is the skeleton.

We urge the Committee of Public Personnel to kill the forty hour bill and leave it to collective bargaining, and as my part of the program is concluded, our Associate Executive Director, Mr. John Thompson, will fill you in on more details. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MOTTO: Thank you Al. John, be brief now because you are on part of his time.

JOHN W. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, Fellow State Workers, my name is John Thompson. I represent CSEA.

Connecticut is Number One in the nation in per capita income. But the 40 hour week proposal by the Governor and her Finance Commissioner would rank us 50th in the nation in common sense.

Six months ago, collective bargaining became law. What has happened since then? We are here a second time to fight the 40 hour week. In December you rejected that scheme to undermine bargaining, but we learned what anti-labor power plays are. On January 2nd, the first 500 of our co-workers were fired, a power play with state employees as pawns.

Last month 200 jobs were washed out at Cedarcrest. We were told this would save the State money. Yet no one can give us proof

6
eac

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

MARCH 23, 1976

6:30 P.M.

of where the savings will come from, or how much it will amount to.

The collective bargaining bill says the State will negotiate wages, hours of work, and conditions of employment. Let's negotiate. We're ready now.

Why is the collective bargaining law being ignored? You gave us collective bargaining. We want to use it. I am sure the Members of the Committee want us to use it.

The 40 hour week proposal is simply wrong. How can we expect anyone to work five hours per week for nothing? How can we expect institution employees to take a pay cut of over \$1,000 a year? How can we expect the state employees --

REPRESENTATIVE MOTTO: John, may I stop you for a minute. You know, I wish the people on the outside would just be quiet because no one can hear and there is no way we can pipe it outside so if you will be quiet, you can hear it from in here. If you will remain quiet on the outside, you will be able to hear the microphones on the inside. All right John, go ahead. I am sorry.

JOHN THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I was saying that how can we expect state employees to donate seven weeks of their time for free. That is exactly what the 40 hour week proposal demands. It discriminates against state employees. Everyone is talking about a \$40 million deficit, but why ask just veterans and state employees to pay it off. Every citizen in Connecticut is responsible. 40,000 citizens work for the State. Why do we expect them to pay off a debt that belongs to 3-1/2 million citizens? Who in the private sector would work five extra hours per week with no extra pay to make up a deficit? State employees don't mind paying their share, but so should everyone else.

The Governor and Commissioner Tepper look to reducing the State work force through attrition. They should know you can lead a horse to water but you can't make it drink. And I can tell you tonight without the slightest hesitation that state employees can not be expected to work with dedication and efficiency during five captive, unpaid hours a week.

Employee morale is at an all-time low and working conditions, Mr. Chairman, are intolerable. Long Lane School, as an example, is understaffed by 40 employees tonight. Eight members of the education unit have left since September and not been replaced. Kids are not being helped; I think we all suffer.

A retardation aide told me last week she is responsible for 32 retarded residents, over half are subject to seizures, too much responsibility, a dangerous situation, and we want to reduce her salary by 14%!

7
eac

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

MARCH 23, 1976

6:30 P.M.

The Social Services Department is understaffed by at least 400 people. Who suffers? In my judgment, the elderly poor, the disabled, the handicapped.

I believe Connecticut aspires to a better public service. I am convinced the people of Connecticut will support decent and fair working conditions for state employees.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we continue to avoid an equitable tax structure. The State has been trying to balance its budget by pecking at its once loyal state employees. Every time we look up we expect to see birds of prey swooping down upon us again. We rely upon you to keep this from happening. We rely upon you to stand firm behind the decision made at the Special Session last December and we are especially grateful to you for that. We ask you to kill the 40-hour week! We believe that what we need right now in the State of Connecticut is an appeal to the best instincts of our citizens, an instinct for fair play. We ask you to kill the 40 hour week and let us get on to the conference table and get on with the business of the State. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MOTTO: Thank you John. Sal Perruccio, followed by Joe Nidelka, followed by E. Steven Pearl. Sal, may I just stop for a minute. I do have a statement that was handed to me from the Connecticut Business and Industry Association and we will add this to our minutes. I also have a statement from Tony D'Angona from the Vocational Instructors who said he is opposed to the 40 hour week. Sal Perruccio.

SAL PERRUCCIO: Sal Perruccio, President of the Connecticut State Employees Union, Independent. I represent 3700 state employees and one of the things that I don't ever imagine is the fact that we didn't give up something for the 40 hour week to be reduced to 35 hours.

Back in 1967 when many of us were before the Legislature and times were booming, state employees were told then by the Governor Dempsey, we will give you the 35 hour week this year but we won't give you a pay raise. Now we have earned that 35 hour week. We've worked to preserve it. And we wish to retain it. Just think of what we have lost this past year from 1975 to 1976. This is what state employees lost. No pay raise in 1975. There were partial increments. Employees who came to work for the State thinking they would get their yearly raise were told they would only get a partial increment. Our pension benefits were reduced in 1975. Our age of retirement was increased to 55 starting in 1981. Our employees sixty years of age and over can't apply for disability pensions, and what about the overtime that was built in for so many of the institutional employees to keep the institutions going. That overtime was lost. And what about the job replacement. The fact that when an employee quits or retires or is fired,

8
eac

PUBLIC PERSONNEL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

MARCH 23, 1976

6:30 P.M.

they are not replaced, and what about the employees that are overworked and overburdened and are threatened with an unsatisfactory service rating if they don't continue to work in place of a person and they have to replace. And what about even part-time vacation benefits. Just the other day before the Personnel Policy Board, I was arguing for a group of 25 part-time employees who have lost their part-time vacation benefits. Now we have given up much and I would have to say not in modern history of labor benefits have so many lost so much.

I don't like to be threatened. I don't like the members that I represent to be threatened but yet we have the threat. It is a two-sided coin. The Governor says if she gets the 40 hour week there will be nearly 2,000 state employees laid off. Some of the people who are here tonight won't be working for the State if the 40 hour week is enacted. On the other hand, in one of the recent articles in the newspaper, the Governor laid off 505 state employees already after the Special Legislative Session and has since threatened more lay offs if the Legislature fails this time to enact the 40 hour week. So you can't win. If she gets the 40 hour week, there is going to be lay offs. If she doesn't get the 40 hour week, there will still be lay offs. And that is an awful way for a legislature to work under.

I think it was brought up by the first speaker. We were absolutely insulted by the groundwork laid by the State Personnel Commissioner of this State. He issued out a newspaper release a few weeks ago saying that the Connecticut state employees were on top of the heap as far as the New England states were concerned and in that little line at the bottom to catch the public's reaction was the fact that the average salary for state employees is over \$10,000 per year!

They asked the union leaders to come to the Governor's office at the last Special Session and they asked the union leaders to look for ways to cut the State expenses and so when we went to the office and told the Governor of certain ways to cut expenses and at the same time to try to relate how to help the budget - they listened, her advisors listened and none of these things that we asked to have done have been enacted since that time. We still have private contractors for snow removal. We still have these double figure leases for buildings that are given out to private contractors while there are state office buildings laying waste without anybody using them. And we gave her these suggestions and they still haven't been enacted on.

And so as the union leaders are made to made fools at least before the public, I say it is about time the legislature produces the guts to stand on their own feet and say to the