

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

<u>SB 482</u>	(76-227)	<u>1976</u>
House Substitutions	88-101, 107-118, 120-131, 135-145	(53)
House:	3374-3377, 3491-3499	(13)
Senate:	1516-1517	(2)

68 p.

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

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2015

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

HUMAN SERVICES

HUMANE
INSTITUTIONS

1976

that the current Medicaid Program has two Program Managers -- \$191,000 program with two management people. One of the issues which has come up again is the fact that the medical management information system will again be delayed for a couple of months because HEW has said they want revisions in the Program. In order to carry out these cost-saving steps it seems to us to put a clear responsibility and focus on planning and review and to add some additional management staff.

In reviewing the Commissioner's original budget request for the next year, there was a request for additional management people within the management system. They were for carrying out the implementation but not for this kind of health policy

Briefly, in terms of those bills that we would like to oppose -- Senate Bill 93, the welfare payments to strikers -- and I think a lot of reasons have been given for it; Senate Bill 294, the stepparent liability for minor children which would seriously discourage re-marriage in the provision of a family setting for children; and Senate Bill ... House Bill 5133 which I think has also been discussed with you in depth, and that's the one calling for the establishment of a public assistance work program. We notice here that there's no approach ... and Senate Bill 26 calling for the create ... creation of jobs and there may be others.

Rep. Osler:

Any questions? Thank you very much...
Ralph Padolsky?

Judith Sessions:

I'm Judith Sessions and I'm representing the Connecticut Group Homes Association. And, we're here, we interested in Bill 5411 on the ... purchasing of supplies and materials for the ... through the State of Connecticut.

Now, basically, we would like to ... we want to be in favor of this bill. I listened earlier ... we now have twenty-five group homes in the State of Connecticut and they are an alternate for institutionalized care in the State of Connecticut, community-based residential services are offered in these group homes. Right now we are in favor of this bill because our budgets are very limited especially in this

austerity year in the State of Connecticut. And, we did not get increases in our budget last year and we're really hoping that we just don't get a decrease in our budget this year.

But ... in our budget there is no area for equipment. We just have no money to buy equipment. As it is, we have to go out and try to solicit private donations, contributions, of money or the actual equipment itself. So there is no money. Granted, there wouldn't be any more money if it were offered through the State of Connecticut, but if we did get a financial donation then it would save us more money and we wouldn't have to look for quite so much.

Also, there is very little money in our budget for household and medical supplies, and to properly take care of these children in our homes we do need more money and this is not the Committee for this; we will be there tonight ... But, for this we do need, you know, this will be a big plus to us for the budget we have if this were approved.

So, we would really like to help provide better services for the youth in the State of Connecticut and hopefully you can help get this through. Thank you.

Rep. Orcutt: Just for my own information, could you tell me how the enrollment in the home is relative to

Ms. Sessions: I don't have the actual figures... I do -- they are in my briefcase.... I think there might be 54 beds is what I heard for last month, that were empty out of 263 beds.

Rep. Orcutt: Fifty-four out of 263; so that you're just about three-quarters full, then.

Ms. Sessions: Yes... and my home is one of the largest homes and have vacancies right now.

Rep. Orcutt: Your vacancies are filled by referrals from ...

Ms. Sessions: Department of Social Services, DCYS, private hospitals, private referrals, state hospitals ...

Repl

90
PB

HUMAN SERVICES

February 24, 1976

- Rep. Orcutt: Is about 75 percent about the level that (inaudible)
- Ms. Sessions: No ... no, we should be running at a level of about 8 1/2 percent a year capacity in our house. At least they funded group homes at a different rate; and for us to run at full level, to be able to just break even, we should have about 8 1/2 percent per year.
- Rep. Orcutt: You mean eight and a half vacancy...
- Ms. Sessions: No, eight and a half girls a month I'm sorry; we need at least 85 percent capacity in our house, yes.
- Rep. Orcutt: Eighty-five percent capacity is what you really need in order to break even ...
- Ms. Sessions: Yes ...
- Rep. Orcutt: And is that ... ten percent below that now ...
- Ms. Sessions: Yes ...
- Rep. Orcutt: And have you been about that ... is that about the average of what percentage
- Ms. Sessions: ... well, last year, I have computed my figures for last year in our home because I don't have it on all the group homes; I had 8.5 average for the whole year; in my house. I had a capacity of 10. I had a total of 8.5 girls for a total for the whole year. So I just broke even.
- Rep. Osler: Thank you. We're really very close to the end of the list now. Okay: Ron Gillam? Grace Raiford?
- Mary Ambler: I'm Mary Ambler from Connecticut Council of Churches. With five other hearings to cover today I didn't dare get on your list.
- I simply want to speak in favor of the concept of getting the flat grant up to a workable, humane level for the people whom it's to serve. The churches in Connecticut have been doing valiant work in putting together food

pantries around the State and it's not exactly, the way, as a mother, I would see that you would like to be able to count of feeding your child to have to go and perhaps find three cans of squash left in a food pantry when you really need something better to count on than that kind of meal plan and the rest that goes with it.

Thank you.

Rep. Osler:

Anybody else? Then we either have gone by the names on the list or we have not been able to rouse them or we have completed the list ...

Rep. Stolberg:

Thank you very much, Dorothy I will declare at this point the public hearing of the Human Services Committee be closed. I would ask the staff to try to call the Clerk's Office and have announced on the loud speaker system in the Capitol that a Committee meeting will be started in five minutes for the purpose of discussing some special questions in the area of children legislation and for the purpose of raising or considering doing favorable reports on some bills.

(written testimony)

The Connecticut Construction Industries Association, Inc.

1290 SILAS DEANE HIGHWAY • WETHERSFIELD, CONNECTICUT 06109

(203) 529-6855

February 24, 1976

The Honorable Betty Hudson
Chairman, Human Services

The Honorable Irving J. Stolberg
Chairman, Human Services

Dear Senator Hudson and Representative Stolberg:

RE: AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROHIBITION OF WELFARE PAYMENTS TO STRIKERS

I represent the Connecticut Construction Industries Association, Inc. an association of associations dealing with all aspects and disciplines of the construction, transportation, public works, and construction of service-related industries of Connecticut. Our membership includes general contractors, subcontractors, owners, users and those who do business with the construction industry or who share our aims and goals.

I want it go to on record that we endorse the above mentioned legislation.

Under the existing statute, the taxpayers and public are expected to support, indeed reward, people who voluntarily choose to leave their jobs to go on strike.

Endorsement of this proposed legislation will accomplish six goals:

1. It would be financially responsible legislation;
2. It would concur with the state's policy expressed in the Unemployment Compensation Act which disqualified strikers from unemployment benefits;
3. It would be in step with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare's proposed regulation which would bar strikers from benefits where they are ineligible for unemployment compensation;
4. It would more than likely be lawful in view of litigation concerning this issue throughout the country;
5. It would be fair because it would not interfere with collective bargaining by publically subsidizing strikers;
6. It would be beneficial to the public and taxpayers by decreasing costs.

If the unions have the power to compel its members to strike, then the unions should be responsible for the consequences of its actions and not expect the taxpayers' money to subsidize one side of a labor dispute.

The Connecticut Construction Industries Association strongly requests your favorable consideration of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,


Donald J. Lynch
Executive Secretary

1
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

PRESIDING CHAIRMAN: IRVING STOLBERG AND BETTY HUDSON

MEMBERS PRESENT:

REPRESENTATIVES: STOLBERG, MANNIX, ORCUTT, WEINGAND, OSLER
QUINN

SENATORS: HUDSON, FINNEY

REP. STOLBERG: Call this meeting to order. To be joined by several other Committee members. There are a number of other different Committee meetings including the Appropriation's Committee going simultaneously. In addition, word has been received that the storm is moving up through Connecticut and if anyone has particular travel problems and getting home, if you could inform our staff who are on my left, your right, in the well of the House, we can try to make arrangements. If no one has any valid, pressing problem, we will go through the list in order the people have signed up. I am Rep. Stolberg, the House Chairman of the Human Services Committee, and with me to start the initial moments of the hearing is Rep. John Mannix from Wilton, the ranking Republican member of the Human Services Committee.

If as you approach either the minority leader's microphone or the majority leader's microphone, you could please mention for recording purposes your name and any affiliation or organization you're representing and the Bill or Bills you wish to address, that would be very helpful to us. In addition, because of a long list of speakers and the weather conditions, we would be most grateful if you could keep your remarks as brief and to the point as possible. If you have any written statements, it would be very helpful for the Committee to have copies of them for duplication for the other members of the Committee.

First person on the sign-up list is Marion Keller.

MARION KELLER: I just wanted to talk about the deaf Bill, S.B. 262, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON THE DEAF AND HEARING IMPAIRED, and this is kind of before the Act that I have heard, that they are trying to have a change made in Bill 5410 which is a Bill establishing a Commission on the handicapped.

I'd like to read you the definition of handicapped in that Bill. Handicapped person means one who because of a substantial chronic, physical, mental or emotional disability or disfunction requires special services

2
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

MARION KELLER: (CONTD.) in order to enjoy the benefits of our society. And I understand and I hope I'm wrong, but I understand that the Commission on the Deaf is going to request that the Human Services Committee write in, "excluding deaf", or someother wording which would eliminate the possibility of two agencies serving the same clients and or one Commission having authority over another Commission.

I think it would be a shame if the deaf were denied the advocacy. This is going to be an advocacy Committee and it's going to be a very protective Committee for all handicapped people, and I think it would be completely wrong if "excluding deaf" were written to 5410. Thankyou.

REP. STOLBERG: Thankyou very much Mrs. Keller. Next person to testify is Kay Marks of the League of Women Voters of Connecticut. Please take the microphone. If we could keep the majority and minority leader's seats free, that way the person testifying can either stand or be seated as he or she chooses. We've been joined by Sen. Betty Hudson, the Senate Chairperson of the Human Services Committee who will relieve me shortly of the Session. Miss Marks.

KAY MARKS: I'm Kay Marks from Mansfield, speaking for the League of Women Voters of Connecticut regarding Bill 5316, AN ACT CONCERNING A COST OF LIVING INCREASE FOR RECIPIENTS IN THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN'S PROGRAM. Connecticut law states that public assistance allowances are intended to furnish support on a reasonable standard of health and decency. To that end, payments should be adequate to meet the current costs of basic essentials, such as shelter, food, fuels, utilities, etcetera. The levels of payment are now pegged at 1971 prices. Between then and August 1975 the Consumer Price Index increased 34%. Therefore, the League of Women Voters contends that support payments are inadequate and that Connecticut is not fulfilling it's own law. In spite of the financial condition of the state, we strongly support a cost of living increase for the AFDC program as the minimum that should be done this year. To let the level of support fall even further behind the need would seriously endanger the health of Connecticut's dependent children, an extremely poor economy in the long run.

I would also like to say a few words about Bill 93, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROHIBITION OF WELFARE PAYMENTS TO STRIKERS. The league is opposed to this Bill. In the absence of a right to work law in the state, we feel it could cause hardship on the families of

3
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

KAY MARKS: (CONTD.) individuals who do not have total freedom from their choice or whether or not to work. Thankyou.

REP. STOLBERG: Thankyou very much. I have a statement on the letterhead of the Torrington Company, a brief statement they requested by read into the record.

Quote. The Torrington Company with 3,500 employees in Connecticut is strongly opposed to any regulation that allows strikers to collect welfare benefits whether federal, state or local. The Public Treasury should not be used to subsidize strikes. End of quote.

That statement from the Torrington Company, Torrington, Connecticut is clearly addressed to Senate Bill 93.

The next person scheduled to speak is Kay Marks of the League of Women Voters. Okay. Oh she was on two Bills that's right, she was signed up twice. Next is Gertrude McCall, Human Service Income Maintenance and Task Force.

GERTRUDE MC CALL: Mr. Chairman, I come to you also as a welfare recipient, and I would like to urge that this Committee to pass the following Bills before you today. Again I come before you in request of the two fuel Bills proposals, 5789 and 5790, and I also wish to add our support to Greater Hartford Conference of Church's to the following Bills, 93, 262, 5314, 5316 and 5764, and I would like to add that if not for the church's help to the Town of Bloomfield at least once this winter, my child and I would have frozen. And even now as I stand before you, we have no fuel or any way of getting help until next year because I received assistance once under the Emergency Fuel Act which was \$13. allowed for fuel under State Welfare when it cost at least \$68. per minimum of 150 gallons.

