

THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 2018

(The House of Representatives was called to order at 10:37 o'clock a.m., Speaker Joe Aresimowicz in the Chair.)

CLERK:

Representatives will convene immediately.
Members to the Chamber.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

(Gavel) Will the House please come to order?
Will members, staff and guests please rise and direct your attention to the Dais where Imam Refai Arefin will lead us in prayer.

DEPUTY CHAPLAIN IMAM REFAI AREFIN:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Let us pray. Dear Sustainer of the Universe, let us first recognize the passing of a great American, former First Lady, Barbara Bush. Her magnanimity, spirit and leadership are a source of strength for us all and our great

Nation.

In this season of growth, let us give thanks for the bounty that we have received during this year. Just as the colors of the mountains and the fruits of the harvest vary in their shades and hues, so do we. The people of Connecticut may have different ideas of how to achieve that purpose, but their hopes and aspirations are the same. We ask from the one God that he grant us inspiration to meet the needs of the future. Give us wisdom to make the right decisions, persistence to support them, and radiance that will win others to work with us. Amen.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you. Would Representative Kupchick of the 132nd district please come to the Dais and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

REPRESENTATIVE KUPCHICK (132ND):

I pledge the allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Is there any business on the clerk's desk?

CLERK:

Yes Mr. Speaker, communications from the
Governor judicial nominations.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Refer to the Committee on judiciary.

CLERK:

Favorable reports, House Bills to be tabled for
the calendar and printing.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The fine majority leader Representative Ritter
of the 1st District.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER (1ST):

Good morning Mr. Speaker, I move that we waive
the reading of the House favorable reports, the
bills to be tabled for the calendar and sorry, and
the bills be tabled for the calendar and printing.
Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

So ordered.

CLERK:

And last but not least, the daily calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Clerk. Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Zupkus seems as though you have a guest up there.

REPRESENTATIVE ZUPKUS (89TH):

I do, thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise for the point of an introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed Madam.

REPRESENTATIVE ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you. I too, with Representative Rob Sampson, I'm not sure where he is, but I would like to introduce you to my great friend Morgan Mancini. She is Miss Farmingbury 2018 and running for Miss Teen Connecticut. She is not only beautiful on the outside, she is extremely beautiful on the inside and each contestant has to have a platform and her platform is autism and today she went to, I say representatives, I say that today she went to Autism Awareness Day but she has done some great things to help close that puzzle. And I do see Representative

Sampson here so I just hope for you all to help me to welcome Morgan to the Chamber today.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Welcome to the Chamber Morgan. (Clapping) And Morgan just so you know, Representative Sampson he is up here with me. He had his file with him. He is running around doing some work, but he is here to support you so thank you for coming up today.

Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative McCarty of the 38th District, you have the floor Madam.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of an announcement?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would just like to remind the representatives that next Wednesday, April 25th will be the Connecticut Legislative Internship Recognition Ceremony from 12:00 until 3:00 and just to remind the representatives that not

to worry that anyone who has an intern your citations will be produced for you, and also if you would please establish a method to communicate with your intern during the day so that photos may be taken. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much Representative McCarty, and I did walk into the Chamber the other day when the interns were doing their mock session. They've learned a lot. It was pretty seamless. I'm actually worried about the gentleman that played the speaker. He may be coming for my position fairly soon. Representative McCarty.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTY (38TH):

Mr. Speaker and I did hear that, and it was a delight to have you there. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you. Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative McCarthy, oh I see some metals over there.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTHY (133RD):

Yes thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I am here

with Representative Dubitsky to introduce two wonderful gymnasts from the state of Connecticut. First I have Megan Cravinho from Old Lyme. She is a Level 7 competitive gymnast at the Patti Dunne School of Gymnastics. She is a junior Olympic level 7 all-around state champion and an uneven bar state champion. She placed second on the vault, balance beam and floor exercise, and she is an all-star regional qualifier competing individually against other qualifiers in all of New England and New York. So I'd like the Chamber to give her a warm welcome.

(Clapping)

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

And Mr. Speaker, we also have my lovely daughter Shelby Dubitsky who is a level 7 state all-around champion. She was the champion, state champion on bars, state champion on floor and she made the Super 17 and she will be representing the state of Connecticut in the nationals against six other states in the region. (Clapping) So ladies and gentleman, our level 7 champions.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much for coming to the capital today.

Are there any other announcements or introductions?

Will the House come back to order, ladies and gentleman? If I can have your attention please, and then the minority leader and the majority leader are going to speak. As many of you know that following the news, we lost one of our first ladies last night Barbara Bush. In my opinion, a great, great woman. I think we in the House would like the opportunity to honor her. We will start with the minority, Representative Minority Leader Representative Klarides to speak on Barbara Bush before we do the moment of silence.

REPRESENTATIVE KLARIDES (114TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and thank you for your kind words. I think that particularly in this day and age where everything has become so political and that you are either right or wrong or good or bad or one party or the other; to stand up here and be able to say something about such a wonderful woman and

you know the interesting part of it is we've gotten to the place in society where a woman doesn't think it's good enough to be the first lady right you want to be the president, you want to be the governor, you want to be the leader and we sometimes look at being that support as the inferior position. But when we look at a woman like Barbara Bush we not only see a wife, we see a mother and we see a woman that was not only the first lady to a president but the first mom to a president and a woman that showed her strength every day; didn't have to band her chest about that strength, didn't have to be the one on the front line to show that strength, but showed it in different ways with the support of her husband and her family and her son, with her support of this country and whether that was quiet support, loud support, whether that was her great sense of humor, she gave something to this county that I don't think we've seen since and I just want to thank you Mr. Speaker for giving us this moment to talk about it because she is not only a former first lady, she's an American Hero. Thank you. (Clapping)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much Madam. Representative Ritter.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER (1ST):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and I want to echo the minority leader's remarks. I could not agree more about what a wonderful life she lived. There were two things that stuck out to me this morning when I was reading the Obituary. One was how long her and President Bush had been married, over 70 years. She was a freshman at Smith College. My mother's Alma Mater actually, and she dropped out to marry this young man named George Bush and they started their own lives, and 70 plus years of marriage. I know my wife is not hoping for that probably on my end.

And then the second thing that struck me was, and I never knew this, that they had a child, a daughter, who died when she was three years old to leukemia. And anyone in this chamber who has children or nieces or nephews, there's probably nothing more life-altering than to lose a young child at three years old and then spend the rest of

your life in a public space, not just a public space, the most public of spaces. That just takes a courage and a strength that a lot of us don't possess and so she is an American Hero, not for all the political stuff although that's really important but to raise your family to be a rock through so many difficult circumstances on a personal level and have that amazing life really is truly what makes our country special and great. So I think we are all going to stand here in a bipartisan way and pay tributes to an American Hero as Representative Klarides said. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much Representative. (Clapping)
And a couple of facts that weren't mentioned that I would like to add to. It was over 26 moves from when she was married until they finally settled in Texas that she went along with our former president and still kept everything together. And it was only her and Abigail Adams that were both a first lady and a first mother. A truly, truly great American.

I would like everyone in the Chamber if we

could still stand please and offer a moment of
silence in the memory of Barbara Bush. (Gavel)
Thank you very much. Chamber will stand at ease.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Will the House please come back to order. And
would the Clerk please call Calendar 36?

CLERK:

Connecticut General Assembly House of
Representatives, April 18, 2018 on Page 46 House
Calendar 36, Substitute House Bill No. 5185, AN ACT
CONCERNING GUARDIANSHIP APPOINTMENTS FOR INDIVIDUALS
SEEKING SPECIAL IMMIGRANT JUVENILE STATUS.
Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on
Judiciary.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban of the 43rd, you have the
floor Madam.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move
acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report
and passage of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Question before the chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Please proceed Madam.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill allows Connecticut to comply with federal law as it applies to abused, neglected and abandoned youth between the ages of 18 and 21 who are eligible for Special Immigration Juvenile Status. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 3428. I ask that he call it and I'd be allowed to summarize.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Would the Clerk please call LCO 3428 and shall be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A LCO No. 3428 offered by Representative Urban.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban, please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, this bill is basically technical changes to the bill that were recommended

by LCO and the probate court, and I urge adoption, I
move adoption.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Question before the Chamber is adoption of
House A, adoption of House A. Will you remark
further on House A?

If not, I will try your minds, all those in
favor please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

One moment. Representative Zupkus or
Representative Dubitsky, you have a comment on House
A?

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we don't
have a copy of House A, so if you could wait until
we actually have seen what we are voting on, I would
appreciate it.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Absolutely, thank you very much. Thank you
representatives. House will stand at ease.

House will come back to order. (Gavel)

Representative Zupkus on House A.

REPRESENTATIVE ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a couple of questions to the proponent of the bill please?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed Madam.

REPRESENTATIVE ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you. I am just now seeing this amendment so could the good representative please explain this amendment and what it means?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the ranking member. This amendment was brought to us by the probate court and LCO. It does not change the underlying meaning of the bill at all. It was a -- it was their feeling that in order to comply with federal law, which is what we are trying to comply with, that they needed to change the language. So

it does not change the underlying meaning of the bill at all.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you. Representative Zupkus.

REPRESENTATIVE ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes, thank you for that information. So I am in favor of this amendment and we will see if there are any other questions on the floor as we move forward. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Madam. Representative Ackert of the 8th district, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it and to the good chair of Children's. Essentially this language, essentially as you -- because I just saw it -- I read the legislation and thought it was coherent to me, but so and the fact that I don't think -- the coordination with, it sounds like it was with a ranking member which is always I think good policy here to kind of get this aired out, so

there aren't any questions, but this essentially
cleans up the language to meet better with the
federal regulations?

Through you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't have put
it better myself.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Ackert.

REPRESENTATIVE ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and thank you for that
for the legislative intent, I greatly appreciate it.
Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you sir. Further on House A? Further on
House A? If not, I will try your minds again. All
in favor please say Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Opposed no. (Gavel) Amendment is adopted.

Further on the bill as amended? Further on the bill as amended? Representative Urban, do you care to -- Urban please, thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes, this -- the federal law which is the special immigration juvenile status is designed to protect children up to the age of 21 who have been abandoned, abused or neglected by allowing them to pursue legal status. I would tell my colleagues that by voting for this bill, you are not deciding or creating immigration policy. You are simply removing an obstacle our state laws created for vulnerable and dependent youth trying to apply for protection that our federal government has made available to them for the last 28 years. It's a two-step process.

First they obtain a special finding from our probate court. Once they obtain that special finding, then with that in hand they can apply for the special immigrate juvenile status from the federal government. So we are not making that

decision, it goes to the federal government. The bill seeks to extend this from 18 to 21. That is the gap that we have in Connecticut. It has already happened in other states and actually our own Connecticut Supreme Court directed us to try to find a legislative solution for these youths that are between 18 and 21, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative Urban. Further on the bill as amended. Representative Candelora of the 86th, you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. If I may, a couple of questions to the proponent of the bill?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I had voted against this bill in the Judiciary Committee when we saw it and frankly I think in part it was -- trying to get a better understanding of what the bill does. And I

guess this bill distinguishes between juveniles in general and it specifically relates to individuals with immigration status, some sort of immigration status or does it apply to all juveniles between the ages of 18 and 21.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no. This is very specific and it reflects federal law that has been in place for 28 years. The federal law goes to age 21. Because of a definition that we have in our state, we don't go to 21, we go 18. So this is to fill that gap 18 to 21. They have to meet specific requirements before the probate court will allow them to have the special finding which then allows them to go on to the federal government and apply for this status.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Candelora.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I do recognize that there's some hurdles to jump through. Under current law, these individuals that would fit the criteria that might be 19 or 20 years old, what happens right now without this law being in place?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my assumption is that they would be being looked for and deported.

Through you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Candelora.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. So what this does is sort of enable somebody to step into their shoes and represent them for that time in order to stay here for guardianship purposes?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the requirements. So that that person that is applying for this first of all cannot be married and they have to consent to the guardianship of an individual that we've found that can offer that guardianship.

Through you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Candelora.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. And one final question. It's -- as I read it, it's not all individuals who may be immigrants. These are particular individuals so under what circumstance -- if I could just get one example of somebody who might fit into this criteria?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. We had an enormous

amount of testimony and all of the testimony was in favor of the bill. These are children who have ended up in our country abandoned, neglected or abused. How they've gotten across the border sometimes might be with parents who then abandoned them or they have fled from situations in their own country where they were subject to war, death, whatever. They have been abandoned, they have been neglected. We had several children come in and speak to us, but I would refer the good representative to the actual Supreme Court Case which was Henry, and I don't have the number, but I can refer you to that case which would then show you exactly why the Supreme Court asked us as a legislature to move forward and close this gap.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Candelora.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't have any further questions. I appreciate the clarification. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you. Representative Dubitsky of the 47th, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. A few questions for the proponent if I may?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you. The good representative had indicated that there are other states that have already done this.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask what other states are they.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there are a significant number of states who define minor up to age 21, but there are ones that don't and we are one of the ones that don't. Of the ones that don't, New York, California, Maryland, New Jersey and

Massachusetts have made this adjustment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that on those few states the -- and I would just note that we seem to be grouped into sort of a category with those very states in a number of things, some of which are not necessarily beneficial to our state, but I would ask. In those states, what is their current age of majority for other things such as the age of majority for becoming emancipated from your parents? My understanding is 18 in Connecticut.

So through you Mr. Speaker, I would ask what are the ages of majority in those states that we are going to be emulating.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I believe that the age of majority is what it is in Connecticut which is

18.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, and through you Mr. Speaker am I correct in interpreting this to say that if -- should this bill pass we will be extending that beyond the age of majority so we will then be considering juveniles to be up to 21?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, only under these special circumstances which are being overseen by our probate court and within that special circumstance if the probate court deems that these children are in fact meeting the criteria then they would be able to apply to the federal government because it is the federal government that has established the age of 21, not the state of Connecticut. We are simply trying to close that

gap.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. So am I correct to interpret the good representative's answer to mean that the federal government considers a person a juvenile up until the age of 21?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, as applies to special immigration immigrant juvenile status under the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services the federal government does use the age of 21 under those circumstances.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Are there any other

aspects of our law that would be affected? And what I mean by that is extending the term juvenile to a person that's 21 years old in this particular circumstance. Would that affect any other circumstance of our law that would reflect on the age of majority of an individual?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you Mr. Speaker. We've worked very closely with the probate court to be sure that this would not have unintended consequences any place in our state law that it is specific to what the federal government and the Connecticut Supreme Court has asked us. Well the federal government didn't ask us, that's their policy. But the Connecticut Supreme Court directed the legislature to try to close this gap.

Through you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. So for example if there are provisions of our law that treat individuals as adults for the purposes of criminal penalties, if the probate court found that a given individual was a juvenile for the purpose -- and they were up to 21 years old, would that have any effect on any type of criminal penalties that might be imposed on this person who was now deemed still a juvenile at the age of 21?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, absolutely not. This only impacts the federal policy.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

And with regard to the amendments, I heard the discussion that these were just essentially technical. Can I -- with regard -- was the

definition of minor child incorrect in the original bill, is that why it needed to be fixed?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that it was not in fact incorrect, it was just that our LCO and the probate court had language that they felt more comfortable with in coming into compliance with federal laws.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REPRESENTATIVE DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you sir. Representative O'Neill of the 69th district, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. If I may, a couple of questions. The proponent of the bill earlier on eluded to a court case that apparently is involved

in the basis of this legislation coming forward and so I was trying to find that court case and unfortunately in the time that we've been having our discussion I wasn't able to. So I believe -- in looking at the materials that are attached to the bill, the LCO or rather OLR report there is reference to a case of Henry B. and I am wondering is that the case in Connecticut -- was it the Henry B. case that was what caused the Supreme Court in Connecticut to suggest that we change the statute?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

And was that case a Connecticut case or is Henry B. a federal case, because I did find a reference of a federal case Henry B. that goes back to 2007 and I'm just -- is it by accident that they

happen to have the same names, because the other reference was to a case this past fall.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

I'm not familiar with the other case the good representative is referring to but this was in fact a state case and it was ruled on ultimately by our state Supreme Court.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and if I could ask, again because I haven't been able to locate that case myself if the proponent could sort of explain what the basic underlying facts of that particular case were.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Certainly Mr. Speaker, through you, it was Henry P. D. P. I do have some numbers that I could give you, but what happened was in Henry's case his mother, who was what's represented as his guardian and his step-father, he turned 18 before the case was heard and so it was denied and that's why it went to the Supreme Court and they adjudicated that case in favor of Henry. And it was in that moment that they told us we needed to close that gap from 18 to 21 so that we would be in compliance with federal law.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, but then was the relief that the plaintiff Henry P. seeking -- it sounds like it was granted that the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the complainant or the petitioner. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes that's correct.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Then that leaves me wondering why is it if the court was able to grant the petitioner his requested relief, why we need to change the statute? What is it that -- if they were able to act in his favor, how did they get there if the statute doesn't support the action?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It was that he turned 18 during the pendency of the state court proceedings and when he turned 18 during it, that led them to I believe the lower court to then say that he would not get the status or the status to

seek federal protection that he was looking for. So he was 18 when they started, they asked for an emergency proceeding. They didn't get there, so that's why it went to the Supreme Court. But it was because he turned 18 at the time. They had applied before that, so that brought the court to say to us as a legislature we should come in to compliance with federal law.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

I apologize Mr. Speaker, but I was having a great deal of difficulty understanding a lot of the answer that was put forward, so let me ask, perhaps I can tease out some of the question that I am not sure about. Was the action by the Supreme Court insufficient? Was the plaintiff or petitioner unable to get the relief from the federal government because he turned 18 during the pendency of the action so that he won in Connecticut but lost at the federal level?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is a two-step process. So until and unless we have indicated that this particular juvenile has met the requirements that we as a state oversee, the particular individual cannot go to the second step which is the federal government. So what had happened here was he was in court proceedings, he turned 18 and that's what caused the problem. And the Supreme Court in reviewing and granting him the --granting oversight to go on with a special immigrant juvenile status indicated that it would be a good thing for our legislature to take a positive action on that gap between 18 and 21.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. But just to follow up, do we know whether the individual in this particular

case was able to obtain the relief that he was seeking all the way through the federal government, I assume administrative proceedings.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I can't say for sure that I absolutely know that. I only know what the court directed us a legislature to do.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. And if I might ask, this sort of a change in the status of our laws relating to probate courts and that sort of thing, especially something that originated from a Supreme Court decision, ordinarily I would think of it as something that would have started in the Judiciary Committee and I'm just wondering why this particular change, which is rather of a technical one as the

amendment which we just passed was very technical in changing the law with respect to this type of jurisdiction. Why did it originate in the Children's Committee instead of the Judiciary Committee?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. We do in fact have cognizance over anything that applies to children and we took this bill in discussion with Judiciary, Judiciary knowing that it would have to go to Judiciary also. So that's why we started it in Children's.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. So, and to try to understand are there other cases -- do we know if there are other cases that are going to be affected

by the passage of this particular piece of legislation that are currently pending? Do we know if there are other cases like that that are in our court system?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I do not have a number. I am only able to assume that when we change that from 18 to 21 that there will be people that will be coming forward to try to be under the Special Immigration Juvenile Status and apply for that federal protection.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. And I noticed also that there was a reference to, that there was a considerable amount of testimony. In the course of the testimony, were there any people who said that

their cases would be affected by this? I did take a quick look and there is quite a bit of testimony. I started reading through it, but I'm just wondering if there are during the course of the public hearing whether there were people who testified that they would be affected -- their case situation would be affected by the passage of this legislation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the majority of testimony that we got from young people were people that had availed themselves before the age of 18 and they came to testify to tell us what a difference it made in their lives and what they are going to be able to achieve and their ability to actually be able to be a part of a job and economic growth, et cetera, so that was the testimony that we received.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. And again one of the things that was mentioned was that there were a number of states that have made changes related to this federal law which I gather from the earlier conversations, has been on the books for about 28 years, so I guess I'm a little surprised that this is the first time it is coming to our attention. And in a quick look, I noticed that there were several states that made changes. Do we know if this is something that is going to be part of a national wave so to speak or is it just that states -- most other states already have 21 as the age of majority for probate court purposes and that sort of thing?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I cannot comment on whether it's a national wave. The only thing I can comment on is it has been federal law for 28 years, so I can't anticipate, I can't extrapolate and

project what kind of numbers there might be, but I do think it is appropriate for us in the state of Connecticut to be in compliance with what the federal government's law is.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. The other part of this question about why this is coming up at this particular moment that I am wondering about it, since it has been on the books for 28 years, was there any testimony that there were people that were denied access who were told you turned 18 or you are too late because our maximum age for juvenile is 18 that you are ineligible. Did anyone testify that they would have sought the relief but weren't able to do so because of our age?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. We were certainly apprised of juveniles where that had happened, but in order for that juvenile to come and testify would be a little difficult because now they had not been awarded the status and they were over the age of 18, so we did find from the people that came to testify that there were indeed juveniles who did not -- were not able to do this because of the gap in our law in Connecticut.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. And I thank the good chairman for her answers to the questions.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you sir. Representative Smith of the 108th.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

Good morning Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Good morning, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

Thank you sir. Just a few questions, if I may, through you?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

Now I too voted against this when it came before us in Judiciary mostly because I wasn't sure what it really did at the time. It was one of the referrals and we really didn't have the background. It was nice to hear an explanation this morning on what we are really trying to do here. As I understand it, simply raising the age from 18 to 21 to comply with federal law. I think that's the gist of it. The question I do have though, through you Mr. Speaker, under the bill analysis it talks about the certain criteria that has to be met in order to actually meet the federal standards. I don't know that I've heard that here this morning, what that criteria is for this to actually kick in. So if the chairman could tell me that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If I heard the good representative correctly, there are several criteria which the probate court would be the ones that would ascertain whether those criteria had been met. They must be under 21. They must be unmarried. They must be dependent on a competent caregiver, and they must consent to the appointment of a guardian after turning 18, and they have to have filed the petition with the probate court. And just to remind the chamber, that is the first step in a two-step process. That simply gets them to the federal government. We are not making the decision.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Smith.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

I thank the chairman for that response. In order to meet the Special Immigration Juvenile Status, the criteria that was just outlined by the

chairman those first have to come into play. Are there additional criteria that have to be met or is that it that it moves from the probate court onto the federal court?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. In our close working with the probate court, it is my understanding those are the criteria and it is the responsibility of the probate court once that petition is filed to be sure and clear that that juvenile meets those criteria.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Smith.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, that's all the questions I have.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you sir. Representative Belsito of the 53rd district, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE BELSITO (53RD):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I have a few basic questions for the proponent of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed sir.

REPRESENTATIVE BELSITO (53RD):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, are there any specific reasons as to why the age was changed between 18 and 21, I mean very specific?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed sir.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

(Laughing) Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, this was initially offered by the federal government. So it was the federal government under the U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services that established that age of 21. We didn't establish it, they established it 28 years ago.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Belsito.

REPRESENTATIVE BELSITO (53RD):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Have -- in your knowledge of this bill and what is going on, have there been problems with individuals from 18 through 21?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, we had a testimony from people who had achieved this status who are under 18 indicating to us that there were people between the ages of 18 and 21 that had not been able to do it because of that gap, but we are not -- we were not able to have them testify for obvious reasons because they were between 18 and 21 and did not have the ability to apply for this.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Belsito.

REPRESENTATIVE BELSITO (53RD):

And one more question through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the bill. To the proponent, will this the change in age here in Connecticut since it's been in force for 28 years or so, will this decrease the amount of problems we have had in this area?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Urban.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I can't speak to whether it would decrease it, but I can speak to the issue of these immigrant children who have been abandoned, abused and neglected and would be able now between the ages of 18 to 21, under the ages of our probate court and the federal government to continue their education to be able to become a productive part of society. So it would be my projection that it would in fact benefit the economy in the state of Connecticut.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Belsito.

REPRESENTATIVE BELSITO (53RD):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and thank you to the
proponent of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

You're welcome. Representative Sampson of the
80th, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Hello.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

I just wanted to start by stating that I have
been enjoying the conversation about the bill before
us, and I think it's delightful that we are
addressing concern that we have in our state law
regarding the supremacy of the federal government
when it comes to immigration. I wholly support the
bill before us, well actually the amended bill
before us, and I am hopeful that it passes. But I
also believe this gives us an opportunity to address
a glaring problem in our state law on the subject of

immigration. And I would like to do that, Mr. Speaker, by offering an amendment. The clerk has an amendment. It is LCO 3749, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The clerk may have an amendment, but I do not. So the House will stand at ease momentarily.

The House please come back to session. (Gavel)
Representative Sampson, you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, you should have an amendment before you and the clerk should have it. It is LCO 3749. I would like to have it called and have the opportunity to summarize.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative Sampson. Will the clerk please call LCO 3749 which shall be designated as House Amendment Schedule "B"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule B LCO No. 3749,
offered by Representative Sampson and Representative Dubitsky.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Sampson has asked permission from the chamber to summarize, without objection please proceed sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. The amendment before us is in addition to the underlying bill. I want to make it clear that I support the underlying legislation. It does the right thing, which I like to see in this chamber by making changes to our state law to conform with federal law, which we all know has supremacy when it comes to the arena of immigration law. My amendment simply removes language from our current law that is in violation and direct opposition to federal law. It eliminates what's commonly known as the Trust Act from our state law, and that is simply added as a last section to the underlying bill which I also support.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative Sampson.
Representative Ritter of the 1st, for what purpose do you rise sir?

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER (1ST):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, I move that we pass this item temporarily.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Without objection, so ordered. (Gavel) Are there any announcements or points of personal privilege? Representative Hall of the 7th district, for what purpose do you rise sir?

REPRESENTATIVE HALL (7TH):

I rise for a moment of silence.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed sir.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL (7TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I regret to inform the chamber of the passing of the honorable Clyde Mark Billington Jr. Mr. Billington formerly represented the 7th assembly district, the district I currently represent. Mr. Billington was quite the powerhouse, not only was he a representative he also served our country honorably in the United States Army and was a business owner. He opened many doors for people of color in our state. In fact, he founded the

black and Puerto Rican caucus here in the chamber.

Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you very much. Would the chamber please recognize a moment of silence? (Gavel)

Are there any other announcements or points of personal privilege? Representative Lemar of the 96th, for what purpose do you rise sir?

REPRESENTATIVE LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of announcement.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, you've seen Bridgeport Day and Danbury Day and even New Milford Day this year. All wonderful days celebrating some truly nice places in Connecticut, but today is in fact the best of the days here in the capital in which New Haven Day is down in the lobby serving up some nice free, world-renowned best in the country Pepe's pizza for everyone who makes

their way down. So make sure to get on down there today and see so many of the wonderful things New Haven has to offer. Of course, including our world-renowned best-in-the-country pizza. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative Lemar, we look forward to that each year.

Will the clerk please call Calendar 245?

CLERK:

On Page 32, Calendar 245, House Bill No. 5439, AN ACT CONCERNING INFORMATION RELATING TO BIOSCIENCE AND CROWDFUNDING ON THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WEB SITE. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Commerce.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Simmons, you have the floor
Madam.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Question before the chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Please proceed Madam.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. This bill requires the Department of Economic and Community Development to include information and resources related to bioscience and crowd funding on its main webpage. And the purpose of this bill is two-fold.

First with respect to bioscience. This is one of our state's high-growth industries. It currently employs over 35,000 people at over 2,000 businesses in our state and is expected to grow by another 20,000 jobs over the next decade, and it's important to prominently display information and resources related to this industry as we continue to try to grow this industry and attract more bioscience jobs to our state. With respect to crowd funding, this is an excellent resource for start-ups and entrepreneurs that are looking to access capital. We know this can be one of the biggest barriers for

new businesses that are trying to access capital and start up and crowd funding is increasingly being used by entrepreneurs to access capital, and we believe this is important information to be included in our main economic development website.

This bill passed commerce nearly unanimously. There is no fiscal note and I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative Simmons.
Representative Yaccarino of the 87th, you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and good morning.
Question to the good chair of commerce, through you Mr. Speaker?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed sir.
REPRESENTATIVE YACCARINO (87TH):

To the good chair of commerce, you did mention there's no fiscal note. Was that correct in this legislation?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Simmons.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMMONS (144TH):

That's correct, no fiscal not.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Yaccarino.

REPRESENTATIVE YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you for that answer. So would it be up to DECD to coordinate with the bioscience industry or CI or just on their website portal?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Simmons.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMMONS (144TH):

Yes, that's correct Representative. It would be up to DECD to coordinate with the relevant agencies and include information pertaining to bioscience on its website.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Yaccarino.

REPRESENTATIVE YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you for that answer. I am pleased to see that DECD is finally recognizing that this is such a crucial industry to our state. I believe that this says 20,000 jobs over the next 10 years; I think if we are proactive as a state we could grow 20,000 jobs in two or three years. And as far as the clustering of the crowd funding, if you look at Massachusetts, Boston area, California, it's always those clusters that bring people together. And any awareness that we could bring to this great potential growth for our economy is something we need to do. I have always said we can't continue to cut, we can't continue to tax, we need to grow our economy and I think this is a small step and we'll have more to come through this session for this industry. So I support this strongly, and thanks to the good chairwoman, and thank you Mr. Chair.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative. Representative Smith of the 108th, you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

Good morning Mr. Chairman. A few questions,

through you, please.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

Thank you. I am just looking at the act as the bill, I'm not sure what prevents our Commissioner from doing this now and why we need the legislation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Simmons.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMMONS (144TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the good representative for the question. And we have spoken to the Department of Economic Community Development and they have agreed to include this information, but we felt it was important as the legislative body to make it more permanent and binding and to require this through law.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Smith.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

I appreciate the chairman's response. I'm not sure it's necessary to enact legislation just to have somebody do what they should be doing to enhance our state's economic viability, but so be it. Here we are talking about this today. I guess the only concern I have about it, Mr. Speaker, is it seems like we are limiting this to you know the biomedical field. If there are other businesses out there or other entrepreneurs who wish to have their information on the state website, are we allowing that as well?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Simmons.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMMONS (144TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the good representative for the excellent question and we absolutely do want to support other industries as well. And one thing we noticed as we were reviewing the main economic development website is that other industries are mentioned including manufacturing, health care, IT, even film and television, there are a lot of resources mentioned for those industries

and so we just wanted to make sure we were adding an additional high-growth industry that we've made significant investments in the state on. But you are absolutely right, we want to make sure we are including others as well.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Smith.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

Again, thank the chairwoman for the answer, and as long as we are not picking and choosing winners Mr. Speaker I guess I can support the bill, but if we are doing that then I would be obviously concerned. And I thank the chairwoman for her answers.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you sir. Further on the bill? Further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, staff and guests please retire to the well of the House, Chamber will be open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. (Ringing)

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Please check the board to make sure your vote is properly cast. If all members have voted the machine will be locked. Will the clerk please take a tally? And would the clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5439,

Total number Voting	142
Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	142
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	8

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The bill passes. (Gavel)

The House will stand at ease. (Gavel)

The House please call Calendar 307. Will the House come back to order first? (Gavel) And would

the clerk please call Calendar 307?

CLERK:

On Page 36 House Calendar 307, Substitute House Bill No. 5290, AN ACT CONCERNING THE OFFICE OF HEALTH STRATEGY. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on public health.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg of 136th, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Good afternoon Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Good afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

The clerk is in possession, actually why don't we just go for--

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

--move the bill--

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

-- For acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Question before the chamber is passage of the bill. Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

That was much more straightforward. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that the legislature last year passed and the Governor signed Public Act 17-2 which established the Office of Health Strategy for the state of Connecticut. The bill we have before us today makes a number of technical changes to enable the orderly transition of various functions currently being managed by other entities to the new entity of the Office of Health Strategy. Specifically among the changes, it replaces the Connecticut health insurance exchange and also takes responsibility for the Lieutenant Governor's Healthcare Cabinet. Most importantly, it also transfers responsibility from the Department of Public Health to the new Office of Health Strategy for responsibility for OHCA and for the CON process and also transfers the state information model initiative, the SIM Initiative, to the new entity and a few other things which I'm sure we will get

into. I move passage Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you. Question before the chamber is on passage of this bill. Further on the bill? If not, staff and guests please retire to the -- Representative Betts on the bill, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Good morning Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. A few questions if I may through you to the proponent of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

You may, please proceed sir.

