



CONNECTICUT AFL-CIO

56 Town Line Road, Rocky Hill, CT 06067
Tel: 860-571-6191 Fax: 860-571-6190

447

Testimony of the Connecticut AFL-CIO before the Labor and Public Employees Committee

February 24th, 2015

Senator Winfield, Representative Tercyak and members of the Labor and Public Employees Committee,

I am Lori Pelletier and I serve as the Executive Secretary- Treasurer of the Connecticut AFL-CIO. I am here to testify on behalf of the 900 affiliated local unions who represent 200,000 working men and women from every city and town in our great state as follows:

On behalf of both union and non-union workers in this state the Connecticut AFL-CIO submits this testimony for your consideration. Since the 1980's worker protections have been diminishing. Income inequality today is at record levels and with the inaction in Washington there doesn't appear to be any relief in sight. From the underfunding of OSHA to delays in the confirmation of members of the NLRB safe guards for workers are not a priority and this is making a bad situation worse.

How does this relate to the proposed changes to the Fund? Well it demonstrates a pattern, a pattern of disadvantaging workers who as consumers drive our economic engine. For decades workers and their allies have fought for protections under the Fund. In the early 1990's the legislature enacted changes to worker eligibility with promises of fund solvency. The taxable wage base was raised to \$15,000.00 in 1999 and despite calls to include a regular adjustment to that amount nothing more has been done.

So here we are today in a similar situation as we were 20 years ago with the similar proposals to undermine the stability of our families who are in the midst of a crisis situation. Remember, employers have the ultimate power in that they control employees' income. So when a husband or wife loses their job through no fault of their own they need a safety net to protect their family.

Each of the "proposed" changes is punitive to the worker. Today's workforce has more women than men, is becoming more and more part time, so increasing the earning requirements or changing the formula hurts families. Initiating a one week waiting period or freezing the maximum benefit hurts our consumer driven economy. Too many workers today live paycheck to paycheck, so the waiting week proposed means for those workers that they will have no money to spend on rent, groceries, gas etc. I suppose they could get their landlord to agree to a week's free rent? Hardly.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER
Lori J. Pelletier

PRESIDENT
Salvatore Luciano

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
Melodie M. Peters

GENERAL VICE PRESIDENT
Thomas A. Wilkinson

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
David A. Roche

TRUSTEES
Mark A. Espinosa
Jeffrey H. Matchett
Jean M. Morningstar

EXECUTIVE BOARD
John Altieri
Richard Benham
Karen Blanchard
Tammie Botelho

Beverley Brakeman
Wayne Burgess
Michael Calderon
Peter Carozza, Jr.
Peter Carroll
Carol Censki
Frank Cirillo
Everett Corey
Shellye Davis
Kenneth DeLaCruz
Michael Dennehy
Stephen Ferrucci III

Ronald Frost
Patrick Gaynor
Richard Golembiewski
William Henderson
Juan Hernandez
Keri Hoehne
Thursa Isaac
Clarke King
Charles LeConche
Laila Mandour
Bette Marafino
John McCarthv

Richard McCombs
Stephen McKeever
Ronald McLellan
Craig Metz
Anna Montaivo
Tiana Ocasio
Warren Pepicelli
Michael Petosa
Ronald Petronella
Robert Proto
Peter Reilly
Carmen Reves

Michael Rosario
Kathleen Santlago
Patrena Smith
Barbara Smyth
Valerie Stewart
James Wallace, Jr.
Paul Wallace

PRESIDENT EMERITUS
John W. Olsen