I also urge the passing of 5696 to have recipients on these Committee's with decision making voices. I thank you and if you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

REP. STOLBERG: Are there any questions from members of the Committee? I should also like to introduce in the first seats Sen. Florence Finney the ranking Senate Republican member of the Human Services Committee, and Rep. Geil Orcutt, 98th district in New Haven. The next person listed to speak is Joanne Strutters.

JOANNE STRUTTERS: Excuse me, good afternoon, I'd like to talk about the Bill 5696 and just briefly we would like to, if we could, be able to make some decisions and

4
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

JOANNE STRUTTERS: (CONTD.) have decision making power on this Bill as welfare recipients. In other words, not just on the Advisory Committee but could we have also a decision making power. That's all. Thankyou.

REP. STOLBERG: Are there any questions? The next person signed up to speak is Vi Cardieux. Is there a Vi Cardieux here? No one responds to that. Mr. Albert Berke. Okay if he could identify himself when he comes in. Barbara Brasel. Could I ask you and whoever will speak for you to step over to the minority leader's desk please? And could the person speaking for Miss Brasel please take the microphone for testimony purposes.

BARBARA BRASEL: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Human Services Committee, I'm here to speak on behalf of the Committee Bill 215, AN ACT CONCERNING, excuse me, 262. I was just at another hearing and it's taking me a little time to shift gears. Okay, now there were a few changes that the Commission on the Deaf and Hearing Impaired would like to see in the raised Committee Bill 262.

First of all, we would like to have the Commissioner of the Department of Children and Youth Services add to our Commission as a voting member, and on line 108 the schedule and billing procedures for a person that word "person" should be changed to interpreter. And otherwise I think the Commission will support the Bill as it stands.

REP. STOLBERG: Fine. Are there any questions from members of the Committee. Thankyou very much.

BARBARA BRASEL: Okay.

REP. STOLBERG: The next person signed up to testify is Linda Klatt of the Business and Industry Association.

LINDA KLATT: Sen. Hudson, Rep. Stolberg, members of the Committee, my name is Linda T. Klatt, I'm Assistant Counsel for the Connecticut Business and Industry Association. CBIA represents approximately 2,800 companies which employ over 600,000 men and women in Connecticut.

CBIA's membership strongly supports Senate Bill 93 prohibiting strikers from receiving welfare benefits. The business community believes that welfare programs, whether administered at the state or local level, are designed to assist those individuals who are unable to provide the necessities of life for themselves or their families.

LINDA KLATT: (CONTD.) We recognize and accept the fact that a social responsibility does exist to make financial assistance available for groups such the aged, the blind, the disabled, and the families in which there are dependent children who parents cannot provide for their adequate support.

Furthermore, we recognize that in today's economy with it's continuing high rate of unemployment, there will be a periodic need to provide welfare assistance to those individuals who have been laid off and have either not accumulated sufficient earnings to meet the initial qualifying requirements for unemployment compensation or who have exhausted their benefits.

However, we feel no such justification can be found for providing welfare benefits to strikers or to those who voluntarily quit their jobs, or to employees who are discharged for misconduct. These individuals are unemployed because of their own decisions or actions. The purpose of Connecticut's welfare program should be to provide assistance to those who are in need through no fault of their own. Welfare is not designed to support those who have been gainfully employed but have decided they no longer wish to work or who have forfeited their jobs through their own misconduct.

The case against providing welfare benefits to strikers is particularly strong. Strikers are able to work. Individuals on strike have voluntarily chosen not to go to work. The opportunity exists for them to immediately return to work and to earn an amount necessary to support their families.

Under the National Labor Relations Act, employees clearly have a right to bargain collectively as well as a right to strike when labor negotiations have broken down. But the fact remains, such individuals in order to strengthen their bargaining position have freely elected to utilize the economic weapon of a strike rather than to remain gainfully employed.

Allowing strikers to receive benefits under either a state of local welfare program upsets the balance of a collective bargaining process that has become an integral part of the free enterprise system. The labor laws have evolved after many years to provide an atmosphere in which both employers and employees are able to influence the terms and conditions of employment. By permitting strikers to receive welfare benefits the bargaining process of union contract negotiations will be out of balance. Strikers having available to them financial assistance through welfare will be less will-

6
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

LINDA KLATT: (CONTD.) ing to negotiate settlements equitable to both labor and management. The possibility of prolonged strikes will be greatly increased.

By allowing strikers to collect welfare benefits the legislature will be forcing Connecticut taxpayers to support individuals who are capable of supporting themselves but who are unwilling to do so. It will mean that business and industry which pays approximately 50% of all state taxes collected, will be subsidizing strikes against their own operations. It will mean that the individual working taxpayer will be penalized. Individuals willing to work and who do work will not only pay the bills to support their own families but will be picking up the tab to support the families of individuals who are able to work but who refuse to work.

Connecticut is now faced with a substantial deficit. This is a time for tightening eligibility requirements not a time for their expansion. The addition of new categories of welfare recipients will only increase the heavy financial burden already borne by the state.

CBIA recommends and hopes that Senate Bill 93 be given a favorable report. Thankyou.

REP. STOLBERG: Miss Klatt, I have a couple of questions. I've become concerned with this Bill and have asked a number of questions of various sources and I would like to pose them to you. Is it the position of the CBIA that all strikers are currently eligible for welfare benefits?

LINDA KLATT: I don't believe so, it's our interpretation that some strikers have been able to collect welfare through local welfare programs, not through the state programs.

REP. STOLBERG: Through General Assistance Programs. In terms of the state programs, is the CBIA aware of the eligibility requirements for strikers?

LINDA KLATT: Yes, we realize that the financial level an individual has to reach is pretty low.

REP. STOLBERG: Is the CBIA aware of what those figures are?

LINDA KLATT: I'm sure we are aware of them. I cannot specifically feed them back to you at this time.

REP. STOLBERG: For the record, and this is of concern to me

7
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

REP. STOLBERG: (CONTD.) because I think it speaks to the issue of welfare benefits for strikers as opposed to the question, the many questions surrounding unemployment benefits. My information from the Department of Social Services is that a striker's family of four, as any other person to be eligible, has to have total assets of not more than \$250, it seems very low and unusual for anyone who has been at work and is now striking to have assets that low.

Secondly, in the New Haven region their total income could not exceed \$330. per month, and thirdly, they must register for the "WIN" program and be available for other work; which means a very small percentage of all strikers would qualify for welfare benefits and the issue that has been conveyed to the public, I'm afraid is, that virtually all strikers can go in and get welfare which is not the case. I would hope we could pin-point the issue in this group.

LINDA KLATT: Rep. Stolberg, I don't think the issue that the CBIA is taking issue with is the low level that an individual has to be at in order to receive welfare benefits. I think we're talking in a more philosophical concept that allowing welfare benefits to strikers is going against the whole collective bargaining process, that it's going to upset the collective bargaining process, in fact undermine the National Labor Relations Act because a strike is an economic weapon which unions use to get benefits for their employees.

REP. STOLBERG: How do you deal with the economic situation of such strikers? I would think collective bargaining hasn't been very successful for them if their total income is \$330. and they have total net assets of less than \$250.

LINDA KLATT: Didn't you just mention that there are very few people, very few strikers who are at that level to you know, be able to collect welfare benefits?

REP. STOLBERG: That's true but the position of the CBIA as I understand it is not to allow them to be eligible.

LINDA KLATT: Yes, it is because these individuals through their union representatives can elect to go back to work and earn an amount that's necessary to support themselves and their families.

REP. STOLBERG: But if their assets and income is this low, what do you propose for their families, irrespective of the conditions of those individual strikers?

8
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

LINDA KLATT: I think at that point the strikers should put enough pressure on the union representatives in order to come up with an equitable settlement that would allow the individual to go back to work.

REP. STOLBERG: Okay, are there questions from any other members of the Committee? Betty?

SEN. HUDSON: This is Sen. Hudson. I take rather great interest in this Bill because it's my personal view, and I might state that bias right from the start, that it's really the biggest we are hearing that's come before this Committee this Session in my view.

There's such a tiny number of strikers that would qualify for General Assistance or assistance under the AFDC UF program that they would way be supporting the strike effort, no way would the General Assistance they receive or State Assistance, the sheer smallness of their number would in no way be working against the business, private business sector.

In addition to that, as you said so clearly, most people did not qualify for the state program but most of them qualified for General Assistance, town assistance and the eligibility requirements for town assistance are even worse than they are for the state program. In that if you were fortunate enough to own your own home, the town would slap a lien on that house and that lien would stay there until you paid every penny of it back. So the impression that somehow these people are getting all kinds of assistance from state and local governments in order to maintain a strike is just not so. It's a political issue I think one can argue philosophically and make some very good points philosophically but the reality, I think the assumptions are false, I guess that's what I'm really questioning. Not the philosophical principle behind it but the assumptions are false that somehow taxpayer dollars are going to be subsidizing strikes, that simply is not so. In my opinion.

REP. STOLBERG: Do you have any final comment?

LINDA KLATT: No, I think I've said, you know, I think I've put forth CBIA's position with respect to this Bill. We basically, I just want to reiterate that, we feel that allowing strikers to collect welfare benefits would be undermining the collective bargaining procedure that has evolved after many years, and we strongly recommend that Senate Bill 93 be given a favorable report.

9
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

REP. STOLBERG: Okay, thank you very much. I have a brief written statement from the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities that with your indulgence I will rapidly read into the record.

Honorable Betty Hudson, Honorable Irving Stolberg, regarding Committee Bill's 5314 and 5316. Connecticut Conference of Municipalities supports Committee Bill's 5314 and 5316 being heard before your Committee today. By different mechanisms both seek to increase payments to recipients of aid to dependent children program. Committee Bill 5314 provides for an increase of 33% of all items excluding rent, while Committee Bill 5316 mandates a nine million dollar increase to the AFDC program to increase payments to the 77% use of the 1975-76 Boston Regional Consumer Price Index.

I think that probably should read 7.7% increase to the 75-76 Boston CPI.

The relief provided in either Bill would be welcomed in this program, however, an annual reassessment of payment levels using a standard that reflects changes in the cost of living for the region is the best long term solution to the problem.

The need for adequate payments in this area is not only morally justified but also a sound fiscal policy. Children suffering from inadequate nutrition and other deprivations may suffer permanent damage or impairment to their mental, physical or social development. These problems left unchecked can place added demands on the state and local communities for social services to meet these special needs. Provision of adequate levels of the necessities of life serve to prevent such needs and to provide these children with a decent standard of living. CCM urges your support, your Committee to report favorably on a Bill addressing this urgent matter.

The next person to testify is Mr. Albert Berke, followed by Raphael Podolsky and followed by Allen Finkenaur. Mr. Berke, take the microphone please. The minority leaders' desk is probably most accessible. Could you take the microphone there please.

ALBERT BERKE: Permit me to introduce Father Bergan who will be interpreter for me. To the members of the Committee of Human Services.

15
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

RAPHAEL PODOLSKY: (CONTD.) about the elderly poor or the elderly disabled who will no longer be able to get glasses, get routine dental care, as a result of the cutback in Medicaid services that's projected and there is no question that cutback will eventually go through. Commissioner Maher has been quoted on public record as saying that that will go through in a short period of time, perhaps as early as April 1st.

I would urge the Committee to consider a substitute Bill that would deal with that problem by confronting the question head on of whether it is a good or a bad idea to preclude people in the adult program from getting those kinds of services. It is my belief that in the short run it will save a very small amount of money and in the long run will be very expensive because by discouraging ambulatory care and by failing to treat people's problems as they arise, they will accelerate the movement of people in the nursing homes which will in the long run cost the state far more money than is being paid now for these medical services.

The third Bill, the third group of Bills I want to comment on is the Bill providing for appeals from General Assistance programs. It is well known that the General Assistance program, as far as I know there was no Bill with the number on that, it is merely listed as being heard today but I see no printed Bill. That Bill would provide, that Bill would do two things. First of all it would provide for administrative appeals and second of all it would provide for judicial review. It's well known that the local General Assistance programs are often extremely arbitrary, there is a genuine substantial need for such review.

The Bill proposes that the review, the administrative review, be by fair hearing officers of the Department of Social Services. The reason for that is that the Commissioner of Social Services already is responsible for rule making authority for the town programs, he has experts who are trained in eligibility standards and how to review decisions and the fact is there is often no one at the local level who is impartial to make such a review because in many towns there is only one person in the Welfare Department. That person cannot reasonably review his own decisions.

I also want to comment on Bill 5777 which is the SSI passthrough. That Bill in some ways is a technical

16
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

RAPHAEL PODOLSKY: (CONTD.) amendment that would equalize the effect of last year's adoption of the principle of passing through SSI increases in the state supplemental programs to people who are on SSI. What it does is it changes the system from an income disregard to an increase in the standard of need. That is a much preferable method, it solves in meeting HEW matching regulation and it also makes it uniform for all people on the state supplement program without regard to the precise source of their income.

And finally I would just briefly comment on Bill 93, Welfare Payments for Strikers. Members of the Committee have already raised this. The only people who strike who would really be effected by this Bill are the poorest of the working poor. Those who have no accumulated savings, those who own no property, those who have virtually nothing except their job income, for those are the only people who could possibly be eligible for welfare benefits and what that Bill would do is it would take and penalize the very poorest of the working poor by denying them General Assistance. As to that Bill I would hope the Committee would be against that Bill.

I'm welcome to answer questions if the Committee has any questions.

REP. STOLBERG: Are there any questions from members of the Committee? Thankyou.

RAPHAEL PODOLSKY: Thankyou very much.

REP. STOLBERG: We've been joined by two other members of the Committee. Rep. Weigand and Rep. Quinn. Next person to speak is Mr. Allen Finkenaur.

ALLEN FINKENAUR: My name is Allen Finkenaur, I'm Director of Taxes at Warnaco, and I'm speaking on Bill 93. A major part of our Connecticut expenditures are for welfare. You and I and the companies are paying this Bill and are finding that our state government still needs more money than we pay in in taxes. To allow people to go on strike and receive welfare benefits only adds expense to the current potential budget deficit. The intent of welfare is charity. Welfare is needed and it should be supported by all of us and carefully supervised. Welfare is state charity to assist those who through some extreme misfortune are unable to supply their minimum needs to live. The definition should never include able bodied

17
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

ALLEN FINKENAUER: (CONTD.) citizens on strike who have willingly left their jobs. There is no reason why you and I and Connecticut companies must support people who've decided that they want to leave their job. By giving money to these people who have chosen to strike the government has in principle made each of us support the strike position against their employer, and I think this is unthinkable.

The time is for fiscal responsibility and citizens are looking for the legislature as never before to watch the spending programs. They want government to be responsible in every way to each citizen for maintaining the right expenditures. Government must not spend frivolously because citizens can't spend frivolously. No more tax money should be doled out that are unwarranted no matter how small the amount.

The proposed Bill to prevent welfare payments to able bodied people, although I've heard discussion that it's small amounts and so on, should not be passed, should be supported and if anything, additional welfare should be given to welfare people not to strikers. Thankyou Mr. Chairman.

REP. STOLBERG: Mr. Finkenaur, could I ask one brief question? What is the total work force at Warnaco?

ALLEN FINKENAUER: We have approximately 800 in the state.

REP. STOLBERG: Do you have any idea on the percentage, if your workers went out on strike, on the percentage who would qualify for welfare benefits?

ALLEN FINKENAUER: I have no idea sir.

REP. STOLBERG: Thankyou. Next is Mr. Hugh Ward.

HUGH WARD: Rep. Stolberg, members of the Committee, my name is Hugh F. Ward. I'm speaking for Machinists 1746. When a strike occurs which is one of the last things an employee desires, and if it should last more than two weeks, both sides are losers. Yet an employer may hire strike-breakers which are protected by our society to cross the picket line in order to bring the employee to his knees and if it results in a loss of a job, the striker must seek some means of support by either another job, if lucky, to find. For an employee is a proud person and who would rather work in a place for welfare. To back this statement, if welfare was for the best for the person, the choice would be welfare in the first case. Survival is the only answer and if denied this could lead to crime. I do know one person who was

18
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

HUGH WARD: (CONTD.) told by his boss when on a strike that he would never be hired again regardless of the outcome. A few days later he committed suicide. I urge, first of all, a striker in majority cases have a family so it's not himself alone, and I urge this Committee of Human Services to defeat this Bill here in Committee and not to aid this terrible piece of legislation.

REP. STOLBERG: Are there any questions from members of the Committee. Thankyou. The next person to testify is Mr. John S. Howe, Department on Aging, followed by Mary LaForge and Josephine Nerlin. Mr. Howe.

JOHN HOWE: Good afternoon, I'm John Howe, Senior Field Representative for the Department on Aging, speaking here this afternoon on behalf of Commissioner Charles Odell who was unable to be here.

I want to urge passage of raised Committee Bill 500, which is AN ACT CONCERNING THE EXPANSION AND REDEFINITION OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON AGING TO CONFORM TO FEDERAL FUNDING REQUIREMENTS. This Bill was requested by our department with the approval of the Governor's Office and has been unanimously endorsed by the present State Advisory Council on Aging.

I'd like to offer a little background information to show why this amendment to present state legislation is urgently needed. First of all the Federal Administration on Aging urges that state legislatures enact enabling legislation regarding state agencies on aging which will include a stipulation that the State Advisory Council on Aging membership be in conformity with federal requirements under Titles three and Title seven of the Older American Act as it's mandated. Now the reason for this is to safeguard against having appointment procedures that end up with members on the Advisory Boards or Councils who don't meet federal requirements.

Unfortunately, the legislation which was passed here last May or June, Public Act 75-474, does not have this stipulation with a result of the present recently appointed State Advisory Council on Aging does not have adequate representation of minority and low income consumers as required by the regulations governing our two major funding sources, Title three and Title seven of the Older Americans Act. Nor does the Council as it's presently made up have fully adequate representation of various major service agencies throughout the state.

19
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

JOHN HOWE: (CONTD.) I'd like to amplify that simply by referring to Commissioner Arthur Flemming, the Federal Commissioner on Aging in his letter to Governor Grasso early in November in which he approved our state plan for this fiscal year. He states that the new legislation for the Department on Aging does not mandate an advisory body which meets federal requirements. I can give you the source and the federal regulation which applies if you want it afterwards. The problem in the makeup of the present Advisory Council has arisen mainly because there are five appointing authorities and this made it extremely difficult to coordinate the appointment action to assure that federal requirements were met.

Let me just refer briefly to Commissioner Odell's letter. Memorandum to the Governor's Office on this, January the 27th. Referring to the complexity of the appointing process. And he points out that while our present state statute for the Department does not conflict with federal regulations, it does not explicitly require compliance, and it's his recommendation that the best way to assure this is that we are in compliance to stay there in future years is to change the Department's enabling statute to reflect federal requirements and those have been embodied in raised Committee Bill 500. The proposed change in the Bill and they're minor ones, will act as a continuing external pressure to assure that federal requirements are scrupulously met.

Now we're requesting an expansion of the Advisory Council from the originally revised 15 up to 21, that is not an unwieldy group. The reason for this is two-fold. First of all we want to assure the retention of the present 15 members who are nearly all 60 years of age or older and consumers and some represent various service agencies in the state and in addition we have an extremely able talented, experienced and dedicated group of individuals on the present 15 member Advisory Council. At the same time, the six additional members will allow for the appointment of persons so that we can meet federal requirements for low income and minority elderly particularly blacks and spanish speaking as well as for two additional people who are knowledgeable in the field of nutrition.

So I'm here for the Commissioner to urge the Committee to act favorably and promptly on this Bill. Thankyou very much.

20
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

REP. STOLBERG: Are there questions from the Committee? I have a couple of brief announcements. First the Democratic caucus has been cancelled. Secondly, the Finance Committee hearing on income tax proposals has been postponed from this evening to Wednesday, March 17th at 7:00 P.M. I would also like to just mention for the record, we have statements from the Connecticut Construction Industries Association speaking to Senate Bill 93 and endorsing it. A statement on behalf of the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce on Senate Bill 93 and endorsing it with some stipulations. A statement from the Naugatuck Valley Industrial Council addressing Senate Bill 93 and calling for the support of Senate Bill 93. Those will be entered into the written testimony.

Next Commissioner Miriam Butterworth of the PUCA, has to return for a tied vote there, and I would ask her for her remarks before leaving. Mrs. Butterworth.

MIRIAM BUTTERWORTH: Thankyou Rep. Stolberg. Chairman Stolberg and members of the Human Services Committee, my name is Miriam Butterworth, and I'm Vice-Chairperson of the Public Utilities Control Authority.

H.B. 5789 I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today and to share with you our awareness of problems that a rising number of Connecticut's population face as they attempt to pay increased utility bills.

I would like to explain the extent of the problems as we see it, to try to identify the types of people who are having difficulties, to point out the steps the PUCA is taking to try to hold down utility bills, and beyond this, the constraints we face which make it likely that utility bills will continue to rise.

The Consumer Assistance Department of the PUCA is presently handling approximately 400 written and telephoned complaints per week, concerning all utility matters. Approximately 55% of these complaints concern high bills from gas and electric companies. At present about 28% of high bill complaint letters come from persons who have low incomes and who find themselves in the position of being unable to pay utility bills without making significant sacrifices in other essential areas, such as food and shelter. We estimate that approximately the same percent of high bill telephone complaints are from callers in the same situation. In addition, we suspect that many more of the high bill complaint calls and letters we get are from people who do not mention their budget difficulties to us.

21
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

MIRIAM BUTTERWORTH: (CONTD.) Most of these callers are people who are willing to pay, who, in fact have always paid throughout their lives, but who, because of unemployment, general inflation, or retirement find that their income will not stretch to cover utility bills, food costs and rent or mortgage payments.

Let me give you a few examples of the problems we hear about. A 92 year old man uses gas for cooking. He can't pay his bills, even though he only cooks once a week, and freezes the food for use the rest of the week.

One man wrote to say that he has been retired for two and a half years. His pension check has been reduced three times because of increased medical insurance costs, food costs are rising, his utility bills continue to rise, what can we do?

A retired man, 73 years old, received \$150 a month from Social Security. Most of his Social Security payment, he tells us, is needed to pay his utility bills.

A wife wrote to say that for the first time in over 20 years of their married life, her husband has been unemployed. Food stamps and unemployment compensation failed to cover expenses for their three children, mortgage payments and food. Their utility bills went unpaid for months. The family had been proud of the fact that they had always paid all their bills, now there simply wasn't enough money to go around.

A retired couple had a total monthly income of \$250; their monthly utility bill, including electric heating, came to almost \$200. And so on.

This is just a small sample of the letters and calls we must deal with daily. The problem areas we see them are retired persons on fixed incomes which remain constant while expenses, including utility bills, continue to rise; and persons who work, but whose salaries do not increase to match increased expenses including utility bills and three persons who find themselves unemployed and cannot stretch welfare or unemployment payments to cover bills including utility bills. In this connection you've had eloquent testimony today, that the flat grant welfare allotment allows a woefully inadequate amount to cover the increased costs of all necessities, especially the large increases in energy.

The PUCA and the Consumer Counsel, David Silverstone, who will be giving you a statement later, are currently setting up a study designed to identify more precisely

MIRIAM BUTTERWORTH: (CONTD.) the total number of consumers who are unable to pay rising utility bills, and the numbers of consumer who will be unable with each new utility rate increase to handle these higher utility bills. Although we feel it's important for us to be aware of the impact of our rate decisions on the people of Connecticut through such a study, the PUCA is limited in the remedial action it can take.

We are obliged by Supreme Court decisions and by the act which created us to give appropriate rates of return to the utility companies it regulates. We must grant increased revenues which will allow the companies to continue to remain financially sound and to provide safe, dependable service to the customers of Connecticut. Utility bills will not, in our opinion, decline. We are, however, deeply committed to the task of slowing the rapid rise in utility bills. Continuing inflation and the tight energy supply situation hamper our efforts.

We are taking positive steps in those areas which we can control. We will, by legislative mandate, conduct of oversee managerial audits of all Connecticut public utility companies. We hope in this way to identify areas of utility company operations, in which more efficient procedures will lower costs and thus help to slow the rise in consumers' utility bills. We will also conduct public hearings on possible new rate structures. These hearings, also by legislative mandate, must take consideration the financial stability of the companies according to the legislative act, we will encourage energy conservation and we will take into account how to try to help people who are of low income, and we also will take into account the states' energy policy, but the rate structures that we produce must not be unfair or discriminatory or unduly burdensome or disruptive to any class or any group of customers.

Also we will back legislation that encourages conservation of energy postponing as long as possible the need to add facilities and the need to obtain additional large amounts of capital in these times of extreme capital shortage. However, we know that these steps will not solve the problems we're discussine today. There will be a need to build and replace power facilities in the future and if the economy improves as we all hope, these needs will come soon.

The shortage of capital I've already mentioned will mean higher rates. Northeast Utilities just last week informed the PUCA that it may need to go into uranium

23
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

MIRIAM BUTTERWORTH: (CONTD.) mining business to assure an adequate fuel supply. This is a wholly new prospect demanding much additional capital. The United Illuminating Company has informed us that it will have to apply for higher rates, actually it has already applied for higher rates in order to include the New Haven Harbor plant in it's rate base.

While we'll do all in our power to slow the rapid rise in utility bills, we know that a particular segment of Connecticut's population will always find itself in the position of not being able to pay utility bills. The need is very pressing, and we turn to you, our elected representatives, to approve a plan that will aid these consumers. We are, we urge you therefore, all of the Commissioners of the Public Utilities Control Authority, to act favorably on Bill 5789.

If you would care to ask any questions.

REP. STOLBERG: Are there any questions from members of the Committee? Now I would thank you and the other members of the PUCA board for the testimony and for recognition of the very serious needs which you have articulated. I would now turn the chair over to Sen. Betty Hudson, the Senate Chairperson of the Committee, the next speaker is Mary LaFarge.

MARY LA FARGE: I'm Mrs. Henry LaFarge of New Canaan, first of all I have a letter from the Board of Selectmen of the Town of New Canaan that I have been asked to have included in the testimony at this public hearing.

We urge complete review of public assistance programs to assure minimum income maintenance levels. We believe that particular attention should be given to allowances for utilities, fuel, electricity, etcetera, in all family welfare grants to bring them into line with present costs. Signed by Henry Noble, First Selectman.

Now I also have a statement here. I am Public Issues Chairman, of the Board of Family and Childrens Services in Stamford, Darien and New Canaan and Chairman of the Coalition for Basic Human Rights of the Stamford area with representatives of 40 organizations in Stamford, Darien, New Canaan and Greenwich.

The latest U.S. poverty level figure for a family of four is \$5,500. The level for Connecticut runs about seven percent higher than that, and yet the maximum a family

24
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

MARY LA FARGE; (CONTD.) of four is given in Connecticut is \$4,830 in the highest rent region, \$4,168 in most of Connecticut, \$3,983 for the rest.

Energy costs are, of course, the worst problem for the poor. A family of four is still allowed only \$35 a month for all fuel and utility costs, leaving an average gap of about \$25. The Emergency Energy Assistance passed by the legislature last year allows aid to families only one month out of 12. So families have to choose between buying food, paying the rent or paying the utility bills. Many cannot afford to stretch their food dollars by buying food stamps, or can buy only a fraction of the stamps to which they are entitled.

We are told that nothing can be done to raise welfare payments because of the budget crunch. I am reminded of what a judge said recently with regard to another state legislature's refusal to authorize funds to provide desperately needed improvements in prison living conditions. He said, quote, the state is not at liberty to afford it's citizens only those constitutional rights which fit comfortably within it's budget. Unquote.

Of course we appreciate the fact that this is a tough time financially for the state, a real fiscal crisis, but our habit of helping balance the budget by prolonging the ever worsening fiscal crisis of the poor is not only a violation of their rights but more expensive in the long run than adequate public assistance. Because we keep people on these sub-poverty levels we virtually guarantee that they will be more prone to illness, physical and mental, which will prevent their working and cost the state huge amounts in Medicaid expenses, which are the greatest financial burden of the Department of Social Services.

As another speaker pointed out, poor nutrition for children before and after birth makes for more mental retardation, lack of concentration in school and this added to the other strains on family stability produces more unemployment, juvenile delinquents and adult criminals. So we wind up with more welfare cases as well as more police, court and institutional expenses.

By putting people in the position of having to beg, borrow, steal or cheat in order to survive we are encouraging greater dependency and more desperate and resentful attempts to beat the system and defy the law.

25
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

MARY LA FARGE: (CONTD.) In summary we are being shortsighted, pennywise and pound foolish in our welfare policies, and a change in priorities is in order.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou very much. Are there any comment or questions for Committee? Thankyou. The next speaker is Josephine Merlin. Followed by Kim Stover.

JOSEPHINE MERLIN: Sen. Hudson, members of the Committee, my name is Josephine Merlin, I'm speaking today as a member of the Catholic Interracial Council which is a volunteer agency in Stamford, Darien and Greenwich. I'm also a member of the Coalition that Mrs. LaFarge chairs and I endorse everything that she has said. As a member of this volunteer agency we are called upon when welfare finds that they are unable to help families and also CTE Committee on training and employment which is an anti-poverty agency in the area, and they screen very carefully and this year we've had a tremendous increase in the number of calls. Person to Person in Darien has been simply swamped, Catholic Interracial Council. In fact the volume has doubled and of course, also these agencies are supported by voluntary contributions for the most part and the monies are not coming in as fast as they should, naturally because the middle class has also been hit very hard. So the burden is tremendous, and we have sufficient endorsement from the welfare, I told them not to come here prepared to speak and that they did use our facilities and they said go ahead and say it because it's really getting to be pretty desperate when they have to keep calling these people.

One of the things that we have done, and I know Person to Person does repeatedly is that if a person is burned out or they're evicted and they've tried to find another place to live because the majority of people do live in the private sector, they do not live in public houses, the welfare is not able to give them that first months security deposit so the landlord says, well you can't come in, so the answer is, well then they have to call private agencies to see if they can come up with the money and eventually they hope that they will receive it, will get it back in some form or another, sometimes they do, sometimes they don't but at least you have given shelter to people.

We have a newspaper clipping that came out last night in the Stamford Advocate that was from the Chairman of the Community Development Program who said that in a survey that they made that there are at least 6,000 units in Stamford that are eligible for assistance,

26
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

JOSEPHINE MERLIN; (CONTD.) that should have but there isn't enough money in the community development program and that the housing situation is absolutely desperate which of course means that a landlord can almost write the ticket the way he wants to and the people living in this private sector, these houses are sub-standard, I know we're talking about high utility bills but the reason is because they're really heating all outdoors, they're not heating indoors. I mean some of us are more fortunate to live in homes that are better insulated and we probably say, well why are they, they must have lights on all the time, they must have the heat on to 90 every night in the week, well I wish they could have it that way, most of them don't have enough heat in the rooms, half of them don't have any radiators so that they have to use electric heaters if possible or something similar to that and which causes a tremendous amount of fires; which also has created a shortage of housing so the whole thing again goes around and around and around like mice in a cage. I don't know where you stop, you catch the tail and you keep going, and I thought the letter that was read by Rep. Stolberg, I'd like to endorse that Connecticut Council of Municipalities, I think that what they said also concurs with what we have to say, and I think that the Commission on the utility problem, I think she said it very well and fairly on the whole problem because we do have to remember that they're people who just get by and pay the bills and we can't penalize them either, but somewhere I do hope that you'll come to something.

Also that Energy Assistance Bill, I feel very strongly about that, we must do something for these people. Thankyou very much.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou for coming, and I suppose I need not say it but I will that the Human Services Committee is fully aware of the plight of the AFDC families, the welfare recipients, the poor of this state and in a sense the testimony that we hear here only serves to reinforce what we already know, and I have urged people who testify to also not feel the job is done when they come before us, but your battle really is with the Appropriations Committee in the General Assenbly. And I would urge that you take your fight to that Committee as well. The buck stops or begins there I suppose. Kim Stover.

KIM STOVER: My name is Kim Stover and I'm from the Zion Lutheran Church in Stamford and the service the congregation is directed to is christian development. I'm also chairman of the Connecticut Social Action

PHILLIP GRIGSBY: Orcutt has passed around a copy of the testimony I wanted to present. I will not go through that, I will not delay this hearing any further with that. I just wanted to highlight a couple things.

I work with the First Congregational Church on the green in Norwalk, I'm also a member of the Steering Committee of the Statewide Emergency Food Council. I just wanted to highlight that if nothing is done on page two, very clearly the Governor's budget this time around calls for no payment increases and relative to the two Bills before you, if there is no increase some of the food centers we're working with may have to stop distribution and there will be a breakdown possibly of the private, public partnership in food distribution.

The punchline being that to vote for the Governor's budget as constituted will keep people hungry during the coming year. I have a couple of comments as well concerning vendor payments for landlords and indentification cards which are there for your reference. I just wanted to when I wrote this up this morning I left out number five concerning housing vendor payments on page two.

I think one of the great needs if you're going to do anything about housing would be for security deposits and if there's any possibility of any pilot program, again on a voluntary basis for welfare recipients in housing, I would urge that that begin with a security deposit program and to extend security deposits which are now possible in cooperative housing to make that available in rental housing as well. So we're asking you to tack on a note to number five under housing for the payments.

I have not written out comments but concerning the energy programs I would like to share with you concerning the energy Bills before you, first of all I do endorse and the Statewide Emergency Food Council does endorse the energy voucher loan proposal before you. But I wanted to suggest if that is not possible given budgetary restraints, there is an alternative which I would like to bring to the Committee's attention and it's a combination of approaches, one that comes out of a sense of the problems now with the energy program, the problem of the once in 12 months of being too centralized or being too slow in payments, and the problem that those that are receiving oil deliveries have no access to the program.

29
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

PHILLIP GRIGSBY: (CONTD.) What I have proposed is an alternative if the voucher loan program is not possible would be a three phase approach. First, utilizing the present program to have to mandate the utility companies again on a voluntary basis by welfare recipients, but to mandate utility companies where possible, to put AFDC recipients on a budget plan like other customers where the recipient would pay the amount in the grant and then the difference would be billed to the Department of Social Services and that difference would be paid once in a 12 month period so it would be eligible for reimbursement and to have that budget be given even though the Bill is not paid totally but to put the amount of budget plan on that amount.

Secondly, to have a special needs allocation for oil. You could have a limit for example, if it's in the bill of \$150 and have this administered in a way that, and work out arrangements with local oil companies service to be paid on delivery. This would be a grant, so therefore, it would be eligible for matching.

The third phase would be improving administration in the present program. To have a more de-centralized approach so that every office and sub-office would be able to give authorization on energy, we have had people now who have been shut off after they have applied, a couple days after they've applied for the grant increasing their cost, everyone's cost. So have a de-centralized where authority for granting this program would be with those offices. And secondly to in administration to set some performance standards for the department. For example to have assistance granted within a certain amount of days after application and secondly to set performance standards in the days that the grants will be paid to utility companies.

And so I think by utilizing a three phase approach, partly an extension, partly correction and a special need for oil, we can remedy I think more problems with energy than we're now taking. And this I'll be glad to write out and present to the Committee. Thankyou for your patience today. Are there questions?

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou. I guess you know how I feel about it Phil, I'm not much for all these, just give them enough money to start with and you just forget about all the other tricky stuff.

PHILLIP GRIGSBY: Right, I agree with that.

30
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

SEN. HUDSON: Are there any comments from the Committee?

WALTER O'CONNOR: Ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, my name is Walter O'Connor, I'm the Secretary-Treasurer of the Connecticut State Labor Council. I'm here to support Bill 5316 and 5790. The statement of purpose is explained on that, I feel that people have testified to this effect that these are in need in these tiring times, but I'm here, my purpose, my main purpose is to oppose Bill 93, and we're very concerned about this Bill because it is penalizing people who because of the law which so states when you have a stalemate in negotiations both sides are equally guilty, you do have the right to strike.

Then the Conference of Business and Industries and Manufacturers come up here and try to weaken the position of the worker, the poorest of the worker by denying his family welfare benefits. Nothing has been said about the fact that the other side of the fence does have tax write-offs for their losses and yet whoever suggested this Bill has another way of breaking the worker's back. We're very, very much opposed to this Bill.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou very much. We have a long list of speakers. I've received another page, it's snowing rather hard I'm told; whether it's hit Hartford I don't know but it's very heavy down in the Norwalk area so I would appreciate it if all of you could be as brief as possible so we don't get caught in a very heavy storm. Peter Munsing, Fairfield County Legal Services next.

PETER MUNSING: Madame Chairperson, members of the Committee, my name is Peter Munsing, I'm with Fairfield County Legal Services. Raphael Podolsky said most of what I would wish to say so I'll be extremely brief. I'd just like to point out that these problems that we deal with every week we have people that come in to ask us questions about welfare. Many of the cases there is nothing we can do, they are receiving the grants, we have to explain to them that a family of two is expected to live on 43 cents per person per meal, that for their fuel, they're allocated \$2.51 a week.

When somebody comes in and tells me that they have a disability, a heart ailment, my first reaction is great, then maybe we can get you on SSI and maybe you won't be as poor now. It's with these thoughts in mind that I just ask you, I realize the main battle

31
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

PETER MUNSING: (CONTD.) is in the Appropriations Committee, I would just like your Committee to send out the Bill with strong enough support so that the Appropriation's Committee will give a good hard look to make sure that some other area of the budget they could cut rather than welfare. Thankyou.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou. The next speaker is Aura Diaz. Would you be sure to use the microphone. Diaz will be followed by Ronald Zooleck and then by Steven Brown from Bridgeport.

AURA DIAZ: Ladies and gentlemen, chairman of the board, I am here in behalf of Neighborhood Service, a component agency of the CPE in Stamford. I work with the community, mainly with the welfare recipients of the city and the recipients of the city, or the State of Connecticut, I would say, are being deprived of the essential needs that they are entitled to.

The welfare recipients at this time is unable to meet the high costs of living and the increase in this is necessary. The private agencies such as the Salvation Army, Person to Person, the Council of Churches and all of the agencies that voluntary help the recipients are being drained through the years of helping the recipients of welfare and when are drained out, the people will be hungry and without shelter because we don't have no one else to turn to. Thankyou.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou very much. Ronald Zooleck followed by Steven Brown followed by Sharon Bridges.

RONALD ZOOLECK: Thankyou Madame Chairman. I'm Ron Zooleck, Executive Director of the Northwest Chamber of Commerce, and I'm here today with the purpose of registering our strong support for Senate Bill 93.

The Bill obviously from the kind of comment that was made today is truly an emotionally charged one because of the obvious involvements that it has. In the interest of time, I will submit my comments to you and make a few brief remarks from the prepared statement.

In the case of a striker, certainly the democratic process of voting is made by the membership of a union or labor force. A strike is an economic hardship on both the employer and the employee designed to force one side or the other into capitulation. For the government to pay welfare benefits to strikers is an

32
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

RONALD ZOOLECK: (CONTD.) overt action in taking the side of the striker and providing greater pressure on the employer.

Certainly the comments made by you today, Madame Chairman of the people regarding the number of people that are involved is a very important point. However, if we talking about the purpose of welfare, then let me follow.

I do not suggest for a moment that welfare payments are so lucrative as to put a striker into a total economic security. Obviously, the kinds of comments I've heard today concerning other Bills further reinforce that statement. However, through the years I have appeared before various Committee's in the General Assembly opposing welfare and unemployment compensation for strikers using the same types of arguements.

However, if it is the decision of this Committee to provide welfare payments for strikers, does this mean that once payments are made, these individuals who receive benefits, are to be treated equally with any other welfare recipient and available for employment? If we accept this premise and the strikers employer can seek replacement from the ranks of the unemployed, the kinds of people we're talking about both in welfare recipients and unemployed, and if we are going to take it to the logical conclusion, then let us do that as opposed to singularly saying that people who are basically now the kinds of people we've heard from today, for receiving welfare benefits, and who under our present laws their skills whatever they are, are sent to the unemployment office so that if we can possibly find employment for them, we will try to do that. If that be true then, then why would we say for welfare benefits, for strikers, that the only person that can employ them are the people they are stiking from. Where for all the other welfare people, potentially every employer in the state is available to hire them, and I think there is a incongruity here. I don't think the people who have spoken to you today and said we oppose or we are in favor, either sides wants to see needy people pushed so that they are not without the basic needs in life, but let us decide what the various aspects of welfare and unemployment are for and once we do that, if they don't cover all the people that are in need, then let us change the law or come up with another approach. I thank you Madame Chairman.

SEN. HUDSON: I think you raised a very interesting question, I wonder if I may ask some further questions of you, stay a few more minutes.

33
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

RONALD ZOOLECK: Surely.

SEN. HUDSON: I happen to agree with you that both sides don't want to hurt people, I don't think business wants to hurt people, I've worked with the chambers very closely, they're dedicated good people.

RONALD ZOOLECK: Would you mind repeating that for my Board of Directors?

SEN. HUDSON: I've said it, it's on the record sir. One of the things that concerns me though what you said and I don't know all the details and is if a person who was on strike would go on to assistance and to find work elsewhere, what that would do in terms of their pension rights and think what benefits they might lose, in other words then you'd be penalized quite possibly for taking the public assistance in that the new job that would be offered to them would not have, they would lose maybe, they would not have destined rights and pensions and so forth at a given time. Is that a possibility?

RONALD ZOOLECK: I think it may be, however, in view of the point that you raised and Chairman Stolberg has raised, has brought up rather, in view of who this would cover, we are saying in effect it's the bottom end of the line, and it would be logical to assume, therefore, that it would be the last hired. Those who have the least invested in the company in terms of time, in terms of skills and in terms of things like pension rights. So I question quite honestly if the kinds of limits you talked about, those are the people that we are referring to, how much they are really losing in fact. I wonder if they really want to go back to work there, and they might not find better employment someplace else, wherever it might be.

SEN. HUDSON: I'm just concerned, the poor and the it seems the helpless always end up being treated most unfairly and that's a concern of mine. The other thing I'm interested in is that those people who may have voted not to strike, they do not in a sense have a choice as is argued by them, as they are willing striking, as been by majority vote not their decision, not their decision to leave and not their decision really to go back, and these people would be penalized if we didn't give them some support, and I wonder what your response would be to that?

34
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

RONALD ZOOLECK: Well I think that obviously is true and then what we're getting into a whole area of the democratic process as it involves unions, and I'm sure the gentleman who spoke prior to me representing unions has some comments to make and I don't want to make them behind his back but quite frankly this is the decision and I have not heard anyone bring up, where does the union show it's responsibility to the strikers that we're talking about? If in fact a small number, where in this process do they recognize the fact that there are people as part of their work force who are in this very difficult economic position and why is it as a result of this quote, democratic vote, unquote, that we are ending up by saying, okay we made our decision because of whatever the situation is with the company and these people, this few numbers who are our people in terms of the strike, are your people in terms of being taken care of? And I ask that question, you know, in response.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou. Are there any questions of the Committee or comments? Yes, Rep. Orcutt.

REP. ORCUTT: I just couldn't help but want to respond to the gentleman that it seems to me in terms of philosophy and much has been said about this Bill 93 in those terms that the philosophy behind the welfare law is that persons regardless of what circumstances are that brought them to their knees, so to speak, are in fact on their knees in terms of not having the needs that they have, basic needs that they have met and from that standpoint it seems to me that the need for welfare is there and that is the basic issue that we're facing when we give public assistance. As a person, regardless of what has happened to bring him to his knees, is on his knees without the basic necessities for living. He and his family.

RONALD ZOOLECK: May I respond. I don't believe that that is the intent of the law, what I think we're saying is and the phrase that we seem to have missed here is through no fault of their own, and I'm suggesting that in terms of the reason for welfare or unemployment compensation, is for people who through no fault of their own have found themselves in a situation where they cannot provide for themselves and their family, and as responsible, as a responsible society we have to react and respond to it. In terms of talking about strikers, this is not the case. This is someone with gainful employment and the only question I

RONALD ZOOLECK: (CONTD.) am asking to the Committee if we agree that we are going to provide assistance for them, are we willing to take it to the next step and that is, they are a special breed unto themselves and are not like everyone else available for gainful employment from anyone, but for one company, one business and that's where I find a problem in this situation.

REP. STOLBERG: I would just point out that the question is where you start, whether you're starting with focus on strikers or whether you're starting with a focus on families who are very poor, who have less than \$250 in assets, who have an income per month of less than \$330 and who have to register for the WIN program in order to qualify for their benefits. Now I would suggest that this Committee being a Human Services Committee doesn't care whether they're strikers, workers, martians or anything else. If they're in the State of Connecticut and they have those needs and they have a family, then they qualify for this.

RONALD ZOOLECK: Then sir you would agree with my point of saying that once they have qualified in terms of not caring where they come from, that they are in favor, available for gainful employment someplace else and conversely their employers are allowed to hire someone to replace them.

REP. STOLBERG: That is the current regulations are they have to register and be available and take employment if fitting employment is offered. That's the current situation.

RONALD ZOOLECK: Thankyou sir, we're in total agreement.

REP. STOLBERG: Great, thankyou.

SEN. HUDSON: The next speaker is Sharon Bridges followed by Lorraine Williams.

STEVEN BROWN: Pardon me, Madame Chairman, I thought Steven Brown was next.

SEN. HUDSON: I'm sorry, I did skip you.

STEVEN BROWN: That's alright. My name is Steven Brown, I'm minister of the Second Baptist Church of Bridgeport, Connecticut and also American Baptist Representative of the National Council of Churches.

36
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

STEVEN BROWN: (CONTD.) I would like to first of all speak in favor of House Bills 5316 and 14, and I would like just speak to them on a level of value question because I think numbers and examples of situations have been well documented.

Certainly all of us are aware of the budget squeeze and the need to balance budgets both at local, state and national levels. However, I would suggest that the coming practice of some state governments is to balance the budgets at the deficit or loss of the poor people. I would refer to both Massachusetts and California where Governor's have suddenly made it popular to balance the budget and also cut back on welfare payments and other specific funds which go to poor people.

I suggest that if all of us are indeed to benefit from the balanced budget and the good economy we should not do that at the expense of poor people.

I would also like to raise the point that if welfare benefits are not raised, but are kept at present levels, we are in reality cutting welfare benefits. For as the cost of living rises, as the cost of rents and fuel rises, if present welfare benefits stay as they are, we are in fact cutting welfare benefits, and I think that should be faced and I think that should be said publicly by the legislature and those who support, or those that would defeat such Bills. That if in fact we oppose cost of living increases for AFDC benefits and if we oppose 33% increase, we're not in fact keeping welfare benefits at present levels, we are cutting them, and I think that needs to be recognized and I think that needs to be dealt with. Because the fact that current welfare benefits for a family of four in Connecticut are 40% below the cost of living requirements stated by the U.S. Bureau of Labor, and I find that to put it politely, disgraceful.

I would also point out that part of our problem is in our tax structure. I admit being new to Connecticut only three months, I come from the State of Ohio which is just enacted an income tax three years ago, and we are struggling with that. I would suggest that while most of the budget is supported by a sales tax, this is an unjust and inadequate tax and it specifically hurts those whom can least afford it and that is poor people. Those with low incomes pay the same amount of sales tax as those with higher incomes, and I would suggest that if we indeed are serious about balancing the budget and

37
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

STEVEN BROWN: (CONTD.) at the same time meeting human needs, you might indeed take a long look and a close look at our tax structure in Connecticut.

Secondly, Madame Chairperson, I would like to address myself to Senate Bill 93. I'd really like to raise some questions about that because it seems to me that the spokesmen from industry I have heard are like a hunter trying to kill an ant with a shotgun. We are not talking about a great deal of strikers, we are not talking about a total work force in any given plant striking and going immediately on welfare, I think it's been pointed out both by yourself and by the other Chairman the incidents of such people would be incredibly small. Yet I would argue that the moral and ethical responsibility as a nation, as a people are to see that there is a sufficient standard for those people who do not have adequate funds and it seems to me the passage of Senate Bill 93 is almost a cruel thrust at those people who might find themselves on strike, might find their resources liquidated and who they, thanks to this Bill if it were passed, would be totally without resources. And I find a Bill with no ethical justification for the various Committees to defeat it soundly. Thankyou.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou. Questions and comments. Sharon Bridges. Lorraine Williams.

SHARON BRIDGES: I am a welfare recipient, one child, and I'm here in support of the Bill 5314. My rent is \$155, utilities \$60, and \$56 a month for food stamps. So my expenses for food and shelter are \$271. As you can see a mother with one child can't survive on welfare. If I had five or six children we could get by because I still would be paying the same amount of rent. I am enrolled in WIN and CETA and I still have no job. People complain about the swelling welfare rolls but what is being done for the other side of the balloon?

If the state would develop a job development program and help the people who want to work and get off welfare that balloon wouldn't be ready to burst. Because my expenses are higher than my grant, I do not know when, where I can turn to, which bill do I pay? Do I take my food to pay my utilities? Or should I go cold so we can eat? I urge you to consider the individual families involved in the decisions you make. Thankyou.

38
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou. Lorraine Williams followed by Wanda Reyes.

LORRAINE WILLIAMS: I'm Lorraine Williams from the Northeast Action Committee in Danielson, Connecticut. We run a used clothing store and a social service agency and we come in contact with, when people come into our store for used clothing they then tell us of all the problems that they're confronting. We take care of not only people on welfare but your working low class which by the way, gets by sometimes on even less than what some welfare recipients get by on.

But I wonder where does the welfare come up with their allotment that they think is a fair amount to give a person for their particular heat, utilities or rent. Like a family of three, now I'm giving you just averages, I don't want to bore you with figures, but \$86 a month for a family of three for heat and electric when welfare only allows \$32.76, I would like to know where are you supposed to come up with the difference?

A family of eight that pays \$139, receives \$51 from welfare, and I would like to, you know, where is this extra money going to come up to pay for these things? Are you people going to give it to the, you know, welfare,

SEN. HUDSON: You know I really feel in a very awkward position because you know, all of you know how the Human Services Committee feels about your needs. It is not us you have to convince.

LORRAINE WILLIAMS: Then who is it?

SEN. HUDSON: The Appropriations Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly.

LORRAINE WILLIAMS: Are you going to bring this to them?

SEN. HUDSON: We probably will JF this Bill and then it will be sent to the Appropriations Committee. I sit on that Committee and I will vote for the Bill. Thankyou. I wonder if I could ask for the indulgence of Mrs. Reyes for a minute, Mr. Sabona has to go and I know all of you are anxious to go, but if you will just allow him to testify then we could go on with the list. I would appreciate that, thankyou.

39
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

JOSEPH SABONA; Sen. Hudson, members of the Human Services Committee, my name is Joseph Sabona, I'm Legislative Director for the Connecticut State Council of Machinists, and I'm here to oppose Senate Bill 93.

The proposal of Sen. Rome to change any form of public assistance to strikers and their families is not only inhuman but legally discriminatory. Corporations and other employers losing money because of a strike may under Internal Revenue Service code deduct these losses from their profits subject to tax in any of the four succeeding years or three previous years. Is anyone suggesting that an employer who was involved in a labor dispute should be deprived of these subsidies? No. Most strikers will not seek public assistance except as a last resort. When they are reduced to the end of their resources.

A recent six month strike of the Metal Trades Council of New London Company against Electric Boat in Groton is a prime example. If it had not been for public assistance and AFDC some of these strikers would have faced starvation because their unions had exhausted their resources.

We hope that this Committee will not adopt a "let em starve" policy against American workers exercising their constitutional rights to strike. Thankyou very much.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou. Mrs. Reyes. To be followed by Julia Gilison. The mike is not working.

MADGA REYES: I'm Madga Reyes, Community Coordinator from Spanish International in Stamford. I'm here to support the Bill 5314. I don't have to go in specifics because I think many people have spoken about the Bill and about the needs of the coverage for mothers with children. Thankyou.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou. Julia Gilison. David Silverstone.

DAVID SILVERSTONE: Thankyou Sen. Hudson. I will submit a statement. I just want to make a few brief comments in support of Bill 5789, which is Emergency Energy Voucher Loan Program. I don't think I have to go into the reasons for the necessity of this Bill, that's been gone into by many people before me. I would like to make a couple of comments though concerning how this Bill ought to be, perhaps could be funded since that seems to be an issue this afternoon.

43
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

TRINA WALKER: (CONTD.) nearby the poor area who are not qualified to give the best care and most of the poor are receiving such health care from them.

I also support the appendix referring to Bill 5777. I support the Bill authorizing the Commissioner of Social Services to contract for the provision of a food stamp outreach program. I think this is very good because on weekend when the welfare receives their food stamps, she or he is completely at a loss, purchasing the food stamps only at the bank.

I am not supporting Bill 93, absolutely no. Denying the poor welfare or those who need from a strike, welfare benefits. These really my opinions, ladies and gentlemen, represent the most reactionary and inhuman elements in our society. Strikers are the the last resource used by our workers usually are the less powerful and less resourceful, and I think it will be a very punitive kind of Bill to deprive those who really qualify for benefits to really deny them.

I would like to ask you a question. I know, I have the impression that only your Committee are very sympathetic with all the good comments on Bills who are in order to improve human lives. May I ask you what kind of influence could you exert when you go in front of the Appropriations Committee and also with you constituency, and also with the Governor's Office in order not to only sympathize with all the things repeatedly year after year but also to use some pressure or to enlighten your constituency in the trouble and the kind of situation that you are in, in order that you really will be able to produce or to deliver some kind of remedy to our terrible, terrible situation.

SEN. HUDSON: Well, the answer to the question is, you know it's rather complex, I will tell you that I do all I can to educate the constituents in my district. I have a weekly column that goes to a paper. I've consistently written about the plight of the AFDC families and as far as the problem is as I see it, I only speak personally now, not for the Committee, there just isn't a large enough power base of people who can exert enough influence on the Governor and on the Appropriation's Committee to have them change this states' priorities and that's really what we have to do. And until that happens, you know, I just don't see these Bills

44
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

SEN. HUDSON: (CONTD.) passing and I guess you know that's been my idea, all of you have followed it, that I have great reluctance bringing the Bills out at all because I really feel that they don't have chance, I'm sorry to have to tell you that.

TRINA WALKER: Now that means that your Committee doesn't have any power within these walls to do anything?

SEN. HUDSON: Well, you know, we have influence and we can vote for the Bills but we're one Committee out of 22 and we're one vote on the Appropriations Committee. It's going to take a lot of work.

TRINA WALKER: You know Mr. Chairman, things are getting worse and worse. If you don't do something and we don't do something together this year, I assure you that with a most shameful bicentennial celebration that in the history of the world has been contemplated. Thankyou.

SEN. HUDSON: The next speaker is Mr. Semenoro followed by Mr. Ned Coll.

CARMEN SEMENORO: I'm Mr. Semenoro, I'm from Bridgeport, Connecticut. I wouldn't of been here today if it wasn't for that young lady. The day when she found me I was picketing the state for the simple reason I'd gone five days with no heat. I'm a father with three kids. No one can tell me about a woman. A woman's work is never done. Now the little assistance I do get from the state doesn't cover half, my gas, my electric, clothes for the kids, food stamps, it just doesn't cover it. Now I've got to go today with no heat. Not that I'm trying to get away from working, I begged the state to give me a job. On the garbage truck, on the ash truck, cleaning our filthy parks, get us work. We'll get off. We want to feel independent just as the next person.

Today I told my son I was coming up here. He said, Daddy, don't go, I feel ashamed, all my friends I'll lose. I said, well one day you'll know. I'm not asking nothing. Just help us out. Just help us out. Thankyou very much.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou.

WALKER: (NOT USING MICROPHONE.)

SEN. HUDSON: We're not using the mike, we're not getting your testimony on transcript. Thankyou. Mr. Coll.

NED COLL: I appreciate the opportunity to speak here, and I appreciate the compassion that the compassion that the previous two speakers have certainly put in, I hope that the members of the Committee put as much compassion into it. One of the most disgusting things that I've seen this afternoon is to leave here and go down that corner and see the entire press of the State of Connecticut meeting there with the Governor and then my dad who just spoke, but not even in front the public, it's a violation of the FCC, discriminatory, and I hope that members of your Committee would get the press in this state to cover the problems of over 100,000 people in this state on welfare alone because they are being discriminated against and I hope that your Committee speaks out against it.

I think that if you don't have enough power, even speak out against the Laurel Club which is the political club of reporters in here and get them involved with people such as this, then you probably should disman your Committee. Now there's special protection of the Governor, you have not told us today to go to the Governor like you told us a week ago and when you did, you know, we went down there, we'll she's getting special protection, Ella Grasso, and she's right around that corner now, and

SEN. HUDSON: It was an inadvertant oversight if I didn't tell you.

NED COLL: No, I think that it was also partly the reason why you don't have a lot of black politicians up there speaking today either. Now they're out there talking about Martin Luther King Day the other day and they had their show here the other night, the Martin Luther King Day, it might be a good thing. I think it's an attempt to get peoples minds out of the problems that we're talking about right now, and we hope that your Committee, if you are sincere, and you want your things passed, then I think you've got to speak out against that Governor. Because she's the one that's calling the shots around this Capital and the rest of the men and women in here are tap dancing to her, and I think that that's very important that she doesn't get special protection since she's a democratic Governor.

And since the people who are clapping right now are the people who live in the cities of this state, they arent the people who were in the Hilton the other night for that \$100 a plate dinner, they aren't

46
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

NED COLL: (CONTD.) the people at all, and they aren't the people like that man, and I hope that this Committee can speak out, get that press going into the homes and seeing what's going on, and I don't mean this as just a blast against your Committee because I think sympathetically I think some of you do have sympathy, but I don't think you are being hard nosed enough with the forces to be around here. The person who runs this, we were in there the other day when we saw that Governor, I was covered up by that press with the exception of the Hartford Times cause she's getting special protection and her press secretary is Larrye DeBarre who is the best cover up man that WTIC and if you want to go out that room a few minutes ago with myself you would of seen how smug virtually all that group was about the problems and in the meantime you've got the people in Connecticut, people who pay taxes.

You know you should be blasting the press for not dealing and bringing out the problems of your Committee cause if we're doing it, I think that you ought to be able to do it because I think you can be a powerful force and an effective force against it. I mean there's no sense just talking to you unless you're willing to be a vanguard against them, and I asked people here, those that are being talked about, one thing that I think that our Governor is running for is Vice-President of the United States of America, and I hope that people who were concerned and voted for her will go down, go into New York City and that Time Magazine and point out that here's that Governor who hasn't identified with the working class of this state anymore that the press has over there in that corner.

Getting back to these Bills. Now you can talk about all the emergency aid you want and electricity, want to get some revenue? Maybe you ought to do this. Maybe you better ask Mrs. Butterworth who spoke here this afternoon, maybe you ought to ask her why this three million dollars being over paid in electricity in that Medical Center out in Farmington when in front of the PUC the President of the Hartford Electric Light promised that the Hartford Electric Light, that contract, that the electricity bill for that Medical Center would never be over \$500,000 a year and if there was a loss it would be passed on to the people who invest in Hartford Electric Light and that's a quote from the Hartford Courant quote from the PUC.

NED COLL: (CONTD.) Maybe you ought to ask about that. There's about three million dollars right there of revenue that could be raised up.

Maybe the Governor can do something about selling that .. that she spoke about and promised in the campaign. Maybe that would help some people, some revenue. Maybe this whole idea of a federal income tax, maybe you should blast her publicly instead of protecting her so much and not speaking out on a progressive income tax. I think that the special protection is a thing that causes her to ignore the people that we've been talking about. The people we're talking about is the people who work for her. You talk about your Welfare Department and our office in the Revitalization Corp and we get calls from throughout the state on all sorts of problems. You could give that Welfare Department a trillion dollars right now and tell them to give it out to the people and the way that the operation is being run from the top it would mess it up.

If you want to go back into history and see an attitude of that Welfare Department between when Shapiro was in there and the attitude between White and Maher, it's an entirely different ballgame. Every Friday afternoon we go over things that we've seen during the week and we have on taperecordings, we have on taperecordings one at WDRC radio, a phone ringing in the Welfare Department all day long and no answer, or rather for 30 or 40 minutes and no answer and that type of thing happens consistently and that Department, your head of that Committee, you should be an investigation, an open investigation into the leadership of that Welfare Department.

Now we talk about the problems of food stamps, we talk about setting up a Bill or putting in the Welfare Commission in charge of emergency service in regard to utilities. What is he doing on food stamps, they closed up that office in Hartford on Saturdays and Thursday nights and working people can't even apply on food stamps and that's an emergency and they might say they don't have the funds, but if they wanted, they could stagger the workers instead of working on a Monday somebody could work on a Saturday. And if they really wanted to they'd go in there themselves and help people who have those problems, and I'm talking about a commitment of the idea of professionals that you have around here. These professional agencies,

48
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

NED COLL: (CONTD.) you know, they're not telling you anything and they're not telling Grasso anything, cause they're not out there, they're not out there nights and they're not out there after five o'clock. You know who has been running the Welfare Department the last few years? The churches and the small social action agencies who have to run around in the night and that type of thing, those type of things have been running the State Welfare Department and this is a fact.

Now if that Welfare Commission, Maher and the political appointment that he has as a Deputy "Perry", she's not out there either. She's not out there with the people that we're talking about and they have not brought the people together in this state who are recipients because of their interests. Really fighting for the recipients. And they won't just say, I'm for a Bill for a 1/3 increase, they'd have those recipients and they'd have Committee's in here today and the proof of the putting is the fact that smoke screens and things that are not being done in that Welfare Department and that is one of the reasons why I think some people, they have a twisted view of the whole welfare situation.

You pointed it out in answer to the, one of you pointed out in answer to the business community, talked in terms of you shouldn't give aid to somebody who is out on strike, it talks in terms of welfare being a form of charity. Well I wonder how many black legs and white legs, legs of men that I know in my work, that are on welfare, right in North Hartford right now and they lost those legs in Viet Nam and they didn't lose them for charity, they lost it for, because they were told to go out there and fight for this nation and that's the whole view of that whole welfare situation, and I'm asking this Committee to publicly ask the Governor of this state to come in and meet the recipients and the landlords in the cities of this state and see what they have to say about welfare, see what they have to say about the rundown neighborhoods and neighborhoods and neighborhoods and publicly ask her because I think that she has to be publicly challenged on this thing because she has written off the City of Hartford, she has written off every city in this state because as far as she's concerned that is not her territory.

Now you get into the Bill talking about the whole idea of 1/3 assistance in Hartford.

49
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

SEN. HUDSON: Would you hold the mike a little further away from you, it's over driving it, I have a hard time hearing you.

NED COLL: You have a growth of alcoholism. I went to a wake the other night of a man 24 years old and the only people in the wake were six other men, 24 and in their twenties because of alcoholism, but unless you know, we bring this out and get this in front of the press, unless you, you're saying you're sympathetic, you've got to get the cases in front of the public of what's happening to people out there, and I think that this is the type, and if you don't think you're getting the coverage from the press I think you should speak out against the press in this Capital because these are foreigner's as far as that press Capital is concerned and I didn't realize as much as I heard the first hour or so of the discussion here today and the voices. Then to go in and see them playing tap dance with Ella across the room and see no one wanting to ask her a gut question, really in regard to the poor people across this hall, when up here, up there on the third floor is the press room and that third floor, you're very, very welcome, you should be welcome. And just like that Governor's Office, that Governor's Office you're welcome to go right around that corner, and what we're doing in order to get some of your Bills through, we've set up a watch in that office, and we're going to have her see poor people every damn day and she stops seeing them, and we're going to have to see her when she has all the power and all the prestige of national coverage, and we're going to have to have her see poor people when she walks in that office every day, and we're asking you to help us with this fight.

Now the question I ask, are you willing to speak out and public invite her and challenge her to come into these areas and meet with the landlords and the working poor and the welfare recipients in the state.

SEN. HUDSON: Is that a direct question to me. Mr. Coll, I've taken on the Governor before as you well know.

NED. COLL: See we don't know well enough. See we'll know well enough if the Senator or various members of this Committee are right in that office. The point I'm trying to make is I don't think people

50
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

NED COLL: (CONTD.) I'm not putting down some of the sincerity you might of put on, I mean put into your effort, but I'm talking about challenging her publicly cause that's where it's at. Unless you're afraid you'll embarrass her. Now are you willing to challenge her on her disregard or not?

SEN. HUDSON: We have several weeks to go before the session is over, and I will then let me judge my recommendations.

NED COLL: Yeah but by that time you know,

SEN. HUDSON: There's going to be a lot happening before this session,

NED COLL: I mean in other words basically though you're saying your Committee is sympathetic, yet I pointed out several things, one was the Governor's lack of concern and the other was the press corp and you're Committee is unwilling to speak out on it.

SEN. HUDSON: I'm not speaking for my Committee, I'm speaking for myself.

NED COLL: Well then, the other thing I'd like to ask of your Committee to meet in confidence on the facts that we have for a need, for an investigation immediately into the highest echelon of that Welfare Department in the State of Connecticut. And that's what we're asking, now are you willing?

SEN. HUDSON: I'm sorry, do you have some facts you want to share with the Committee concerning welfare wastes? I would love to see it.

NED COLL: Yeah well we want to show the people too. People like last Friday night and people who are jockeyed around in that 2550 Main Street office and that type of thing or the man who called me today from Bridgeport on a similar type of thing and that type of thing we want to get out to the public to see that they can spend a trillion dollars and if it's administrated with a group of bureaucrats who don't give a god damn for the streets in this honorable hall, I don't think it's very honorable, then I think that we're going to lose thousands of lives and see children die more and more. Thankyou.

SEN. HUDSON: Thankyou. Emma Fair is the next speaker.
Emma Fair.

51
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

REP. STOLBERG: Before you take over I will attempt also to respond to Mr. Coll's comments. I want you to recognize that a lot of different ways to pursue the ends and ...Sen. Hudson has and we've been in the Governor's Office and we've been with the press and we're making the fight on every single front it can be made and I'm afraid that what you're calling for may well come to pass very soon because of the reluctance, in my opinion, of the political structure to respond to the tax reforms needs and the human needs and the educational needs in this state. Many of your comments, in my opinion, are well taken and some of the members of this Committee and others in the legislature are going to be joining the issue and have joined the issue for years. Maybe if some of the people out there can get involved in the political system and occupy some of the seats here with votes, we'll have a little more leverage with the executive branch and a lot of others. And I would call on you and others to do just that because the voices up here I could number perhaps 20 or 30 who are calling and who have voiced the kinds of things that you have discussed. That we need more people from the streets in this chamber and in the chamber upstairs and perhaps in the Governor's Office too.

NED COLL: But in response (NOT USING MICROPHONE)

REP. STOLBERG: I assure you that has been, we can't get into dialogues here. There again I think you've raised a valid point of urban Senators and Representatives who should be doing the job that you're talking about. You press them, I assure you I am pressing them too. Next speaker is Emma Fair.

EMMA FAIR: Thankyou. My name is Emma Fair and this Bill the Committee's talking about, 5314, I want the Committee to do something about this Bill instead of talking about it. I'm not speaking for myself, I'm speaking for all welfare recipients whom are being mistreated. Thankyou.

REP. STOLBERG: Thankyou. We'll do our best in this Committee. Darog Ward. Barbara Earle from Darien.

BARBARA EARLE: (READ BY CURTIS FOWLE) Mrs. Earle asked me to read a statement. She was not able to be present in person.

My name is Barbara Earle. I am Director of Person to Person, Saint Luke's Parish, Darien, a private outreach organization funded by Saint Luke's Church,

BARBARA EARLE: (CONTD.) area churches and individuals. We fill requests relayed to us by many social agencies. By far the largest number of requests come from State Welfare workers asking for food for their clients or money to supplement their flat grant payment. In fact, these workers collect food among themselves on a regular basis for our pantry. In recent years this pantry has been taxed to a point where we have been forced to buy food weekly to supply the need.

In 1975 we fed over 590 families and supplied 816 families with clothing they could not possibly afford to buy. This is only the tip of the iceberg. Our experience of eight years tells us that welfare payments are dangerously low in high rent areas such as ours. It also shows us that most welfare families are not bad managers but are being asked to do the impossible.

The State of Connecticut must face up to it's stated responsibility. If it is unable to do so and to allocate sufficient funds for this progress then ways must be found to aid the private sector in picking up the pieces or they too will collapse for lack of funds. Thankyou. Signed Barbara Earle.

REP. STOLBERG: Thankyou very much. Next to testify is Queenie Mitchell followed by Mrs. Twitty. Mrs. Mitchell take the microphone please. If Twitty is here and if Eliza Williams is here, would you please be prepared to be at one of the microphones.

QUEENIE MITCHELL: My name is Queenie Mitchell of Waterbury, Connecticut and to each and everyone I'm not going to take much of your time, but I'd like to say to you that on the welfare, I have two dependent on the welfare and we can hardly pay, my light bill is on the edge of being cut off right now and I wish and hope that your Committee will do something to help us. I'm trying to everyway I can to try to make my ends meet. I turn myself to welfare or to the state to any help but I'm talking to you this afternoon, please, please be a help to us. I thankyou.

REP. STOLBERG: Thankyou. I would hope that all of you would also be in touch with your own Representatives and Senators because it's not only the few members of this Committee, we need more support and the areas where you live is the areas where you have the greatest say about what your own State Senators and your own State Representatives do, so please contact them. Mrs. Twitty followed by Eliza Williams.

53
ldp

HUMAN SERVICES

March 9, 1976
2:30 P.M.

REP. STOLBERG: Either of them here? Mr. David Simpson. Is David Simpson here. Could you identify yourself please.

CELIA TWITTY: My name is Celia Twitty from Waterbury, Connecticut and I have three grandchildren and my daughter is alcoholic. As you see I'm the old woman. In March, in January I went to the Welfare Department, the State Welfare Department, asked them to give me some oil and snow is on the ground and the thing is out, my furnace was out and I asked to give me some oil. She tells me to go and ask Elmer "Klem" that's the man I get oil from and then he would put oil in my tank. So I went and had him to call me. He told me that he didn't credit people for oil. He called them and they still didn't put no oil in my tank. And I don't get but \$200 and some dollars and I got three grandchildren and I have to take one hundred dollars and buy food stamps and I had to take the other and buy clothes and I don't have enough money to get around for my kids cause they always need clothes and I got to pay \$10 and some cents for a pair of overalls for one of the boys and the little boy I have to pay six dollars and some cents for a pair of overalls and god knows what the shoes cost and I just can't make it like that because I am ... and they take all I get to do that, and I'm sick of it, I save on the doctor and he do too and it's real rough and I'm mighty sick of it all. Please, don't help me cause I don't want your help, I want it for the kids because I get my help. I want it for the children. Help me support my kids.

REP. STOLBERG: Thankyou Mrs. Twitty. Eliza Williams please.

ELIZA WILLIAMS: My name is Eliza Williams. On behalf of the recipients in Waterbury. We are here to support some of the Bills. We support the Bill for a special needs program and energy costs. Recipients are in need of assistance for utilities. Their allowances do not cover the full cost of heat oil. At present they are not eligible for welfare assistance because they received help in April of 1975, therefore, they have to look for other means of assistance.

I am under the opinion that welfare still has almost \$400,000 left in their emergency fund and

H-179

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1976

VOL. 19
PART 8
3173 - 3620

Wednesday, April 28, 1976 191.

Total number voting	143	efr
Necessary for passage	72	
Those voting Yea.	143	
Those voting Nay.	0	
Those absent and not voting	8	

The bill is passed in concurrence with the Senate.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 926, Substitute for S.B. 424.

WILLIAM A. O'NEILL:

Mr. Speaker, may that item be passed temporarily, please.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Is there objection? So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 931, Substitute for S.B. 482, an Act concerning revision of procedures governing the commitment of mentally ill persons. Committee on Judiciary.

ROBERT D. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate. Will you remark?

ROBERT D. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, this bill would add more definite requirements

Wednesday, April 28, 1976 192.

for the involuntary commitment of mentally ill persons. Presently, efr one of the standards under which people can be committed to a mental institution is that the person is a fit subject for confinement. The vagueness of such a standard has been held un-Constitutional in a number of Courts, and, in fact, in Connecticut it has led to wide variations in the number of people who are involuntarily committed depending on the Probate Court location. In the Norwich area, for example, 98.4% of those who are probated are committed and 60% only in the Connecticut Valley Hospital. The bill provides that involuntary commitments can be made only if a person is dangerous to himself or others, or gravely disabled. The Connecticut Psychiatric Association has indicated support for this concept. In fact, they indicate that they are presently in practice applying this standard for involuntary commitments. The bill also requires that in involuntary commitment procedures that the patient be informed of their right to counsel, to cross examine witnesses, and to appear at hearings. It also provides for access to medical records. In addition, annually each patient would have to be informed of the possibility of another hearing with regard to their continued commitment. In the emergency commitment areas, patients would be required to be informed of their right to be examined by a physician of their own choosing. I would say that this bill has the support of the Connecticut Hospital Association, the Connecticut Psychiatric Association, and the Commissioner of Mental Health. I move its adoption.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

Wednesday, April 28, 1976 193.

JOHN W. ANDERSON:

efr

Mr. Speaker, through you, a question to the proponent of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please frame your question.

JOHN W. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, in the beginning of the bill the reference to alcoholism...I would like to know if that has any effect to the voluntary commitment of an alcoholic?

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman of the 37th, if he cares to respond.

ROBERT D. TOBIN:

No. The reference pertains only to the involuntary admissions. The voluntary admissions section remains exactly the same as under present law.

JOHN W. ANDERSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark? If not, will the Members please take their seats; staff come to the well. The machine will be opened. Has every Member voted? Is your vote recorded in the manner in which you wish to have it recorded? The machine will be closed. The Clerk please take a tally. Oh, the Clerk please announce the tally.

The following is the result of the vote:

Total number voting 140

Wednesday, April 28, 1976 194.

Necessary for passage	71	efr
Those voting Yea.	139	
Those voting Nay.	1	
Those absent and not voting	11	

The bill is passed...in concurrence with the Senate.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 933, S.B. 152, an Act concerning the elimination of the State Banking Fund and the transfer of its assets to the General Fund. As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

RAYMOND C. LYDDY:

Mr. Speaker, I move for adoption of the Joint favorable report in concurrence with the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on adoption of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate. Will you remark?

RAYMOND C. LYDDY:

Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk get out Senate Amendment "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk please call Senate "A".

RAYMOND C. LYDDY:

May I have permission to summarize.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection to the gentleman summarizing? The Clerk please call Senate "A".

in which you wish to have it recorded? The machine will be closed. The Clerk please take a tally.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting.....	146
Necessary for Passage.....	74
Those Voting Yea.....	91
Those Voting Nay.....	55
Those Absent and Not Voting.....	5

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The bill is PASSED as amended.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 667, substitute for H.B. No. 5529, An Act Concerning the Establishment of a Board of Regents for the University of the State of Connecticut, as amended by House Amendment Schedules "B" and "C" and Senate Amendment Schedule "B", File No. 595, 825.

MR. O'NEILL (34th):

Mr. Speaker, may that item be passed temporarily please.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Is there objection? Hearing none, the item will be passed temporarily.

For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

MR. TOBIN (37th):

Mr. Speaker, I would move for reconsideration of a matter considered yesterday, Calendar No. 931, a substitute for S.B. No. 482, An Act Concerning the Establishment and Expansion of Municipal Airports, File No. 708 which was recommitted to the Committee on Transportation. I was on the prevailing side of that issue. The matter appears on page 5 of the yesterday's calendar.

THE SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR

THE SPEAKER:

The chamber's attention is directed to the calendar of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 28, 1976, page 5, Calendar No. 932, S.B. No. 516 in your files as File No. 640. The legislative status; the matter came to the chamber as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A". The motion of the gentleman from the 111th for acceptance and passage, for adoption of Senate "A", Senate "A" was adopted on a voice vote. The motion to recommit the bill as amended to the joint committee on Transportation, the motion carried on a voice vote. The Chair accepts and entertains the motion of the gentleman from the 37th for reconsideration of our previous action the Chair has just described.

Will you remark on the motion?

MR. STEVENS (119th):

Mr. Speaker, point of order.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 119th, please state your point sir.

MR. STEVENS (119th):

My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not under Rule 29 of the House Rules, a motion for reconsideration of reference of a bill or recommitment of a bill to committee can be considered except on the same day of reference or recommitment. And I would further on the question on whether reference and recommitment are one and the same, refer the chamber to section 387 of Masons which discusses both recommitment and reference.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair is prepared to rule. In as much as yesterday in part

House of Representatives

Thursday, April 29, 1976

93
djh

of our proceedings, there was a motion on the part of the gentleman from the 140th for reconsideration of a matter which had been recommitted to the joint committee on Liquor, as I recall, yes it was, that recommitment having--that action on recommitment having been made on Tuesday. So in anticipation of any possible point of order in connection with the motion of the gentleman of the 140th, yesterday the Chair, on Tuesday evening and during the day, during the morning yesterday researched the very point of order which the gentleman raises.

And the Chair will rule that the point of order is not well taken. The Chair will cite with favor House Rule 29 and further with favor Masons Section 284, subsection 2 thereof and ... to section 1 thereof. It is clear from a close examination of 384 in Masons, section 2 that the motion to recommit is distinct and distinguishable from the simple motion of reference to committee. The rule, House Rule 29, which the gentleman claims in supportive of his point of order is not supportive thereof for the rule indicates that the limitation of reconsideration on the day of action taken, relate only to matters which are referred to committee and as the Chair calls the rule, all other matters may be reconsidered on the subsequent day.

The motion for recommitment which is treated and characterized as a rereference to the Masons citation indicates that the motion for recommitment pertains to cases, "cases of importance and for special reasons" it is referred back to the same committee. And further, in subsection 3 thereof, it is advisable to refer a bill back to committee when numerous amendments are proposed or substantial revision of the bill is required.

The motion for recommitment is so that a committee can address

itself, again address itself, the same committee, the committee of origin to the matter that it had in hand at a previous point in time. The motion for reference is to avail a committee that has a current jurisdiction that is appropriate to the subject matter of the bill avail themselves of the opportunity to work their will on that aspect of the bill, it is relevant to the written scope of the committee to which that matter had been referred.

So, for these reasons, the Chair considers the motion to recommit as totally and entirely distinguishable from the motion to refer and that the motion to recommit therefore being mutually exclusive thereof does not fall within the limitations the gentleman refers to, the same day limitation the gentleman refers to, House Rule 29. And so, for these reasons, sir, I respectfully suggest the point is not well taken.

Will you remark further on the motion?

MR. LYDDY (126th):

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the Chair having indicated that they will entertain the motion has made, may the Journal indicate that I am absenting myself for reasons of possible conflict.

THE SPEAKER:

The Journal will so note, sir.

MR. TOBIN (37th):

Mr. Speaker, as we all recall, this bill was narrowly recommitted yesterday on a voice vote that I believe was extremely close. There was some confusion as to the parliamentary procedure involved and Mr. Liskov withdrew his request for a division of the House. Because of the confusion regarding the procedure and out of respect for him, I bring on this motion for reconsideration and I would move that when the vote be taken, that it

be taken by roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

My first ... is a motion for a roll call vote on the motion for reconsideration. All those in supportive of the vote being taken by roll will indicate by saying aye. In the opinion of the Chair a sufficient number are supportive of the motion and when appropriate, a roll call will be ordered.

Will you remark further on the main motion?

MR. CAMPBELL (118th):

I think by just the power of repetition, people expect to be talking about this bill maybe forever. This bill, just to give you a little bit of history behind it, was not passed by the Transportation Committee. It was petitioned out to the Senate and it was defeated by one vote. In time, reconsideration came up and it did win by one vote.

Yesterday, we had discussion and we had a vote here and it lost. Now how many times do we have to consider a bill the big cities are pushing? I strongly urge that we do not reconsider this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on this motion?

MR. LISKOV (131st):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you Rep. Tobin. I shall be very brief. I think that everyone in this chamber knows what the issues are and I merely want to say that we have been inculcated on the principle that we are a government of laws and not of men. Now what better right is there than to have an appeal to the courts which is the basic right of every individual, authority or municipality. I urge the consideration for reconsideration for this measure. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the motion?

MR. LEENEY (124th):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief also. This bill was discussed yesterday at great length and it was alluded to that it possibly might have an impact in three areas in the state and I would like to state that this is a Bridgeport bill. It originated in Bridgeport, it's for Bridgeport and it would help Bridgeport. The Meriden-Wallingford situation is not critical. It was not even known until the bill came on our books here. The situation in New Haven is not valid either. New Haven stands to lose nothing if this bill fails because New Haven already has an LCO, they have jet service, they have good runways. They stand to lose nothing but Bridgeport stands to lose it all.

And, you know, we came here to Hartford with a very minor bill which we hoped we would get some help on and all of a sudden this bill becomes immoral, the political and unfortunately the constitutional question of the decade. And we, in Bridgeport, would like your support. We can recall in the past being asked to vote for a bill for the city and town development bill which we had reservations on, would it help certain cities, we were more than happy to come to their aid. We would ask you to come to our aid because we desperately need this bill. We ask for your support. What do we hear? I made a commitment. The bill is unconstitutional. It's poorly written or in lieu of that, I have an airport in my district, therefore, I can't vote for an airport. We hope some of you will hear us and some of you will for once do something for the big cities. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MR. RITTER (6th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this motion. I do so although Hartford, to the best of my knowledge, is in no way benefited one way or the other by the outcome of the basic bill. I do it with the hope that other will support it so again we may establish the principle that people will have the right to have their bills heard and debated, voted up or down. Too many times have we witnessed the easy slide from a bill coming out of committee coming before us here and then being referred to other (record 15) committee thus killing it before there's an opportunity to have it debated and to require people to vote yes or no on the merits of a bill. I plead with people to remember that when they're prepared to vote to refer one bill, they're putting themselves in the position of having bills that they want to have debated and voted on referred as well. I think if we try to establish there the opportunity for full debate and whether one supports the basic bill or not, one certainly should support the right of people to have a debate on the basic bill and not on the motion to refer. I hope you people will support the motion.

THE SPEAKER:

For further remarks, the gentleman from the 46th.

MR. SWEENEY (46th):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose reconsideration, Mr. Speaker. We heard the debate yesterday, the merits on the bill. The Transportation Committee, again I will repeat, acted twice on the bill. It was petitioned out by the Senate. The Transportation Committee defeated the bill in executive session the first time. The second time it carried by one vote. Based on this, Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose reconsideration.

House of Representatives

Thursday, April 29, 1976

98
djh

MR. ALESSIE (122nd):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to reconsider. This bill was discussed yesterday and was deated on a voice vote. I can respect the individuals' intentions from the delegation of Bridgeport to fight for its city. The bill was defeated and now let this general assembly proceed with the affairs of the state. I urge vote opposition to the motion on reconsideration.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MRS. WILBER (133rd):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I urge that we reject reconsideration. The Transportation Committee really did not discuss this bill and there are some serious legal questions about the lines in the bill and there's no way I can mention them without, mention the problem of reconsideration without touching on those lines. It says that the municipality or municipalities requesting establishment or expansion of such airports--

THE SPEAKER:

Excuse me madam. Thank you. The lady from the 133rd.

MRS. WILBER (133rd):

It says the municipality or municipalities requesting approval have proven the necessity for the establishment or expansion of such an airport. Now that, so far as anyone on the committee understands, does not include environmental factors although we have been told that it may; it does not include the question of noise pollution, air pollution or safety that limits a court decision in my opinion. If the committee had another opportunity, I think to discuss this with the proper judicial authorities we might have a different feeling but we never came to that

House of Representatives

Thursday, April 29, 1976

99
djh

point and it seems to me it's terribly important to leave this in the Transportation Committee where it can be reviewed again. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the motion for reconsideration? If not, will the members please be seated and the staff come to the well. The machine will be open. Have all of the members voted and is your vote properly recorded? If so, the machine will be closed and the Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting.....	147
Necessary for Reconsideration.....	74
Those Voting Yea.....	69
Those Voting Nay.....	78
Those Absent and Not Voting.....	4

THE SPEAKER:

The motion FAILS.

THE CLERK:

Page 9, Calendar No. 731, substitute for H.B. No. 5759, An Act Concerning an Appropriation for Algae Control, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A", File No. 652.

MR. ANDERSON (106th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the bill in concurrence with the Senate and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

MR. ANDERSON (106th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is Senate Amendment LCO 3865.

S-116

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1976

VOL. 19
PART 4
1306 - 1791

April 22, 1976 J.G.T. 62

establishes a fee of \$10.00 payable to the Motor Vehicles Commissioner prior to the issuance or registration of an operator's license which has been suspended or revoked. If there's no objection, I would move this bill to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

No objection. So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Turning to page 12 of the calendar, calendar 671, file 705, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Finance. Senate Bill No. 515. AN ACT CONCERNING REGISTRATION OF SNOWMOBILES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lieberman.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, I move acceptance and passage and to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 672, File 708, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary. Substitute for Senate Bill 482. AN ACT CONCERNING REVISION OF PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE COMMITMENT OF MENTALLY ILL PERSONS.

THE CHAIR: (SENATOR FAULISO, PRESIDENT PRO TEM)

Senator Lieberman.

SENATOR OWENS:

Mr. President, if I may, I would move acceptance of the

April 22, 1976 J.G.T. 63

committee's joint favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR OWENS:

I would like to remark very briefly since this is the major effort of the Committee on Humane Institutions this year, Mr. President. A great deal of effort has gone into it, a great deal of changes have been made defined and it is presently a good bill. It would in effect change the standards for commitment to the mental hospital. There have long been abuses in the standards of commitment in mental hospitals in this State and in other States and this bill will restore and set a standard that will eliminate lots of habeas corpus proceedings and lots of mismanagement in this area. It has the broad support of the Commissioner of Mental Health, a broad base for it from many of the legal advisors in the mental hospitals from legal service programs thru-out the State, and I should also point out that the standards that have been adopted here are already being implemented in the hospitals. The bill in effect allows a commitment if a patient is mentally ill and dangerous to themselves or others. That's the added standard that's given - dangerous to themselves or others besides being mentally ill. It's a much needed change of definition, the bill sets ^{up} good standards, it's an excellent piece of legislation and I would urge its passage. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objection, it may be placed on the Consent