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

To the good chairman, could you -- this is -- I just want to confirm for everybody's benefit in the chamber despite the bill being 120 pages long, this really truly is a technical bill and for that reason I will not be going through it section by section, but I do have some general questions that I would like to pose.

One is; what is the mission of this new Office

of Health Strategy and why was it created and what is its goal?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and thank the representative for that excellent question. The Office of Health Strategy was created to more efficiently coordinate the activities of a number of agencies and working groups, all in the interest of promoting the public health of the people of the state of Connecticut. By creating a single point of entry for data collection and analysis, we will hopefully be able to aid various healthcare entities with the pursuit of better healthcare for the people of the state of Connecticut.

It's also intended to avoid duplication of effort by definition that would create greater efficiency overall as well as several other benefits related to how we coordinate among various healthcare practitioners in the state such that

communication and transparency are preserved while also preserving protection of data and adhering to HIPAA regulations.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Betts.

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much. And through you, Mr. Speaker, that sounds all well and good and I really believe what the chairman said but I am wondering if he can confirm that by through the testimony which there are several entities that are affected specifically by not only OHCA but this new Office of Health Strategy. I wonder if the chairman could share some of the testimony that was given, whether it was in support of this new office and if so why they were so supportive.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. The testimony was

virtually all positive. We heard from not only the new executive director of the Office of Health Strategy but from the Connecticut Hospital Associations, various affected parties; all were supportive of the concept of not only creating the Office of Health Strategy but were all encouraged by the potential benefits it would bring to the people of the state of Connecticut. Many of them noted the ability for greater efficiency and coordination among agencies and working groups and generally were very hopeful that this would bring results that would bring immediate benefits to the people of the state of Connecticut.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Betts.

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Thank you for that answer. And in that process, I wonder if the good chairman would comment on whether the CON process how it's impacted and whether that's going to be transferred over to the new Office of Health Strategy?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes, and I hope this is the only time we discuss CON this session, but by transferring the OHCA from Department of Public Health to the Office of Health Strategy the Office of Health Strategy will be taking on those responsibilities, but importantly, and that's why I'm glad the good representative brought it up, this bill spells out the transition process so that CON applications that are currently being administered by OHCA under DPH are concluded effectively so that we don't leave any such applications in limbo. The timing is spelled out with the transition to occur by October 1, 2018.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Betts.

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much, and thank you for the

answer. And I think, as everybody's heard up to this point it just reaffirms that this really is a technical bill that's transitioning the responsibilities of an agency going into extinct into a new one; however, there does remain one outstanding issue of great concern to a lot of the parties in particular the public. I wonder if the - - not wonder, I'd like to ask the chairman to address it cause we've had several meetings on it, several questions on it and I'd like to know will we be continuing to look into this after he answers this question and that's dealing with the issue of privacy data and what the office is going to be collecting, how it's being used and whether patients' data will in fact be protected and confidential.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes, this was perhaps the single issue we spent the most time discussing

as the representative pointed out, we've had several conversations with the Office of Health Strategy on this point. Clearly, everybody agrees that protection of personal healthcare information is paramount, and in our desire to bring together data that can be used to improve health outcomes, we are going to remain vigilant to ensure that health data is protected, and that is by no means a trivial task to undertake.

To the good representative's point, we have engaged the Office of Health Strategy on their process and also the director responsible for data management there. Not only are we going to observe and adhere to every aspect of HIPAA, that's just the beginning. And the representative talks about an ongoing effort. We will maintain an ongoing dialogue with the Office of Health Strategy to assure that we are reassured that data will be protected, that only those who should have access to that data have access, that we are putting in place all the security that we possibly can looking at best practices and the best technologies available.

And I am confident that because we are going to have an ongoing dialogue we'll do the best job possible to protect individuals' health data and we will continue to have that conversation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Betts.

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Thank you for that answer, and I want to reinforce what the good chairman has said because I've heard from a lot of people, I know many people in the public health committee have, but I want to make sure that everybody in this chamber understands. You need to let the Public Health Committee and the Office of Health Strategy know if there's any concerns or problems dealing with privacy. We cannot react to it or respond to it unless we know it. So it is incumbent upon all of us and each of us to make certain that the public health committee is aware of it. It's not going to be one and done when the session is over. I think this will be a multi-year undertaking. It's an

enormously complex one, but incredibly sensitive. So I implore everybody here to understand that if they hear of any issues whatsoever that you contact the Office of Health Strategy and the Public Health Committee so that we can make sure that if there's any serious problem [inaudible- 01:33:13] collect it will immediately be addressed.

With that, I thank the good chairman. I would recommend to or offer to my colleagues to feel free to ask any questions, but I think this is a very important bill that's going to outline future comprehensive public policy that will lead potentially to lower costs, certainly greater efficiencies and I ask the chamber to support this proposal. I thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative Betts. Representative Ziobron of the 34th, you have the floor Madam.

REPRESENTATIVE ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you so much Mr. Speaker and good afternoon. It's always nice to see you on the Dais sir.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Good afternoon, always nice to have someone here from the burg, the Belltown.

REPRESENTATIVE ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you. So I rise with just a few questions to the good proponent of the bill please.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. So in reading the OLR analysis for this bill it seems that we are extending the time period to October 1, 2018, which allows this organization to collect data from patients in the hospital. I was not aware that we currently did that. I thought we did it in a way that wasn't patient ID driven, but in the OLR analysis it seems that we are allowing people to collect the personal information of the people who are in the hospital and I'd like to understand what is the purpose for that, specifically for the identification purposes in the bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm very glad the representative brought that up. We do not want to create the impression that we are going to be sharing individual identifiable data by any means. The issue of disaggregation is something we have discussed at some length during the debate on this particular legislation and other legislation. It is intended to collect data from all sorts of sources, particularly from practitioners, but as OHS has assured us the aggregation of that data will assure that individual data cannot be identified. So that the concerns that we all have that an individual patient or somebody receiving care could be identified will not occur. This is something that we, as part of our ongoing conversation, we're going to assure is absolutely protected. It is paramount to the entire concept of the data collection process.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Ziobron.

REPRESENTATIVE ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and I really appreciate that more in-depth response because I think it is very critically important that we ensure the privacy of that kind of data to our residents in this state, so I do appreciate that getting that on the record.

And through you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to give my colleagues some additional information. One of the reasons there's no fiscal note on this bill is because it's paid for through the assessments of the insurance company. And there are many accounts within the budget that we call off-budget accounts, and this is one of them. It's the insurance fund. We also have a banding fund. There may be a few others that my good friend is familiar with, but this is not being paid for by no one. It's being paid for through an assessment on our insurance companies and we are, of course, the insurance

capital of the world. I am extremely concerned when we continue to put things onto the insurance fund without further explanation.

So when I'm reading the OLR analysis of this bill, I'm looking at that analysis, not the full bill, so I don't have the line item in front of me but it seems that in Section 64 and 65 it talks specifically about the insurance assessment and some of the language does concern me because it says in the OLR analysis that the bill requires the Connecticut insurance companies and hospital and medical providers to annually pay the insurance commissioner an amount that covers the appropriation including fringe benefit, capital equipment purchases without seemingly any oversight.

So I'd like to understand specifically what assurances are insurance companies have in this great state that these budgets are going to be fiscally prudent, who is going to be approving these or is it a blank check to the insurance company to cover any and all appropriations in that account?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I share your concerns about what might be considered off that budget accounts. I would first of all suggest that if there is any such an account, this is one where the insurance companies might feel that their investment -- all of us who contribute to that would feel that the investment is well-spent with the understanding that hopefully we will drive down insurance claims by being able to improve the health of the people of the state of Connecticut. So as exceptions go, I would hope this would be one that is both efficient and logical.

To answer the representative's second question, the executive director of the Office of Health Strategy is appointed by the Governor. The administration of the Office of Health Strategy is assisted by the Department of Public Health, but most importantly I can assure you that the Public Health Committee will remain very vigilant in

staying in continuous contact to monitor the success of the Office of Health Strategy. And I want to thank the representative for putting this on our radar screen as well so that we can be good stewards and make sure that the organization that is created around the executive director is not excessive and that the expenditures are reasonable and can be justified by the activities of the Office of Health Strategy.

The question is pertinent because we are going to be building a database. There will be some costs. So we will need to make sure that that's done in the most sufficient means as possible.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Ziobron.

REPRESENTATIVE ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the good representative's response in this regard because certainly in the sub-committee process of the last year we've talked about this area of the budget, and one of the things that I

objected to in the sub-committee process was an additional employee for the executive director of the Office of Health Strategy and I was told that it was a simple transfer from the Office of the Health Advocate, but this is an executive assistant position. And when I think that now, the insurance companies are going to be paying the fringe for all of these employees, what my constituents may not understand is that the fringe benefit rate in the state of Connecticut is almost 90 percent of their salary.

So when we're looking at a budget it's very difficult and one of my continuing frustrations in the budget process is that when we look at an agency and for instance the Office of the Health Strategy and we see a line item that says PS its personal services, that's the amount of the salary. But then you have to go to the comptroller's section of the budget to find out what the fringe is, but it's not delineated by agency. So having this additional cost of the fringe benefit, which is almost equal to their salary -- we need to make sure that we are

being very cognizant when we are adding employees that we make sure we understand that we are also adding that fringe benefit cost. And that fringe benefit cost can be very expensive.

So Mr. Speaker, I'm so glad to hear that the leader and certainly the ranking member of the Public Health Committee are going to be keeping an eye on this. I take them fully at their word. We need to make sure that we keep down the administrative cost of this new health initiative. I believe in its purpose, but I also believe that our insurance companies need to be reassured that they have a fiscal watchdog on their behalf and somebody that's going to be watching those appropriations even though it's not out of the taxpayer fund, the general fund, it is going to have an impact in our insurance industry, and for that reason I wanted to bring it forward to the chamber today. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative Ziobron.

Representative Srinivasan of the 31st, you have the

floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Good to see you here
this afternoon.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Likewise sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr.
Speaker, just a few questions for clarification
purposes to the good chair of the Public Health
Committee.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr.
Speaker, we already established Public Act 17-2. So
having established that, you said this bill was just
technical changes that were there, so in technical
changes I know sometimes a lot can be included in
technical changes. So I just want to make sure, in
these technical changes, A; are we adding staff to
what was already agreed upon in the past? And B; if

so, who is going to be paying for that staff?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. If I understand the good representative's question which I believe relates to the previous questions. The staff, which will be a modest staff to administer the new role is covered by the expenditures and the insurance fund and through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and that was my understanding too, I just wanted to clarify that. And so since there is going to be the hiring of new staff and as our good Representative Ziobron brought about the cost factor, does the good chairman -- can he give us an idea as to what will be the increased burden on the insurance companies?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. No I don't have a number handy. Obviously the emphasis is on establishing an efficient group, but to be fair there will be some expenses that even go beyond staff. The establishment and the maintenance of a database which will have this health data. There will certainly be some analysis that needs to take place. So there are some investments by the state of Connecticut via the insurance fund to ensure that we can get the kind of results, the kind of product from the Office of Health Strategy that's going to lead to the benefits for the people of the state of Connecticut.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the goals are commendable. No question about that at all to

collect the data, but my concern is; is it an open check where we really don't know what the cost is going to be on the insurance fund? Because ultimately that's going to come down to you and me. It's going to come down to the taxpayer of Connecticut directly or indirectly. So it seems to be we are saying that we are going to go ahead with the plan, which is a good plan no question about that, but the plan also needs to be tied in as to what the cost factor is. And it seems to me through you, Mr. Speaker, we do not have an idea. Yes we are saying it will be under the insurance fund, no question about that, but do they know what the tab will look like or in the ballpark at least?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I share the good representative's concern to make sure that as we do with every aspect of government that we spend our money wisely, and as I've said previously there are

going to be a lot of eye's on this and I really look forward to the ongoing collaboration between our committee and the Office of Health Strategy. This is going to be one of the more exciting things we do. So I can assure you there's going to be a lot of communication, a lot or review on how they are operating and how they are bringing about change in the state of Connecticut. So I'm pretty confident that we are going to be able to go forward in a way in which everybody should have a good comfort level.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes there'll be a lot of eye's watching and making sure every dollar, every penny is spent wisely, but through you Mr. Speaker, who has the final authority?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. That would be the executive director of the Office of Health Strategy.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, does that executive officer work with or in collaboration with a board?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Could the representative repeat the question? I missed the very end of that.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan, do you care to repeat your question?

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Definitely, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, this executive director is the final say in

what the proposals are going to be and I'm concerned about the cost factor since it is an open check. Good as is, well-intended as it is, it's still an open check. But through you, Mr. Speaker, is the only final authority the executive director or is there a board that also is going to be established or is there one that is going to have a way in as well?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. There will be others who will have a lot of involvement with the operations of the Office of Health Strategy, but to be explicit I do not believe they necessarily have any final authority with regard to the operations as the good representative described. So that really still resides with the executive director.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, switching into another set of questions regarding the protection of identity and privacy, which was also raised by good ranking member Representative Betts. Through you, Mr. Speaker, the agencies that will report to the Office of Health Strategy; how will that data be decoded so therefore identity is not a concern?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

I'm sorry, once again through you Mr. Speaker, I didn't pick up the question part.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the question is what is the process that we have? The identity, the privacy will not be revealed in this transfer of information to the OHA?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and thank you to the representative for the clarification of the question. My understanding is that the state of Connecticut will benefit from the best practices in data protection working with a firm that has accomplished this for other states. It's certainly something that has been one of the most sensitive issues. It's just the discussion of electronic health records were first brought forward. There are any number of security protections, but to answer the representative's question directly, it's really a matter about how the data is stored and that it's only revealed in aggregated form, not disaggregated to the point of individual identity by name or anything else that would allow you to identify a specific person. There's been a lot of best practice built into this over the years and we believe we have a good partner such that we are doing everything possible to assure that identity is

not revealed.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, as we speak here on a Wednesday afternoon, through you Mr. Speaker, do we know who their partner is or that is going to be the privy of OHS to come up with a partner assuming that this bill moves forward?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that we do have a partner, a partner who is working in several other states currently. The name escapes me, but they have been thoroughly vetted and have had a very successful record in not only providing a great database but in providing the protections that we are also concerned about. And I should add that to correct my previous statement, all aspects of the

data management part are not paid for by the insurance fund but are actually paid for by federal funds. So that component of it is really not an issue for the insurance funding.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it's now my turn not to clearly understand what the good chair said. So if you report to us this difference between the insurance fund, the federal fund and who is responsible for what because obviously that's excellent for us to know. That we are going to be getting federal funding and I want to make sure we are all clear on what is it that's coming from the insurance fund and what is it that's coming from the federal funds.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes, allow me to offer that clarification. The insurance fund will cover the cost of staff and general operations of the Office of Health Strategy in all its various responsibilities, but explicitly that relates to the data management piece which is significant is underwritten by federal funds as it is in virtually every state.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. So in this data collection which is desegregated, will ethnicity, will race be a factor that will be included in this or not be included in this data collection?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. This has indeed been an issue of some controversy. The issue of race and

the labels that are used to identify people. I have been assured by the Office of Health Strategy that the information on race, excuse me, will not be disaggregated in the fashion that has raised a lot of those concerns. So certainly, race is not the basis for making healthcare decisions and it's not the key component of our data collection.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, could the good chair then elaborate how this data will be collected excluding race, excluding the ethnicity.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. There will be some information that will be ethnicity related, but it will be at a very top level basis. It will not be disaggregated by geography or some other factors

that raise concern. It will be consistent with how health data has been collected in the past and will not represent any new frontier in further breaking down ethnic information. So this does not represent any departure from what has been collected in the past successfully over a period of decades in terms of health information, and has been respected in that process.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the good representative is aware of the concerns that were raised with information that is being collected on an ethnic basis, on the racial basis, and am I to understand that none of those would be included in this data collection from the, through the office of OHS?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. If I understand the representative's question, based upon all of the e-mails received, I'm sure the good representative received and others may have received, the type of disaggregation by subgroups of any ethnicity will not be collected in the fashion as to which people have feared. We are working in close collaboration with the Office of Health Strategy to assure we have every confidence that the data they are collecting has integrity and has specific use for improving health outcomes. And there should be no reason to collect the data at the level which has caused so much concern among members of the community.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, the final question is could the good chair tell us as to whether such a system exists in other states?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I can't speak chapter and verse for how every state handles this. I know that other states have chosen to collect different data points than we do, but we are really going to be working directly with the Office of Health Strategy to make sure we do what's best for the people of Connecticut. We are not relying on what other states do in order to decide what we want to do.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Srinivasan.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. The bill is well intended, no question about that at all. You know we do need data, we need adequate data to make important decisions in the public health. There's no question about that at all. I'm not here arguing against that, but my two concerns about this bill,

A; is the data collection process, the integrity of this process is I'm still concerned about that because we heard extensively, extensively the various racial concerns that people have, the ethnicity that may be a concern here. And I'm not convinced as we stand here today Mr. Speaker that that privacy will be retained as we hope and we know it should.

And my other concern is a cost factor. I mean I would like to know that we are signing off today. Yes, there's a federal component I'm glad to hear that, but also what is the impact as far as the state is concerned. For us to stand here and say the taxpayer is not paying, it is by the Connecticut insurance company; ultimately my opinion is no different than even me through our insurances. So for those reasons, until we have a little more information that I'm comfortable with, I will not be able to support it this afternoon. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative Srinivasan.

Representative Betts, additional remarks?

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker for the second time, just a couple of comments. I've heard very clearly what people have been asking about today and I wonder if I could pose a question to the good chairman?

Through you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

You surely may, please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Thank you. Regarding the issue of the privacy data which we all are aware of and I previously had mentioned to everybody that we need to monitor this on a regular basis. Would the good chairman be amenable and more than amenable but actually be proactive of setting up a sub-committee within the Public Health Committee specifically tasked with the responsibility of monitoring and establishing regular communication with the Office of Health Strategy as it relates to this issue of privacy data which is of such paramount importance to everybody here. Especially as it falls within our purview,

would you be receptive to talking to your chairs to set up a sub-committee specifically to do that?

And the second suggestion I would offer is a very simple one. Each year we simply report to the general assembly, in particular to appropriations, the amount of money insurance companies are being asked to pay for and why as it relates to this posed by the questions of Representative Ziobron because I do agree with her. The assignment of the benefits for the executive assistant frankly is problematic for me, but it's already been done, but it's certainly a good way being able to anticipate questions and concerns that have been raised today. So I post those two questions to you Mr. Chairman.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I am very much supportive of both of the suggestions the good representative has brought forward. As I've stated previously, we've been in fairly consistent

conversation with the Office of Health Strategy as it relates to the issue of data protection. But I do like the idea, and I will discuss with my co-chairs and with the good ranking member the prospector, creating such a sub-committee which can provide that kind of assurance. And I'll go a step further, I'll go out on a limb I believe the executive director of the Office of Health Strategy we'll both be supportive of that idea and of providing an annual report on the operations of the Office of Health Strategy.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Betts.

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, and I thank the good chairman for that because believe me we are keenly sensitive, I am keenly sensitive I think the previous speakers have raised some very legitimate concerns and it's really incumbent upon us to address it, not ignore it or minimize it, and I think those two actions would go a long way to

making people feel a little better. So I thank you very much for the second time Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative Betts. Representative Sampson of the 80th, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and good afternoon. So I've been listening intently to the debate on the bill that's before us and I know that these questions were asked previously, but I don't know if I have a distinct grasp on the actual answer. We were told that this was a more-or-less technical bill and I'm just confused after listening to some of the Q&A about whether or not we are changing the way the Office of Health Strategy is funded and I'm hoping, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the good chairman if he could fill me in and let me know if we are changing anything in this bill before us on how it's currently funded? And my understanding is that the funding stream is by assessing the insurance companies that do business in our state, and I'd like to confirm that that's accurate also.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I thank the representative for the question. Yes, the bill is now explicit as to the funding source which does identify the insurance fund as the source for the funding and explains how that will be accomplished. It was intended to be absolutely transparent about the funding mechanism. I can't recall to what degree it was explicated in the original public act.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and thanks to the chairman for that answer. So the question and maybe I didn't quite catch that but does this bill change that mechanism in any way from what is current law?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I do not specifically recall the language in Public Act 17-2, so rather than give a potential erroneous answer I will just say to the good representative; this bill is intended to make eminently clear how it will be funded.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and thanks again to the chairman. Okay so that was my first concern is exactly where is this being paid for and what is the impact to the citizens of our state. And the second question really is, well I'll say that I have an overriding concern that seems to come back year after year. I serve as the ranking member of the Insurance Committee and it seems to me that we have an endless stream of state agencies and bureaucracies being created for the purpose of

managing the cost of healthcare and healthcare insurance in our state. We have the Access Health CT, we have had the Office of Healthcare Advocate, we've had numerous other things. We've had the SIM Initiative. We've had a lot of different things, all designed to help address problems that stem from the high cost of healthcare and therefore insurance. In my mind, our role as a state government should be limited in the area of healthcare insurance anyway, which is my area of expertise, to protecting consumers, to make sure that they get what they pay for as far as the insurance product they choose and for verifying that insurance companies actually have the ability to pay the claims that they are on the hook for with the policies they write. And that's the duty of government, and I don't think it should go much further than that. It's consumer protection, public safety. Managing the healthcare area or the healthcare insurance area to me is a step too far. So I always have that concern. I know a lot of these things consist already and maybe combining them into one agency might, in fact, be an

improvement and I get that the technical part of this bill seems to try and do that by pulling from other arenas to make that happen.

I would like to say that I'm convinced that that's the end result, but I just have one question that pertains to that subject. And that is, through you Mr. Chairman, is there anything in this bill that would give the Office of Health Strategy the ability to impact insurance premiums? And what I mean to be more clear is that the state of Connecticut insurance department is the legitimate body tasked with the role of determining insurance, what are acceptable insurance premiums. Insurance companies come to them and say we want to offer a product that does this, it should cost this and the insurance department looks at that and determines through an actuarial analysis through actual science and math whether or not those are legitimate numbers and they are justifiable. I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that we are trying to interject politics into that process and use the force of government to impact the ultimate result as far as insurance

premiums, and I think that's a dangerous avenue. So to repeat my question, through you Mr. Speaker, is there anything in this bill that gives the Office of Health Strategy the ability to influence, lobby or otherwise override the insurance department in the determination of what are acceptable insurance premiums?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I understand the good representative's question and I would suggest that there couldn't be anything more apolitical than what we are trying to accomplish here with the Office of Health Strategy. My understanding is the entire 120 pages, there is nothing that speaks to some sort of direct influence of the Office of Health Strategy or this aspect of government over the insurance industry. But I will suggest that it will have an influence indirectly if it's successful. If we are able to improve health outcomes that should have a

beneficial impact on insurance claims. And in fact, insurance claim data will be part of the data collected. It might help insurance companies decide where to invest particularly in prevention that would reduce the overall cost of healthcare. That is the primary objective of creating an Office of Health Strategy.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and I thank the chairman for that excellent answer. I appreciate that very much. And I am delighted to hear that answer; however, I am still going to state before the record here that I am going to oppose the bill on the grounds that I believe that everything we just discussed falls within the realm of the private marketplace. As I said, the insurance department is there to make sure insurance companies are following the law, they are fiscally solvent and the consumers are protected. That is the end of the

responsibility of government in my mind in that arena, and I don't believe that it's beneficial for a government agency to be interfering with how healthcare providers determine what care is appropriate for their patients. I think they are the ones that should determine what preventive healthcare they should have, and I think when it comes to the insurance industry they have skin in the game as far as that goes. And I know that they are already actively developing policies to create preventive medicine options for their consumers to hopefully save premium down the road. They are the reason why we have such things as you know free check-ups and annual exams and that sort of thing and why they are low cost to many types of tests for the early diagnosis of cancer and many other things.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the chamber for the time and just wanted to get that on the record.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative. From the home of the whiffle ball and bat, 113th district Representative Perillo, you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Not so much a question, but a comment. Specific to Section 6 of the bill. As you may recall we made this change from the Office of Healthcare Advocate to the Office of Healthcare Strategy, I believe it was last year, and one of the charges of the Office of Healthcare Strategy among many other things is to pay attention to costs which is important. And I mentioned Section 6 because in Section 6 of the bill a lot of data, and I think the Representative Sampson had sort of referred to this, a lot of data that used to go, cost data, that used to go to the exchange now goes to the Office of Healthcare Strategy. So a question, again that Representative Sampson started to ask, so I would like to pose this question to the chairman of the Public Health Committee; is there a role for the executive director of the Office of Health Strategy to try and drive, support, advocate for legislation as it pertains to coverage, reimbursement and cost?

Through you sir.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. If I understand the good representative's correctly, I do not see anything in this bill that promotes even the prospect of government involvement in those aspects. If anything, the movement of the data from the former insurance exchange into a centralized database will benefit the insurance industry and those involved because we will have better aggregated data that can be looked at in a variety of ways. So again, the original intent, the mission of the Office of Health Strategy is to combine data sources in a fashion that will benefit all the potential users, assuming that they are qualified to receive such data analysis. It is not intended per se to drive legislation, it's intended to assemble information, analyze information and develop a strategy to be worked with in collaboration with the various interested parties both practitioners and the insurance industry to benefit the consume.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REPRESENTATIVE PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker and I thank the gentleman for his answer to the question. The reason why I ask it is because again the Office of Healthcare Advocate essentially shifted and is now the Office of Health Strategy, and it was not uncommon for the Healthcare Advocate to testify specifically before the Public Health Committee which is where I served, possibly in front of the Insurance Committee as well, to testify on behalf of many things. Very often, that testimony would include support for mandatory coverage. The Office of Healthcare Advocate, regardless of what its initial intent was supposed to be, became in many ways consumer protection for healthcare consumers. That's all well and good; however, one of the charges of the Office of Health Strategy is to monitor and make suggestions for the control of costs to keep costs low. That is many often times in direct opposition

to advocacy for mandatory coverage, increases in coverage, increases to access.

So I want to, at least at a minimum, make the point very clear that in my view if the Office of Health Strategy is going to effectively advocate for the management of cost to keep costs low, to keep insurance affordable, to keep access affordable, then that is not necessarily consistent with an agency that is going to advocate for increases in mandatory coverage. I just want that out there. I want it known. I want my perspective to be heard. If the gentleman can speak to that, I would appreciate it.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you. Representative Steinberg.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak to that. I think the good representative highlights one of the natural tensions that we will deal with as a state in what is the appropriate role of government in promoting healthcare, and there will always be the tension between costs and between

coverage and protection of individuals. I think that's actually a pretty healthy tension. I think that sometimes we get focused on costs literally, but what we need to look for is value. We need to be able to connect the expenditures involved in healthcare with improved outcomes. And I do believe that the creation of the Office of Health Strategy will be central to validating the value in various activities and practices and will inform all those who are charged with the responsibility for promoting the public health. So that I think ultimately we will have greater confidence. The expenditures we make are actually of value and are improving outcomes and are not just simply additional costs. So I'm hopeful that we will be able to entertain the natural tension between costs and coverage in a way in which will benefit the people of the state of Connecticut.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you Representative Steinberg.

Representative Perillo.

REPRESENTATIVE PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I am hopeful as well. I hope that's where we are going with this. I hope there is that healthy tension. I am worried though that we may get away from that healthy tension, and I don't want to see a situation where the Office of Health Strategy becomes a defacto consumer protection agency that urges coverage for this, that and the other thing regardless of the cost that goes with it. I thank you, sir, for your time. I thank the chairman for his time. I appreciate it. Thank you sir.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

You are very welcome Representative. Further on the bill? Further on the bill? If not, staff and guests please retire to the well of the House. Members take your seats. Machine will be open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast? If all members have voted the machine will be locked and the clerk will take a tally. The clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5290,

Total number Voting	144
Necessary for Passage	73
Those voting Yea	93
Those voting Nay	51
Those absent and not Voting	6

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much. Are there any announcements or introductions? The bill passes.

(Gavel)

Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Stallworth, my good friend from Bridgeport, for what purpose do you rise sir?

REPRESENTATIVE STALLWORTH (126TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I stand for the purpose of an introduction.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Please.

REPRESENTATIVE STALLWORTH (126TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have Eric here today, Eric Zaldumbide who is here with us today visiting. He is part of TeenPact Leadership School, an excellent youth from my district and he is here with his mother Eva who is on the camera. And I would like the House to give him a hearty welcome.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Yes sir, let's do that.

Representative Mushinsky.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Last Thursday we had a cancelled House session and we missed the official presentation by former Representative Lynn Taborsak of the official house can of GORP or trail mix which got the legislature through the 1991 extended general assembly session. We were in session all year working on a tax package and a spending

package, and in those days there were no caucus lunches. So after a while everybody ran out of food money and food and Lynn Taborsak, representative from Danbury provided food for the House of Representatives and it was this big can of trail mix. So she brought it in on Thursday to bequeath it to the House and if you are beseeched some night and you are out of caucus food, please be aware its right here by my desk and it's a very honorable can of trail mix. It's been serving the House of Representatives since 1991 and it's fully loaded, and it will be here by my desk if you need it. But I sure hope we are not in session all year. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative Mushinsky. It's great to remember Lynn Taborsak, she served here well.

Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 211?

CLERK:

On Page 27, House Calendar 211, Substitute House Bill No. 5383, AN ACT CONCERNING DISPUTES

BETWEEN HEALTH CARRIERS AND PARTICIPATING PROVIDERS
THAT ARE HOSPITALS. Favorable report of the Joint
Standing Committee on insurance and real estate.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REPRESENTATIVE SCANLON (98TH):

Good afternoon Mr. Speaker. I move for
acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report
and passage of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

The question is acceptance of the Joint
Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the
bill. Representative Scanlon, you have the floor
sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. The bill
before us today talks about an incident that
happened last year that many of the folks in this
chamber will recall, which was the seven-week
impasse between Anthem Insurance and Hartford
Healthcare. And during this very long seven-week
process, tens of thousands of our constituents from

across the state were negatively impacted by the fact that because that contract expired, their insurance was therefore considered out-of-network when they went to visit a doctor or a hospital that was part of the Hartford Healthcare Network. And there were many stories that I heard as chairman of the Insurance Committee, that my colleagues on the committee heard and that were heard in the press. And I won't tell all of them, but I just want to share for a moment a few of the stories that we heard. We heard from Stephanie Bruneau, 61, of Colchester. Stephanie was diagnosed with a brain tumor after a fall sent her to the hospital. And she was told that her insurance would not be accepted because of the dispute and that they could not treat her. And she was allowed to go to Yale-New Haven Hospital, but she wasn't able to seek treatment there.

Secondly we have someone like Lisa Casperick [phonetic] of Berlin, who learned the day before her gastrointestinal surgery in October that her insurance would no longer cover it and she was

forced to undergo a stressful and scary several hours when she needed to find a new hospital to have a majorly scheduled insurance surgery the next day.

So ladies and gentleman, many people, tens of thousands of people, were impacted by this and that's what brings us here today. And with that, Mr. Speaker, the clerk is in possession of an amendment LCO 3710. I would ask the clerk to please call the amendment and I be granted leave of the chamber to summarize.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Will the clerk please call Amendment LCO 3710? I would ask the clerk to please call the amendment, which will be designated House Amendment 3710, House "A".

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", Substitute House Bill No. 5383 LCO No. 3710 offered by Representative Scanlon.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

The representative seeks leave of the chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to

summarization? Is there objection to summarization?
Hearing none, Representative Scanlon you may proceed
with summarization.

REPRESENTATIVE SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. So this amendment is basically the exact same thing as the bill reported out of committee, which was reported out with only one negative vote. And what it does is basically a very simple thing. It says that number one, that consumers who are going to be impacted by a subsequent contract dispute like the one we saw with Anthem and Hartford where a hospital network and an insurer cannot come to an agreement, that they have to get 90 days' notice of that as opposed to the 60-day notice that's currently law in the state of Connecticut. And the point of that is to just give them more time to process what might happen to them. These things are rare. They don't happen very often, but when they do as the case was last year, seven weeks is a very long time for people to be inconvenienced by this to put it lightly and we think that adding more time is the

proper thing to do.

The second and perhaps probably more important thing of this bill is the fact that for the very first time under this piece of legislation, we are going to say that in the event that a contract does expire that patients will be allowed to stay in network under the terms of the existing or previous contract for 60 days, 60 days. So while the two large companies last year was Anthem and Hartford, next year could be somebody else, are negotiating nobody is going to be told that they cannot go and access the insurance that they are actively paying for in their premiums.

And so I believe that we are doing a very common sense thing here by making sure that in the event of a future dispute, not just because of one bad dispute, but in the event of future disputes that our constituents will not be subjected to the stories that I was sharing earlier of massive inconvenience or massive worry about not being able to access the doctors that they've been going to or the hospital that's down the street from their

house.

So with that Mr. Speaker, I move adoption.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you sir. The question before the chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Scanlon please. Nope, pass to Representative Sampson please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. The amendment that is before us improves the bill, and I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor and I'd like the opportunity to speak again once the amendment is voted upon. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you sir. Is there any more discussion on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

The Aye's have it, and the amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Sampson, welcome back, thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make sure that we got the amendment out of the way so I would know what language we are actually discussing here in the chamber. I am pleased that the amendment passed, apparently overwhelmingly. It actually improves the bill pretty dramatically. From where we started this process earlier this session, the good chairman mentioned that there was only negative vote in the committee and I think it was me. And I voted no because I have a longstanding concern as a member of this body when we get involved in things we should not. And insurance companies and insurance -- and healthcare providers, they are big boys and girls and they enter into contracts with one another. I am loathed

for this body to engage in telling people what their agreements should be for them. I believe that they've got a lot of expensive attorneys working for them and they are not new to the area of negotiating what their agreements are. So it's a concern for me when we stick our nose in there, since I'm a real estate agent and there are people from all walks of life in this room, but there aren't too many healthcare or insurance company executives in this room who have any real knowledge of what should be in a contract between those parties. However, I think that the bill actually has been paired back to something I can live with at this point. It is an agreement between the parties about what happens when there is such a dispute.

I just said on the previous bill that I think our obligation as a legislative body, as a government, is simply to provide for consumer protection and public safety in certain areas. I would say that if we were talking about a contract about someone purchasing a car, that's none of our business. But when it comes to the availability of

healthcare and access to healthcare insurance, we do have an obligation as a state government to be there to make sure the consumers are protected, to make sure that people get the services that they pay for. This change in the bill simply says that there is a mechanism that kicks in if there is a disagreement to protect consumers and patients during that period and I think that's a reasonable thing for us to be involved in and a reasonable requirement to place in the law. So I am supportive, but I do have a couple of quick questions if I could.

Through you Mr. Speaker.

I am curious to know if the chairman knows if such similar language has been enacted in any other state or well I guess we'll leave it at that, a state.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Sampson.

Representative Scanlon please.

REPRESENTATIVE SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you, very good question and the answer to that to my very good

friend Representative Sampson is that the states of New York and New Jersey have similar provisions that they refer to as a "cooling off period" where in the event of a similar contractual dispute between insurers and hospitals in the states that I just mentioned, New York and New Jersey, there is either a 60 days or 90 days depending on the state.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that answer. So I'm curious to know what the experience has been since those "cooling off periods" have been enacted. Have they been utilized or things have been hunky dory between the parties since then?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative Scanlon please.

REPRESENTATIVE SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of

specific instances where either of those states have used these provisions. They may have happened, I just am not personally aware of any major disputes that have come up in the recent times since those states have passed this "cooling off period" legislation that I could comment on that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative please further remarks?

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Yes, thank you very much Mr. Speaker. A final comment that may turn into a question. Just looking at the language that's in here, I have only one thing that really came to mind that I want to make sure of and that is that this language essentially says that if there is a dispute between the insurance company and the healthcare provider the insurance company will be reimbursing the healthcare provider based on the terms of the previous contract for that period. But then it goes on to say that once an agreement is reached that that agreement

would be retroactive. So the one thing, and just I hope I get a favorable response because this is only a real concern that I have to protect consumers. I want to make sure that no patient ends up getting caught in the middle of this dispute by virtue of they walk into a doctor's office, they have the agreement that's in place because of the dispute that is based on the previous agreement between the company and the provider, but what happens if that agreement changes and is now retroactive? Is there a chance that this bill would create a situation, through you Mr. Speaker, where the patient ends up being billed for me because the agreement of the company and the provider changed after-the-fact and is retroactive?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative Sampson.
Representative Scanlon, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe so and that is certainly not the intent of the bill, is

to charge consumers more because of this, it's to keep them whole.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I thank the chairman for his answer. I appreciate the efforts that have been put into this bill for a legitimate purpose and I appreciate even more that the final product is actually a responsible thing. This conversation started with talks about mandatory arbitration and a lot of significant overreach. The ultimate product is a legitimate provision that I can see has a place in our law to protect consumers. It has been reached with an agreement between the parties, and I would urge my colleagues to support it. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will

staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the clerk will take a tally. The clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Bill No. 5383 as amended by House "A",

Total number Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	147
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	3

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

The bill as amended is passed. (Gavel)

The chamber will stand at ease for a moment.

Thank you very much, the chamber will return to business. Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 36 as amended by House "A"?

CLERK:

On Page 46 Substitute House Bill No. 5185 and amended by House "A", AN ACT CONCERNING GUARDIANSHIP APPOINTMENTS FOR INDIVIDUALS SEEKING SPECIAL IMMIGRANT JUVENILE STATUS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Clerk. The chamber may remember we took out this bill earlier in the day. It has been amended. The amendment was accepted and is coming back to be explained and voted on. Thank you very much. Representative Urban, thank you for waiting.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move passage of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Urban, you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Mr. Speaker. I believe that I have given significant testimony on why this bill should become law, so I would urge adoption.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to start from the outset by saying that I support the underlying bill very much. I was listening to the debate earlier and I appreciated the number of times it was mentioned and brought to the attention of the chamber that we need to be in alignment with federal law when it comes to correcting this area of our

state law as it pertains to immigration. And it occurred to me that there is a glaring problem in our state law when it comes to immigration. It's something called the Trust Act. I want to speak about it in more detail, but I will start Mr. Speaker by offering an amendment. The clerk should have an amendment that is LCO 3749. Would you please ask the clerk to call it and allow me to summarize?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you sir. Will the clerk please call LCO 3749, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "B".

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B" LCO No. 3749 offered by Representative Sampson and Representative Dubitsky.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much. The representative seeks leave of the chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative Sampson you

may proceed with summarization.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. The amendment that is before us is a very simple amendment. It is in addition to the underlying bill. I want to make that very, very clear. That is not a strike-all amendment. I agree with the underlying bill. I support the underlying bill. I want to see the underlying bill become law. My amendment adds language to that existing currently amended bill before us to simply remove from our current state law something commonly known as the Trust Act, which essentially is a set of provisions that tells our local and state law enforcement officials to ignore criminal warrants issued by ICE under the authority of the federal government. And I move adoption Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

The question before the chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule "B". Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Urban please.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, it took a while for my mic to come on, I'm very sorry. MR. Speaker, I totally appreciate the good representative's support of the underlying bill and I respect that he is bringing out this amendment, but Mr. Speaker the underlying bill is for a very narrow portion of our law. It applies to juveniles between the ages of 18 and 21 and then it applies to federal law after probate court has looked at those juveniles. And in addition, the underlying bill is civil law. The amendment is looking at criminal law. And we have not had a public hearing on this particular issue, which is a very important issue and I believe should have a public hearing. So I would urge my colleagues to not pass this and wait for another time. And Mr. Speaker I would ask for a roll call vote.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Question before the chamber is on a roll call?
Question before the chamber is on a roll call vote?
Let me try your minds. All those in favor of roll call signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

The requisite 20 percent has been met. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amended bill? The Aye's have it, the amendment is adopted, no, no, no, wait a second. Mr. Sampson I cut you off before and I am cutting you off again, I apologize Representative. You, sir, have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just for the record I believe we have simply affirmed that we will have a roll call vote when the amendment is voted upon. And I will also state for the record that this language did, in fact, have a public hearing. This bill was brought before the Judiciary Committee and it did, in fact, have a public hearing. So that is incorrect.

I believe that this amendment is directly related to the underlying bill because they have to do with the same thing, which is the issue of supremacy when it comes to immigration law. Our

United States Constitution is very clear that the area of immigration law is the purview of the federal government. That we do not have the right to interfere with that, and we are simply in the underlying bill making a correction to comply with federal law. And I think that is notable because it seems like we are willing to, as a body, to come together to make changes to our state law to comply with federal law when it suits us and in other cases ignore federal law when it does not. And my amendment speaks directly to that because we have a provision in our state law, which is an absolute utter and direct contradiction to federal law. It is called the Trust Act, and essentially what it does is it says to our local and state law enforcement officials across our state that they must ignore the federal requirement that they have, the federal law that tells them what their actions should be, when dealing with criminal illegal aliens.

I want to stop right there and I want to just talk about a little vocabulary because whenever the

issue of immigration comes up, the issue of vocabulary needs to come up too. Because as someone who believes in the rule of law in our country, as someone who is descendant from people who immigrated from other countries, I care about the rule of law and I care about the value of America's heritage as a home for immigration. The thing is that it always seems that when you start talking about illegal immigration, people that want to support policies that benefit illegal immigration always omit the word illegal. There is nobody in this room, there's probably nobody in this building who is against immigration. We all have friends, neighbors, family members and ancestors that are immigrants. It's nonsense to suggest that someone's against immigration because they believe in a law that sets up a process for how people immigrate to our country.

And I will go one step further. When it comes to the issue of the Trust Act, it's not even about immigration or illegal immigration, it's about criminal illegal immigration. There are people that

come to this country legally every day and I support them and I want to see the federal government actually tackle that issue more properly than they have in recent years. And I want them to do that by understanding the number of people that want to enter our country and the value that they can provide to our culture and our economy. But that's very difficult to do when we are dealing with the larger issue of illegal immigration.

And it's even harder to do when we are dealing with the other issue which is the small but significant number of people who are in the country illegally, that also happen to be criminals. Now I'm gonna say one more time, this bill is about criminal illegal aliens. It's not about immigration. It's not even about illegal immigration. It's about criminals who happen to be illegal aliens.

We passed this law several years ago, in fact when I first got here and it may have passed unanimously, and I voted for it. And I voted for it because I was told that the Trust Act was a good

bill because what it did was it gave a mechanism for people who are in our cities across our state, but who are in the country illegally, a way to confront law enforcement without fear of being deported. That they could trust their local law enforcement agent. To say, look my neighbor is a criminal, I want to tell you but you can't deport me. That's just one of the many, many fallacies that have been perpetrated on us when the Trust Act was passed.

And I'm gonna go through them very, very briefly. I don't intend to spend a lot of time on this issue, but I want the record straight and I believe it's important that we have an up or down vote in this body to say who supports the rule of law, who supports the fact that the federal government determines what our immigration laws and who does not.

The issue is that if you believe the folks that pushed the Trust Act, you believe that illegal aliens are more inclined to come to law enforcement because it exists. But there is no proof that anyone has ever been deported because they reported

a crime to law enforcement as someone in the country illegally. There's not a single example of that anywhere. And think about it, why would they? If I'm a local law enforcement officer and some illegal alien comes to me and reports a crime to me, my first reaction is not going to be to bite the hand that feeds me and say, hey incidentally you know how are you here? That's not what they are going to do. They are going to appreciate that fact and they are gonna be less inclined to prosecute them based on that. In fact, I would say that are arguably less likely to ask.

Aside from which, there is nothing stopping any of us or someone in the country illegally from reporting a crime anonymously. Every day crimes are reported anonymously. There are tip lines galore. There is nothing stopping anyone from reporting a crime if that is their desire. You don't need to create an impediment to federal law to make that happen. These policies, these sanctuary policies; and let me just clarify that really quick too. The Trust Act in effect makes Connecticut a

sanctuary state by saying that our local law enforcement officials or state law officials cannot interfere or, or actually instead interfere but not assist in apprehending or detaining people that are under a criminal warrant, a criminal warrant, from the federal government.

The thing is that the only people that can actually offer something to someone who is in the country illegally who wants to report a crime is the federal government. Our state authorities have no authority to do so. They cannot change someone's status or extend their Visa or give them a special accommodation in any way. There is actually no benefit whatsoever for someone to report a crime as an illegal alien to their local or state officials. However, if they reported to their federal official there are programs in place just for that purpose. Now I'm not an expert at this and I honestly didn't know I was going to be having this conversation today, so I did not do near the preparation that I normally would. But there are multiple Visa statuses that allow people to stay in the country

for various purposes. They are known as the STU and the VAWA, the VWAWA non-immigrant Visa's, which basically are tools at the disposal of federal law enforcement officials for granting additional status for immigration to people in the country illegally when they help them apprehend criminals. Why? Why on earth would we be standing in the way of actually helping someone get additional status by saying we don't want you talking to the person who can give it to you. That's ridiculous.

Illegal aliens are not going to cooperate with law enforcement in sanctuary cities. Many people that come to this country illegally come from places that have corrupt governments. There is not the incentive there that's going to convince them that they are suddenly going to be trusting American police. And add that to the fact that we are actually telling people in our community that we only care about some of our laws. These laws over here, we are gonna follow those. But these laws over here, well they don't mean so much so let's ignore them. How can we do that and then expect

that someone who is new to our country who wants to trust in the authorities is going to do so? I wouldn't trust anyone who tells me, I follow the law on Monday and Tuesday but Wednesday it's out the window. It erodes the civic trust.

It also makes a mockery of what we do here. Everyone in this room is a law maker. We work hard to come up with policies, public policy to affect how our state runs. And I'm sure the people in the federal government do that also, and our town governments across the state. They do that in good faith expecting that what they come up with because they have the authority in our documents that determine how our country is run to do so. It's not up to us to decide if someone else's authority doesn't matter.

The other thing is that the notion that somehow these sanctuary policies increase the safety of people that are in the country illegally is complete and utter nonsense. When you set up a sanctuary state or a sanctuary city, what you are doing essentially is you are telling the criminal element

among the very decent, honest, hard-working illegal alien population that they should come into their neighborhood because they are less likely to be apprehended. That doesn't sound like a good plan either.

I am going to close just by saying that I want to speak to people that are illegal aliens that are living in our state currently. I just want to explain to you that if you are a decent, law-abiding person in every other respect, this bill is not about you. I got no interest in dealing with that. As I stated from the beginning, not my job. Federal government handles immigration not the state government. But we have a state law that does affect you and basically what it says is that for people that are subject to a criminal ICE warrant, which is not you that is not you, there are people here in the country illegally that are not on the list of people that the federal government is trying to detain. Generally speaking, you end up on the federal ICE warrant list because you are a significant threat to the community. You are a

criminal. You are suspected of terrorism. I will just make a side note that our policies like the Trust Act lead to terrorism, because they don't do what's necessary to make sure that we are protecting our fellow citizens against people that are coming into this country to do us harm.

What I want to say to you folks is if you are aware of a criminal, don't contact your local law enforcement officials, call the federal government. Call ICE. Call them and tell them you are aware of criminal activity. They are the ones that can actually help you.

Forgive me, I have several notes scattered across several things.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Take your time representative.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

I guess I've covered pretty much all of the points. We could talk at some length about the cost to our society for the failure to follow our federal immigration laws. We could talk about the threat to public safety. We could talk about how they put

national security at risk. And we could talk about how these policies are ultimately extremely discriminatory and extremely unfair to people that enter the country through the legal process. I stand before you, Mr. Speaker, simply to ask that the members of this body vote to stop ignoring our obligation, our constitutional oath, to uphold the Constitution, to uphold what our obligations are to the federal government, to recognize the supremacy of the federal law on immigration and to stop making it easier for criminals to hide in our state because they are less likely to be apprehended. Because we are instructing our law enforcement not to help assist in apprehending them. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? Representative Tong, please.

REPRESENTATIVE TONG (147TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment. And I wanna take some of what has been said piece by piece. I rise

largely because I feel as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee duty and obligation to correct the record and to make sure that everyone in this chamber understands what the Trust Act does and what it does not do, and the process of how we've considered changes to the Trust Act.

As many of you know, I've stood on the floor of this House two or three weeks ago and implored this body to respect the rule of law, to uphold our state's constitution, to know our role constitutionally, and I agree with Representative Sampson when he says that immigration law is the purview of the federal government. Not our job is what Representative Sampson said and that it is the obligation of the federal government to enforce our immigration laws. That is exactly why this chamber passed the Trust Act unanimously. One hundred thirty two to zero, as Representative Sampson indicated, he himself voted for that law.

And what that law says exactly what Representative Sampson said earlier; the Trust Act says that the federal government will retain its

authority for enforcing immigration law and it's not the obligation of state and local law enforcement to do their jobs for them. That is why unanimously we passed that law.

Now Representative Sampson mentioned criminals. He used that word over and over again, Mr. Speaker, he used the word illegal over and over again. He talked about criminals and I presume bad hombres and people that would do us harm. That's addressed in the Trust Act in the language that this amendment seeks to remove. In fact, it has several exceptions in the Trust Act which provide that state and local law enforcement will not cooperate with the civil immigration detainer and will not do the federal government's job for them unless the person is a criminal.

And so the Trust Act carves out several exceptions. For example, if somebody has been convicted of a felony, if somebody is subject to pending criminal charges, if someone is an identified gang member, if someone is identified as a possible match on the federal terrorist screening

database, if this person presents an unacceptable risk to public safety; that is in the Trust Act. That is in our statutes. That is the law of this state, of this land today and 132 of us voted for it.

And so to pass this amendment today; I pause it would make us even less safe because this provides us circumstances under which we are to cooperate or not with federal immigration authorities. So I wanted to correct that record; that indeed the issue about people who have committed crimes is addressed in the Trust Act and that's existing law.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I take some exception to the reference to our American heritage. I'm not sure exactly what was meant by that. Let me tell you what I know about our American heritage. I know about the Huang family in Farmington who came here 20 years ago. They opened a nail salon in Simsbury. They work seven days a week; killed themselves every day for their two boys, Americans both of them. And they face the possible threat of deportation back to China. They're ethnic Koreans

so there was a possibility that they would be deported to North Korea. And all the Huang's have ever done was work extremely hard and contribute to the communities of Farmington and Simsbury.

Let me tell you about the Altaf family from New Britain who opened a pizza place who also work around the clock for their family and their children. That is part of our American heritage.

And let me tell you about Attie [phonetic] Tong, my father, who was working in his Chinese restaurant on Park Street in Hartford when an INS agent walked in almost 50 years ago. My father, yes, had overstayed his tourist Visa. And that INS agent said you gotta get out or we are gonna throw you out. And in desperation, my father wrote a six-page hand-written letter to the President of the United States; President Richard Nixon, a republican president who responded to my father's plea. And President Nixon responded and sent that same INS agent back to our restaurant and said, Mr. Tong you can stay, you have to go to the back of the line and wait your turn. And because of that, I was the

first American born in my family. And he became a citizen many years later.

People like the Altaf's, people like the Huang's, people like Miriam Martinez in Stamford, people like the Tong's work every day, seven days a week, 15 hours a day. They contribute to this economy. They do great things for our community. That is the American heritage that I think we all know and love. And this bill is an affront; this amendment is an affront to that heritage. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Will you remark further on House Amendment "B"? Representative Lemar, please.

REPRESENTATIVE LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong objection to the amendment that's being offered. Mr. Speaker, the insinuation was made that this will make our communities safer. By adopting the amendment before us, Connecticut will become a safer place for our residents for our citizens.

Well let me tell you how wrong that is. We don't need to trust Representative's Sampson's words about what will make us safer, we can instead listen to police chiefs, our chief state's public attorney, our chief public defenders and every law enforcement official who supported the establishment of these principles when they were enacted into law in 2013. Every one of them came before us and said the procedures we put in place at that time will make Connecticut's citizens safer.

I represent two communities in this general assembly; the city of New Haven and the town of East Haven. In New Haven, we are proud to have a working relationship between our New Haven police department and every community group in our city that knows that if they are a victim of or a witness to a crime, they can safely come forward, report what they've seen and protect all of our citizens with the information that they have. The police department in New Haven has stated numerous occasions that the protections we have in place saves lives.

Moving backwards and this amendment seeks to do, places all of our citizens in Connecticut at risk. The established procedures we have in place are worth protecting. They are worth protecting strongly. They are worth rewarding. Everyone who has come forward and said all of our residents deserve the ability to come forward, go to the local police department, report crimes, be witness to crimes and ensure our communities are safer.

I also represent the town of East Haven. Now a few years back, that town had some rogue police officers who were harassing and profiling individuals as they came into town. The Federal Department of Justice came in and investigated what was going on, saw the amount of terror that these few rogue police officers were creating in that community, and the Federal Department of Justice offered the solution that we have in Connecticut. To restore trust in all of their communities. The Police Department enacted processes and procedures very similar to that which we have established at Connecticut state law. Because we know all

citizens, all residents, all people who call Connecticut home should come forward if they are a witness to a crime, to come forward if they are a victim of a crime. They should have a working relationship with their police departments and they should ensure that all of our communities are safe and feel welcome being part of the American process.

Now we've seen in the last year attacks on immigration. We've seen attacks for political purposes in buildings outside of Connecticut. I don't know that I've seen the language and the verbiage that was used today anywhere in Connecticut until this last moment. So I am fearful that we've entered into this national conversation in the most disparaging way. In a way that would step back from our unanimous vote, our unanimous public policy's support of civil immigration detainment procedures that we established. And it is my hope that we can listen to the works of New Haven police chiefs, the Connecticut Association of Police Chiefs, the Connecticut Criminal Defense Associate, the Chief Public Defenders, the Chief State's Attorneys and

all those who've come forward suggesting that Connecticut's procedures are the right policy for the state of Connecticut. Please vote against this amendment.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative. Will you remark further on Amendment "B"? Will you remark further on Amendment "B"? Representative Candelora of the 86th district, please you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this amendment. I understand the concerns that were just raised by the other side of the aisle, but this amendment in particular refers to illegal immigrants who have been detained under a civil detained. And I think under current law, the law that we did pass unanimously, one of the provisions has us notifying the federal authorities when an illegal immigrant has been arrested and committed a crime and allows for a release within 48 hours. And what I continue to hear from our communities, and we could reserve for another day

the other issue of our good-time credits and the impact on our communities, but releasing these criminals back into society has caused a problem in our communities. And we are hearing about neighborhood groups forming together trying to seek ways of making their neighborhood safer. And frankly, I think its think policy in part that has led to our cities to be less safe. Because if an individual has committed a crime and is under civil detainer, they should be retained by our law enforcement until we hear from the federal government on how we should handle them.

Under the current Trust Act provisions, they are released within 48 hours, and I think that underlying bill while I did support it many years ago has gone too far in its application, has made Connecticut residents less safe. Therefore, I support the amendment. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative. Will you remark further on Amendment "B"? Will you remark further on Amendment "B"? If not, we'll --

Representative Smith, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just a question I guess, through you, to the proponent of the amendment if I may?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Yes Representative. Representative Sampson, please prepare yourself for a question. Thank you. Representative Smith please.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just for clarification purposes, when we talk about a civil detainer what are we actually referring to?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. A civil detainer is essentially a warrant that is issued by the federal government to apprehend someone who is in the country illegally, and typically because they have committed a criminal act. I was very clear when I

spoke that this bill is not about immigration, it's not even about illegal immigration, it is about criminal illegal immigrants. That's the subject of the bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Smith.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

And I thank the proponent for that clarification because when you hear the words civil detainer, you think of civil action or a civil proceeding or a civil matter. When in fact what we are talking about is a criminal matter that is before the federal government. And I noticed in our current detainer statute that it talks about if there has been a prior conviction of a felony, obviously there could be very serious Class A misdemeanors that we have on our books, that person could be -- have been convicted of a Class A misdemeanor or a sexual assault, anything along those lines, yet under our current statute would not be able to be retained by our current local police.

So I think we have gone too far in the detainer statute. I think this amendment helps clear it up and gives our local police authorities a little bit jurisdiction and power to actually, as the good judiciary from the chairman from the Judiciary Committee said it'll get those bad hombres off the streets and where they belong. So I will support the bill as well. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Will you remark further? Representative O'Neill of the 69th, please.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. If I could through you, a question to the proponent of the amendment?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Please be prepared. Yes, Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you. In bringing out the amendment, it was indicated that our current law the so-called Trust Act is in conflict with federal law and I have

read, and I've just pulled up a copy of the article that was published in October 2017 in which the Attorney General said that Connecticut's Trust Act does not violate federal law. Now it seemed to be directed at information sharing kinds of aspects but apparently the Attorney General issued a press release stating that Connecticut and some other jurisdictions were not in violation of federal law. Apparently there had been an earlier press release that had suggested that maybe we were, and this was a clarification.

So my question is, has there been a determination by a federal authority or for that matter a state authority, a judge or a police organization, law enforcement organization that Connecticut's Trust Act is in violation of federal law?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I thank the

colleague for his question. I am not aware of any court case that might stipulate whether or not the Trust Act has been found to be with or without credibility in you know our federal requirement, but we have our U.S. Constitution. We have our federal law that establishes that immigration is the purview of the federal government. And any provision that we would put in our state law that creates an impediment, a direct impediment, to the federal government in being able to prosecute federal law clearly is a violation.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Sampson.

Representative O'Neill please.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Then I guess I have to ask, what is the clear impediment that Connecticut law presents to the federal government in the enforcement of the U.S. immigration laws? What provision of the Trust Act creates that impediment?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative O'Neill.

Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the question. Essentially our Trust Act directs state and local law enforcement officials to ignore federal law when they are required to obey it in detaining people that are subject of a federal warrant. Could you imagine anyone saying that we are not going to detain someone that is subject to a federal warrant for anything else? Sorry for asking a question with a question. Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative O'Neill please.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Now as I read the Trust Act and I did read it rather quickly in connection with all of this, it talks about civil detainers and that's what the conversation was earlier. IS there language in our law that speficially says that police officers or other law enforcement people should not -- are to ignore, not pay attention to a

federal warrant?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative O'Neill for your question. Representative Sampson, the floor is yours please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes. The statement in our existing law is "no law enforcement officer who receives a civil immigration detainer with respect to an individual who is in the custody of the law enforcement officer shall detain such individual pursuant to such civil immigration detainer" and so on.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Okay, cause that's different, the language about detainers -- that's a different instrument from a federal warrant. And so that -- and when I read through it I didn't see the

word warrant referenced anywhere in our law on that score. So I thank the gentleman for his clarification. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative O'Neill. Will you remark further? Representative Candelaria of the 95th district, the floor is yours sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. A couple of questions, through you Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the amendment.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Yes Representative Candelaria.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELARIA (95TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm just a little bit -- I wanna get a little more clarification. We are talking about within the proposed amendment, we specifically talked about civil immigration detainer. And I've been hearing that this detainer is also a warrant. To my understanding, it's not a warrant. So I just would like a little bit more clarification.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative Sampson, if you would please prepare yourself for questions. Representative Candelaria, please proceed. Nope. Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Representative Candelaria, would you please repeat your question for Representative Sampson?

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELARIA (95TH):

Sure. So within the proposed amendment it talks specifically about civil immigration detainer and I've been hearing the debate a little bit and I'm quite confused because to my understanding the detainer is not a warrant. So I would like some clarification because this specifically talks pursuant to -- I'm assuming this is the Federal Section ACFR to 87.7, so I want some clarification specific to that section. What does it entail, because it's my assumption that this is basically a

notice of ICE to our local authorities for someone that we do have in custody? So they can start that proceeding to have that individual be removed from the country. So we are talking about proceeding, so I'm quite confused when I hear the word warrant. So I would like some more clarification on that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much. Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the question. Let me just say that I don't claim to be an expert on the federal law regarding federal warrants or civil detainers, but I do have some information in front of me and I want to make it clear what we are talking about. We are talking about people that are already in the country illegally that are also subject to a request from ICE that is determined to be what is called a civil detainer. And my understanding of the law is that the only people that are subject to those detainers

are people identified under DACS, which is the Deportable Alien Control System, and generally speaking you end up on that list because you have been charged under a section of the Immigration and Nationally Act that requires a criminal conviction and the charges, the basis for the removal or two a criminal conviction noted in the DACS system for a crime that renders the alien removable.

And that is not simply being here illegally. So I keep going back to this. We can talk about the ins and outs of it, but the Trust Act is about telling our law enforcement officials not to comply with their obligations to federal law. It was mentioned that they should only file a state law, well I don't know about you or anyone else here, but I am subject to federal law and state law. I cannot not file my taxes because I did file my state taxes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Candelaria.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELARIA (95TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, still I'm still

confused. So I still would like more clarification on it cause when we bring this proposal out there's a couple of things that come to mind. You know, we're talking about people that have been convicted of a felony or who are in the process. So I want more clarification on that.

And here's my other concern. You know people that may be detained -- now I think we're crossing the border because we're talking about profiling at the same time. So I'm a little bit concerned about that piece. And the issue of people having similar names. So I want to make sure that if this does go through and we are actually going to start moving within this process, how will we identify that these are the right individuals that are in custody. Not people that have similar names cause if they're gonna look at a database based on names [cursing], sorry about that, but Juan Candelaria probably would be on that list cause there's many Candelaria's throughout the nation. So I am concerned. How do we identify that the person we have in front of us that this bill tends to have our local law

enforcement that [inaudible03:33:30] that where they could be focusing their energies on more serious crime would be focusing more acting as ICE agents. How will we ensure that those people are the correct people first of all? And what would be that process?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson, that question is yours.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. There were a number of pieces to that question. The first one I would say is we are only talking about actual criminals. That's the first thing that I want to just reiterate. That DACS system determines who among our immigrant population that is in the country illegally, how among that larger group falls into the category of being eligible for criminal removal. And by definition, those are criminals. Those are people who have committed a crime either under our immigration laws or because they've committed a much

more serious crime. But it is not simply their presence in the country illegally.

I don't know what the latest estimates are for the number of people that are in the U.S. illegally; I hear different numbers 10 million, 11 million, 12 million, who knows. Three million people approximately are identified in the DACS system as criminal aliens, but only a million of them so we are talking 10% of the population have final orders of removal. And the scary part ladies and gentleman that everyone should be aware of, is that ICE only at any one time is able to apprehend about 1% of them, about 11 thousand. So there are many, many people who are here illegally that are also criminals, and not everyone here illegally I would classify as a criminal, we are only talking about criminals, are in our communities making everyone less safe, citizens and noncitizens alike.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much. Representative Candelaria, you still have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Here's where my concern is, because if we are talking about criminals if you break the law you are a criminal right. So you have a lot of unfortunately people that left their country for a better life here in the U.S. who cross our borders; based on what I'm hearing they would be considered criminals. So who are we -- we're looking at everyone then. That becomes the bigger concern.

But here's the biggest question for me. We know that we have had people that have been detained by our system. They are currently in custody and they are still in custody because ICE has not come and get them. There is a cost associated with that. If we pass this bill, I would assume that we would see more proactive -- we'll see our police force more proactively targeting these individuals, get them into custody and there will be a cost associated with that. Because for a fact I know -- in our correctional system we have people who have been there for years with detention orders and they

are still within our prison and Connecticut taxpayers are paying for that. This will add additional burden to our taxpayers. So I don't think this would be the right bill to move forward at this particular time.

One for that reason, we are talking about that we have a fiscal crisis that we need to address. Secondly when we are talking about who are we going after, it could be anyone that has crossed the border illegally. A family that is here looking for a better life, a family that's probably working at a restaurant that we go eat every day, right where we go socialize with our families, those are the individuals who are doing a lot of the work here in the United States. So I have many concerns with this bill. I encourage my colleagues not to support it and reject the amendment.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative Srinivasan of the 31st district, please you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon Mr. Speaker. I too have been listening to this debate intently and want to make sure that I have some things clarified in my mind before we obviously press the right button.

So through you, to the proponent of the amendment, a few questions through you Mr. Speaker?
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much, and sitting behind you we have the proponent of the amendment, Representative Sampson, if you would sir, please you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to position myself so I can hear my good representative's answers. Through you Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding and is loud and clear that on numerous occasions Representative Sampson eluded that this is only going to impact criminals who are obviously illegal immigrants as well, but only if they have done, committed a crime.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that question from my colleague. Yes, I will reiterate that this applies only to those people that are being pursued by federal law enforcement authorities, and that does not apply to every person who is in the country illegally. I have the statistics here. I would be happy to review them with anyone who would like to discuss them.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the good representative for the response because that was an important clarification. Because in the previous conversations that we had, our good chair of the Judiciary Committee gave a long list of individuals, hardworking, he talked about them working seven days a week, 15 hours a day, and also was -- shared his own family story.

But through you, Mr. Speaker, since all of those individuals, assuming I'm presuming they are not criminals. Through you, Mr. Speaker, would this amendment impact them in any way?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you again Mr. Speaker. Again, this amendment simply strikes something that is in our state law that is in direct contradiction to federal law. It is a law that we passed and adopted that says we are going to tell our local state and local law enforcement officials to not comply with federal law, which they have to because federal law has supremacy in the area of immigration. My amendment is simply to strike that. It is not as was suggested to target anyone. In fact, we don't do anything in this case except for comply with the federal law that already exists and remove our provisions from state law that would be an impediment to our obligations to comply with federal

law.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, being not an attorney I just wanted to clear that. As I understand this amendment, if this amendment were not to pass, through you, Mr. Speaker, within a 48-hour period of retaining if ICE were not able to get to them, of course excluding holidays and weekends and so on and so forth, those individuals, those individuals who are criminals in our society would have to be released?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Back to you Representative Sampson, if you would please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and please forgive me that I didn't really understand the question. I don't think that there is anything that is in our current state law that directs us to do anything except for to comply with the federal law that exists. So I don't know if I can really answer that

question with respect to this amendment. This amendment simply removes what I feel, and I think can be clearly demonstrated, is in direct contradiction to existing federal law. And if it went to a court, I think it would say so.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Sampson.
Representative Srinivasan, your turn.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and through you my final question to the good proponent of the amendment, so what this basically does is that if we detain such individuals as I see that in Lines 61-63, those individuals will continue to be detained til the immigration authorities come over and take charge of the situation?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative Srinivasan.
Representative Sampson, Representative Srinivasan has said this is his final question, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I would be delighted to reply that that is correct, and as is the case in every other state that does not establish its own unconstitutional impediment to following federal law. Simply the amendment removes an impediment that should not be there. We have no right to be interfering with the federal authorities on this issue.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Sampson.
Representative Srinivasan, of course you may ask all the questions you wish, I hope I wasn't discouraging you. But you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Not at all. Thank you Mr. Speaker. No I have asked all my questions. Thank you for the opportunity to do so. But I do want to also close by saying being a first generation immigrant myself, having gone through the process, due process, for me to come here into this nation, this beautiful nation and have all the opportunities that I have had, had the opportunity that I was able to bring my wife

here when we got married and gone through the process, through the legal process that enables us to be legal citizens here. And so for us now to look at the illegal citizens, illegal immigrants that have come into this country and then unfortunately this criminal acts that are done by these individuals, they've got to be held responsible, and then for us to say that, gee you know what they are criminals yes they happen to be illegal and we do not need to do anything about that, turn and look the other way will definitely not make our societies safer. We need to make our first responsibility is public safety, and for public safety we need to make sure these illegal immigrants who are criminals, they need to be held under the federal authorities for due action to be taken to them. I stand here, Mr. Speaker, in strong support of the amendment and I hope my colleagues, both sides of the aisle, will do the same. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you sir. Still on House Amendment "B".

Representative Stafstrom please you have the floor
sir.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through
you, a couple of questions to the proponent of the
amendment?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Of course. I believe the proponent of the
amendment is just waiting for his microphone to go
live.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the
proponent of the amendment has said repeatedly that
this amendment does not affect everyone who is in
the country illegally. It would only apply to those
who have committed otherwise criminal conduct. Is
that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. What I have stated is

that they are required only to detain those people that the federal government has issued a civil detainer for, and I specified the reasons why a civil detainer would be issued which includes criminal conduct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you sir. Representative Stafstrom.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

So Mr. Speaker, through you, is the answer to my previous question no?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Stafstrom.

Representative Sampson, you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. The thing is that I don't know what the federal law is in great detail. I do not know what things determine what they would require a civil detainer would be issued. But we are talking about two different things here. The issue is public policy that is developed on a federal level versus state level, and the amendment

simply says we have no right to interfere on something that is their jurisdiction and removes it. I don't know why we are debating what is a crime under federal law or not.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative.

Representative, your turn.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, you know I think that kind of highlights the problem with the amendment. The proponent doesn't in fact and can't in fact tell us exactly what it does or doesn't do. I think -- you know I still would like some clarity because it's been said a couple of times here that this amendment -- these detainer holds would only apply to those who have committed criminal conduct outside of otherwise being in this country without documentation. So I'm trying to just clarify, does the proponent know, yes or no, whether in fact this bill applies to folks who are in the country -- this amendment applies to

folks who are in the country without documentation
who have not otherwise committed criminal conduct?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. We're back to the 80th district,
Representative Sampson please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. The answer is
absolutely no. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Absolutely no, the proponent does not know
whether it applies to folks who are in the country
illegally and how have not committed criminal
conduct, or only to those who have committed
otherwise criminal conduct?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Good thing you stayed standing Representative
Sampson, it's your turn again.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Mr. Speaker, I actually like the notion of answering questions on this side of the room and look forward to doing a lot more of it in the future. I said "no" the amendment would not apply to anyone that has not committed criminal conduct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Sampson, now we go back to the 129th district, Representative please.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, what line of the amendment can I find that assurance at?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative Sampson, do you need a moment to look through the amendment? Thank you, you're ready. As you wish please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

There is nothing in the amendment that pertains to federal law. Again, we are in the state

legislature. The federal government has the purview of immigration. If they determine someone needs to be detained and issue a civil detainer because of their criminal conduct, it is our obligation as a state recognizing the supremacy of federal law to detain that person. This body enacted a law that was in direct contradiction to that. I am attempting to amend our -- to remove that mistake, for lack of a better term.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative Stafstrom, back to you.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, not to belabor this but the cracks to this amendment as I read it and we've been debating it for some time now really is at Lines 31-35 of the amendment, which changes the basic premise of the Trust Act which we've heard about and was passed back in 2013 that says in current law in the state that "no law enforcement officer who receives a civil immigration

detainer shall detain such individual unless" and then there's a number of enumerator circumstances which the good chairman of the Judiciary Committee went through. The amendment here, the language of it reverses that, and it says "any law enforcement officer who receives a civil immigration detainer shall detain such individual pursuant to such immigration detainer." And removes those circumstances under which a civil immigration detainer shall be complied with.

My fear, Mr. Speaker, is that that language and as we've heard today, I believe there's at least some concern as to what it means. But as I read that language, what it does is it says any civil immigration detainer shall be complied with no matter what. So that begs the question, Mr. Speaker, what is a civil immigration detainer. And thankfully the statute and the amendment contains the definition. At Lines 5 through 7, it refers us back to the federal regulation that is promulgated by the department at the federal level. This is not a federal law. This is not a state law. It's a

federal regulation, and the regulation in fact determines what an immigration detainer is and who can issue one.

So through you Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the proponent of the amendment is familiar with the federal regulation or not on which this amendment is predicated.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much. Representative Sampson, that question is for you.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't have it before me, but I am familiar with it.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Stafstrom.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, does the proponent of the amendment know who, in fact, can issue a civil immigration detainer? Does it have to be a federal judge? A federal prosecutor? Who can issue a civil immigration detainer?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. There are a number of folks that can issue such a detainer; border patrol agents, special agents, immigration inspectors, you know people that are involved with Homeland Security, again federal law not state law. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I understand that comment federal law not state law, but we are doing here in the state statute is incorporating a federal regulation into the statute and into this amendment.

So through you Mr. Speaker, is one of the people who can issue a civil immigration detainer a commercial airline pilot?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Stafstrom.
Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Again, we are in the

Connecticut House of Representatives. This is not the place to debate what the federal law is. The amendment is very simple. It says we recognize the supremacy of the federal government on immigration. We should remove the part that is in direct contradiction from our law because it is a deliberate attempt by state and local entities who impede the enforcement of that federal law. We are a nation of laws. We should follow them.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Sampson.

Representative Stafstrom, please.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, although I'm not sure my question was directly answered, which was a fairly simple one of whether an airline pilot, a commercial airline pilot, Delta, American Airlines, Southwest, Jet Blue, can issue a civil immigration detainer or not. As I read that federal regulation they can in fact do that. But Mr. Speaker more importantly I would submit to you that in fact this body, this House of Representatives is

exactly where we should be debating this federal regulation. Cause if this federal regulation, as the way I read it and as I read it in connection with the amendment that is currently on the board before us, this amendment if it passed Mr. Speaker would allow that Jet Blue pilot, that Southwest airline pilot to issue an immigration detainer requiring, requiring our Connecticut state police, our corrections officer and our local police to detain someone in custody. That is what this amendment would do, and it would allow them to do that whether that person has been charged with a criminal violation or not.

Does the proponent of the amendment have any language in this amendment or the federal regulation or other federal law that would put my mind at ease that that is not the ultimate effect of this amendment?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

I do not because I do not make federal law. I simply respect the oath of office I took to honor and uphold the constitution of the United States and I recognize that they have the constitutional authority to deal with immigration. I don't want us making policy on immigration. That's the point of the amendment, is to stop making policy on immigration. It's a very simple choice. Do we believe the federal government has the right to determine what our immigration policy is or do we have the right as this body to ignore the federal government? If anyone in this room wants to change our federal immigration policy, I encourage them to run for congress in an attempt to do so, but we should not be doing it here.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative Stafstrom, the floor is still yours.

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. So Mr. Speaker, in fact the proponent of the amendment cannot tell us whether this amendment would in fact allow a

commercial airline pilot to order our state police to do something. You know, and I understand the point the proponent of the amendment is trying to make and I don't disagree with him. If the federal government wants to allow a commercial airline pilot to order its federal agents around, its FBI agents, its customs and border enforcement agents around, that's the federal government's purview and that is the purview of congress. But when it comes to ordering around employees of the state of Connecticut or of the political subdivisions thereof, our cities and towns, that sir I believe through you Mr. Speaker is where we do properly exert our authority and enter in and decide whether and under what circumstances we want that commercial airline pilot to be able -- or that border patrol agent to be able to order around our state employees and our local and municipal employees. And we settled that question in 2013 Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, through you, on that point do we have any idea of what the fiscal cost of adopting this amendment would be?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you sir. Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the question. Between you and me, I don't necessarily agree with the fiscal analysis and the fiscal note that I've been provided with because I would argue that it is incorrect, as much as I'm sure my colleague would, but it says there is not fiscal impact. And if my colleague would like to discuss the cost of illegal immigration to our state budget and our national budget, I'm happy to get into that. I have a lot of information on it that I left out of my previous remarks and I would relish questions on that to dispel the myth that somehow it is a benefit to have people in the country illegally. But again, the cost in dollars is far less than the cost in life and crime when you are dealing with people that are not just illegal aliens, again this bill applies to criminals, MS-13 gang members, Mr. Speaker. That's who it applies to. I think we should let the

federal government do their job and get rid of these people. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Oh thank you Representative Sampson. Representative Stafstrom, you still have the floor please. Do you have any further remarks or questions?

REPRESENTATIVE STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, you know I suspect that I do agree with the Representative in the sense that the fiscal note for this is probably not accurate. Perhaps we disagree for different reasons. I think my concern for this is in a city like mine of Bridgeport that already has one of the highest mill rates in the state, already has several hundred police officers, but certainly could use several more, that they would be diverted from the streets of our city, diverted from doing traffic control, diverted from investigating other crimes, diverted from engaging in community policing in our public housing projects and you know shopping districts and in other parts of our city. And what

they will instead be doing is following out orders of federal immigration agents, possibly even airline pilots on when to hold someone against their will.

Mr. Speaker, my other concern and I know there are others who want to speak so I will wrap this up. My other concern is for that person on the streets of a city like mine in Bridgeport who is the victim of a crime, who fears that they have been taken advantage of but they may be in this country illegally. Under the Trust Act that we have now, that individual should feel comfortable to walk into the Bridgeport Police Department and to say they are the victim of the crime and that the police should investigate that crime with the same vigor and the same authority that they investigate any other crime that takes place in our city.

Mr. Speaker, if this amendment is adopted, if this law goes through, that person living on that street who is a victim of that crime who is living in this country illegally should absolutely, absolutely fear walking into that police station because there is no guarantee that their name will

not be run through a system that some border patrol agent or some airline pilot issued a civil immigration detainer and they are going to be held against their will and deported. So they are going to stay silent Mr. Speaker. They are going to stay silent of that crime, the perpetrator of that crime is never gonna be caught. This bill does not make us any safer. In fact, what it does Mr. Speaker is it makes us less lawless and it allows justice to certain people over others. With that Mr. Speaker, I firmly, firmly implore this chamber to reject this amendment, to recall that just several years ago we struck a balance in this chamber in employing the Trust Act. And said our federal immigration agents should not -- should be able to go after criminals and those who are charged with crime, but not those who are not.

The proponent of this amendment could not give us assurance that this bill will not impact those who have not otherwise been charged with crimes and I will submit to you that it certainly does. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. A moment if people would. I am not the only member of this body who has tinnitus and when people raise their voices to make a point, it can be painful and it's certainly not really necessary. We're hearing each other. So please if people would remember to be respectful of each other and not enough for that, don't be raising your voices. If there's trouble hearing people speaking normally with the microphones, come up to the Dais and tell us. We will have things adjusted. Thank you very much. Representative O'Dea, now that I've taken the air out of the room, would you like to give us your mellifluous voice at a normal tone please?

REPRESENTATIVE O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I -- just a few questions to the proponent if I may and my good friend from Bridgeport, I think I agree with him. This amendment will make our cities less lawless, if I could quote him. I do believe, I think, through you Mr. Speaker a question to the proponent of this

amendment. As I understand it, this amendment is simply to address someone who's already detained. So we are not putting more obligations on officers who are already on the street. This person has already been detained and what this amendment does is simply give the local authorities the option of whether or not to release them after 48 hours of not.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much. Mr. Sampson you said you were hoping for more questions, congratulations here's one. You have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and thank you very much to my colleague for asking that question. To clarify the record, since it was claimed a moment ago that law enforcement would be out there engaging in federal immigration activity and that is not the case, as was stated by my colleague, this bill would only make it so the federal law is followed and that people that are already being detained are treated

according to federal law. No one is going out looking for anyone.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative.

Representative O'Dea back to you.

REPRESENTATIVE O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, and as I understand it the civil detainer laws as contained in the federal regs are not changed at all by this amendment. Whatever the civil pilot can do now, they are gonna be able to do if this amendment passes and whatever they can't do now they won't be able to do through this amendment if it passes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, is that correct?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative O'Dea.

Representative Sampson, is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. That is also correct.

We do not have the power to change federal law, even the law that this amendment hopes to remove from our

books doesn't really even work unless people chose to follow it, but they do so in direct contradiction to the supremacy of the federal government.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative O'Dea again.

REPRESENTATIVE O'DEA (125TH):

And to summarize, I think -- and I do think there's an honest disagreement between what to do under these two scenarios. And I think this amendment attacks this issue, and this issue is that suppose someone who's under civil detainer is arrested and they are sitting in a cell in New Canaan, my hometown, and under current law if I understand it we contact ICE as required and ICE says whether they will be here within 48 hours or they won't be here within 48 hours, and under the current law through you Mr. Speaker my understanding is if ICE doesn't pick them up within 48 hours we have to -- New Canaan has to release? Is that correct?

Through you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Representative Sampson, to you please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Under the Trust Act and state law that is correct, through you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative O'Dea please.

REPRESENTATIVE O'DEA (125TH):

And if this amendment passes, what that will allow is New Canaan PD if somebody's under civil detainer that they think should be held and ICE says, listen we can't be there within 48 hours, but we can be there within 50 can you hold them for an extra 2 hours, under this amendment that would be allowed? But if this amendment doesn't pass, that wouldn't be allowed? Is that correct?

Through you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. That is also correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative.

Representative O'Dea please.

REPRESENTATIVE O'DEA (125TH):

And not to be simplistic, but I'm a simplistic man as my good friend coming by me here in the front row could attest to; is there any real difference -- does this amendment really do anything else other than what I just kind of articulated? In other words, give the local PD the option to hold for a period of time longer than 48 hours if necessary to assist with the ICE request.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative.

Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. And through you, to my colleague, no that's all the bill does.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment rather.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Great, thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE O'DEA (125TH):

So to my friends on the other side of the aisle who disagree with this amendment, I don't want to get convoluted but my understanding is we are simply addressing that one issue, and that one issue being if a local PD wants more time -- I'm sorry, if ICE wants more time than 48 hours in order to get that person, my understanding is that's the only issue addressed in this amendment, and so I would ask my colleagues think about that depending on where you live, in Bridgeport I assume that's just a non-starter, but in my town in New Canaan that doesn't seem unreasonable and I think it gives the local authorities could release after 48 hours, they don't have to hold. So it just gives more choice to your local authorities. And so I would ask my colleagues to examine their districts and vote accordingly.

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative O'Dea. Will

you remark further? Representative DiMassa of the 116th, it's your turn please.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, it is good to see you up there. Just a couple of general comments, maybe the 50,000-foot view on this. I really don't want to get into the immigration debate. But I've heard a lot of this argument as far as following the law, following federal law, following state law. You know and certainly I want to be in compliance with all the laws we have, especially in the state of Connecticut. So keeping that in mind, do I really need to have the state police or my local police pull over a bicyclist for going over 65 miles an hour? Do I really need to have my probate clerk or my city clerk check to make sure they are not selling alcohol in the same place they are keeping official records? How about this; do I need to have my health department or perhaps our consumer protection really check to make sure that every pickle we are selling in the state of Connecticut actually bounces? Because according to

current law, if it doesn't bounce it's not a pickle. How about this one? Do I really need to report my neighbor for throwing their used razor blades out in their regular trash pickup? You know, these are all things that, you know, if we're really gonna have a conversation about numerous laws we may or may not be following perhaps that's a larger conversation for a later day. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much for your comments sir. Will you remark further on the amendment, Amendment "B"? Will you remark further? The majority leader, Representative Ritter please.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER (1st):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the debate here and it was good, I think as the questioning went on that people ask their questions and so we appreciate that process. I would say there's two comments I wanted to make. Number one, we all when we take the oath of office in this chamber, for most of us it was in January 2017 for this term. For some like Representative Gibson, it

was only a few weeks ago. But we all take very, very, very seriously the oath that we take to this state and to this country. So to insinuate that a vote on an amendment in any way diminishes one's loyalty or affirmation of their oath to a constitution is a road I'd rather not travel down in the future. We are all very, very proud of that, myself included.

And I would just end by saying that last year in 2017 the federal government did threaten to withhold funding from states and cities that they felt violated their view of federal law. Connecticut was not on that list. So the current federal government and the current Attorney General, who I will get to in a second, said Connecticut -- what their policies are do not violate what is known as Section 1373 dealing with detainers because of our sharing of information, which I believe the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the vice chairman dealt with. So we are compliant with this administration's view of their federal immigration policies based upon last year's stance.

But I will say this to the fact that our state is compliant. If we are in any way an impediment, legally speaking, to some of the forces in Washington D.C., I stand with that impediment. I am proudly part of that impediment. We are not violating anything. But are we an impediment at times to them? We might be, because our state has a different view of things. State's rights, that's our country. So if all we are doing today is arguing about whether we are an impediment to federal law and so some of the forces and voices we see down in the current federal congress, I proudly stand as that impediment. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Ritter. Representative Cheeseman of the 37th, please.

REPRESENTATIVE CHESSEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions for the proponent of the bill, if he could -- the amendment as it's stated if he could prepare himself?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson, please prepare yourself. Representative Cheeseman you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you so much Mr. Speaker. Through you, it's my understanding is it not that this is -- that the Trust Act was devised in response to the Secured Communities Program which required local law enforcement once they'd arrested someone and it had been determined that they were subject to a federal warrant or detention to then retain that person upon the arrival of ICE? Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Ma'am. Representative Sampson please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and through you to my delightful colleague, that is my understanding yes. That certain legislatures across the country including ours created this state law purposely to obstruct the federal authorities on the subject of

prosecuting people who are in violation of our
immigration laws.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative Sampson.
Representative Cheeseman.

REPRESENTATIVE CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and through you Mr. Speaker, so it's
my understanding, and I just want to confirm it with
the good proponent of the amendment, that under the
Secured Communities Act when an individual is
arrested, taken into custody, it is customary for
the local law enforcement to share their
fingerprints with the FBI. Now under the Secured
Communities Act they then share those fingerprints
with Immigrations and Customs enforcement who are
able to say yes this person is on our detainer list.
Is my understanding correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Madam. Representative
Sampson to you please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I believe you are correct. I don't work in law enforcement, but the process that you laid out seems like it is appropriate. I would note, however, that there is nothing in this that would say that someone could not as -- if an immigrant in the country illegally approached law enforcement, tell them something, that that doesn't generate a civil detainer.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative Cheeseman.

REPRESENTATIVE CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes, that's my understanding as well that this only applies when an individual has been apprehended on for some possible crime or other activity that local law enforcement deemed to be illegal and at that point if their fingerprints, which are shared with the FBI and are shared with ICE, are determined to be in the system then ICE is notified and could issue a detainer. Do

we share the same understanding?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

To you Representative Sampson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

To you Representative Cheeseman.

REPRESENTATIVE CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you so much Mr. Speaker and again it's my belief that when ICE is notified that they do in fact prioritize these detainers and removals and they are looking particularly at people who present a most significant risk to public safety as determined by the severity of a crime, their criminal history and other risks to public safety. Is that your understanding as well Mr. Sampson?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Yes Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely correct.

In fact, I would note that in the days leading up to the 911 attack on our country two of the highjackers had been stopped on separate occasions by the police department and if their backgrounds and immigration status had been checked that plot may have been uncovered. And the Trust Act being enacted essentially undoes that good work.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Sampson.

Representative Cheeseman.

REPRESENTATIVE CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. And again, it is not our Connecticut law enforcement or other police who are enforcing -- who are deciding on detainers, it's only federal immigration authorities who are making decision with regard to detainers and the need for removal. Is that your understanding Representative Sampson?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Again, Representative Sampson the

question is for you.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and yes that is also completely accurate. The state has no jurisdiction to make that determination.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you. Representative Cheeseman, do you have more please?

REPRESENTATIVE CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you, and I heard another -- someone on the other side of the aisle state that commercial airline pilots could issue an immigration detainer. Was that your understanding of the law at it stand?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Cheeseman.
Representative Sampson, please.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. As I stated before, I don't have that 287 federal regulation in front of me, but I do not believe that is accurate, no.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative
Cheeseman.

REPRESENTATIVE CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to
share with the good proponent of the amendment
having consulted the 287 and seen the line that says
border patrol agents including airline pilots. That
includes those airline pilots who are actually
border patrol agents. I have the good fortune to
have a member of my family who works intimately with
ICE and Department of Homeland Security and he
confirmed with me that commercial airline pilots,
unless they are federal air marshals are in fact
unable to issue immigration detainers. So I just
wanted to clear that point up. And I thank the good
proponent of the amendment for his information.
Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Madam. Will you remark
further on Amendment "B"? Will you remark further
on Amendment "B"? Representative Ritter, I

apologize for interrupting you before. Will you please remark further on Amendment "B"?

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER (1ST):

No problem, and I know we had a misunderstanding previously on the board, so no problem on my end. I would just urge everyone in the chamber to vote against the amendment. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Mr. Majority Leader. If there is no further comments, will staff and guests please come to the well of the house? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast? If all

members have voted, the machine will be locked and the clerk will take a tally. The clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House "B"

Total number Voting	147
Necessary for Adoption	74
Those voting Yea	62
Those voting Nay	85
Those absent and not Voting	3

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

The amendment fails. Returning to the bill. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the house? Will members please take your seats, and the machine will be open?

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the clerk will take a tally. Thank you very much. The clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5185 as amended by House "A"

Total number Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	143
Those voting Nay	4
Those absent and not Voting	3

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

The bill as amended is passed. (Gavel)

Are there any announcements or introductions?
Representative Hennessy of the 127th, for what reason do you rise sir?

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSY (127TH):

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

We're listening sir, please.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, next week April 25, next Wednesday, will be our annual Help-A-Hero Drive in which we bring items for our veterans to fill a Humvee that will be located between here and the yellow [inaudible04:34:39]. I am asking that you will please join Representative Ferraro and the Veterans Committee to help out the veterans that are at the South Park and here in Hartford and we also benefit Homes for the Brave in Bridgeport. You all know the drill and I hope that you can bring things in on that day, next Wednesday.

And further we are doing the Save A Suit. So if you have suits in your closet that are collecting dust and you would like to find them a suitable home, on May 3, two weeks from now, we will be having our Save-A-Suit drive in which this organization, this non-profit, that helps prepare veterans for interviews will be out collecting clothes, gently worn, to be fitted for our veterans.

And this of course is male and female. So I hope that you will be supportive of that too. In the last couple of years we've been doing it and it's been very successful. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you Representative Hennessy. I am getting the signal some didn't make out everything. Would you please repeat the dates that we'll be having drives for veterans?

Through you, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you, Help a Hero next week, April 25, which is a Wednesday. And then two weeks from now Save a Suit, which is May 3rd. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much. Representative Ferguson of the 138th, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE FERGUSON (138TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise just to mention to my colleagues that in the gallery joining us this afternoon are members of the

Danbury High School boys track team. The boys track team at Danbury High are class LL state championship, which they won back in February winning it for the fifth time in a row, and they are joined -- we are joined here today with their coach Rob Murray and members of the team. And I ask that they wave and we wave back and congratulate them and welcome them. (Clapping)

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Congratulations! Our normal warm welcome please. Thank you very much Representative Ferguson for bringing that to our attention. We thank the team for their hard work and for visiting us today. Representative O'Dea of the 125th, your turn sir.

REPRESENTATIVE O'DEA (125TH):

Just real quick. For the first time in Connecticut history, three football players from the same team committed to an FBS school from New Canaan, public school. Drew Payne committed to Notre Dame. Jack Stewart, my daughter's prom date committed to Michigan. And Jack Conley committed to Boston College. All to play football. For the

first time in a public school, three committed to an FBS school from the same team. So I just wanted to make that announcement and I thank you very much.

(Clapping)

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much for sharing that announcement with us and letting us know what progress we are making with our student athletes, we appreciate it. Thank you Representative O'Dea. Representative Buckbee of the 67th district, for what reason do you rise sir?

REPRESENTATIVE BUCKBEE (67TH):

For point of information Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Yes sir, you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE BUCKBEE (67TH):

As was mentioned earlier after a wonderful New Haven Day today, tomorrow will be New Milford Day starting at 11 o'clock, and along with what Representative O'Dea had to say, it will be the first time that I'm aware of that we've ever had a New Milford Day here at the capital. So I ask you

all to please stop down tomorrow. The same spot from today down in the lower lobby and meet some of my friends in New Milford including big industry like Kimberly-Clark and small farmers like GoatBoy Soaps with their brand new baby goats that will be here tomorrow. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much Representative Buckbee. Any further announcements or introductions? Seeing none, we will return to the calendar of business for the day.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Will the clerk please call Calendar 284?

CLERK:

On Page 5, Calendar 284 Senate Joint Resolution 29, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF GRANT W. WESTERSON OF OLD SAYBROOK TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative DiMassa of the 116th, you have

the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark sir?

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Westerson is from Old Saybrook, current [inaudible04:40:00] officer for the town of Old Saybrook, and excellent all-around candidate. I move adoption Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you very much sir. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark on the resolution before us? Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I also stand in support of Grant Westerson for the -- for this board

and he brings a lot of yachting, boating, understanding of the sound, understanding all of the issues both economic and environmental and a very strong candidate, so I urge support. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Would you care to remark further? Representative Carney of the 23rd.

REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I just rise for the purpose of supporting the nomination of Grant Westerson from the great town of Old Saybrook to serve on the Board of Directors of the Connecticut Port Authority. Mr. Westerson has extensive experience in boating and has an extensive public service career in the state -- I'm sorry in the town of Old Saybrook, having served on the Board of Finance there, and also he's had experience as the executive director of the Connecticut Marine Trades Association. So he will bring a lot of expertise to the Connecticut Port Authority, so I support his nomination and urge my colleagues to do so. Thank you so much Madam Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

The Ayes have it. (Gavel) Resolution is adopted. Clerk please call Calendar 285?

CLERK:

On Page 5, Calendar 285, Senate Joint Resolution No. 30, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF SCOTT D. BATES OF STONINGTON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative DiMassa of the 116th.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark sir?

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Bates is from Stonington, currently a deputy secretary of state for the state of Connecticut, an excellent all-around candidate and I move adoption Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you very much sir. Would you care to remark further? Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Also stand in very strong support of Scott Bates for this board, and he will continue as chairman. He is also deputy secretary of state, significant government experience. Again he understands the intersection

of all that's important to this board, so I urge support. Thank you very much.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

The Ayes have it. Resolution is adopted.

(Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 286.

CLERK:

On Page 5, Calendar 286, Senate Joint Resolution 32, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE REAPPOINTMENT OF RICHARD J. BARLOW OF CANTON AS MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MATERIALS INNOVATION AND RECYCLING AUTHORITY. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive

and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative DiMassa of the 116th.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Certainly Madam Speaker. Mr. Barlow is from Canton. He is the former first selectman and I move adoption Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Representative LeGeyt of the 17th.

REPRESENTATIVE LEGEYT (17TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise to enthusiastically support the endorsement and reappointment of Richard Barlow of Canton. He is

imminently qualified and has all kinds of experience in these kinds of matters, and will be a great reappointment addition to that committee. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I concur with the good representative from Canton and also Representative DiMassa. Thank you. I urge support.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

(Gavel) The Ayes have it. The resolution is

adopted in concurrence with the senate.

Clerk please call Calendar 287.

CLERK:

On Page 6, Calendar 287, Senate Joint Resolution No. 33, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF JAMES GILDEA OF DERBY TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CONNECTICUT COMMUTER RAIL COUNCIL. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative DiMassa of the 116th.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark sir?

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Gildea is from Reading. He is currently the director of

manufacturing at Bigelow Tea and an excellent all-around candidate. I move adoption Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I also stand in very strong support of Jim Gildea for this commission. It's a reappointment. He does commute down to Bigelow Tea, best tea company in Connecticut, if not the United States, little plug there. He understands and he knows what he needs to be doing and what the Commuter Rail Council does. He's a very good communicator and I stand in strong support.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

It seems the chamber is half asleep. All those opposed "Nay".

The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted in concurrence with the senate. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 288.

CLERK:

On Page 6, Calendar 288, