

TESTIMONY OF THE

GREATER DANBURY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
MILFORD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
NORTHWEST CONNECTICUT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
CONNECTICUT COALITION OF PROPERTY OWNERS
ALLIANCE OF CONNECTICUT YMCAS
LUMBER DEALERS' ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT MESSENGER COURIER ASSOCIATION

BEFORE THE LABOR & PUBLIC EMPLOYEES COMMITTEE
1:00 PM, TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2011
ROOM 2A, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

Good afternoon, my name is Marshall Collins. I am appearing today in my capacity as Counsel for Government Relations for the above referenced organizations (hereinafter the "Organizations"). Collectively they represent approximately 3,500 employers in Connecticut. They include both for profit and not-for-profit employers.

Good Afternoon. **The seven above named organizations individually and collectively oppose SB 913 AA Mandating Employers Provide Paid Sick Leave To Employees.**

Whether employers are for-profit or non-profit entities, they all know that to compete for good employees, they have to offer benefits. Virtually all of the 3,500 member employers represented by these organizations offer benefits including paid sick leave to their full-time workers. However, mandating that they offer additional benefits to their part-time workers is expensive, can be an administrative nightmare, and may have little relationship to protecting the public. In the briefest terms, this bill is unnecessary and is bad for Connecticut.

In this deep recession, the additional cost to employers cannot possibly create one additional job. In fact it will cost many part-time workers their jobs as many companies would eliminate the part-time people and replace them with far fewer full-time workers.

The seven organizations do not necessarily see this as dramatically increasing the possibility for abuse. However, the bill is expensive regardless of whether the person uses the sick time or not. Companies have to reserve the funds to pay for the sick leave, and oftentimes to hire a replacement worker as well. Non-profits in particular would fail audits if they did not reserve funds to pay for accumulated sick leave.

Additionally consider the cost of tracking the hours of such individuals as the student who is a part-time worker who enters and reenters the workforce when home from school on vacations or breaks?

This proposal is in no way "business friendly." It increases the cost of doing business in Connecticut versus other jurisdictions without materially benefiting the public. Does anyone really believe that Connecticut will be able to reduce its 9% unemployment rate through the passage of this bill?

Finally, how is this consistent with Governor Malloy's message that "Connecticut is open for business?" SB 913 is another mandate on Connecticut employers. It takes certain benefits (sick leave) off the table as subjects of collective bargaining. This is one more one size fits all proposal.

Employers know what they can afford and what is best for their employees. When thousands of responsible employers, as are represented by these seven organizations, oppose the bill, it is safe to say that it will not make Connecticut more "business friendly."

For these reasons and more, all seven organizations individually and collectively oppose passage of SB 913.

This completes my testimony. Thank you for your consideration.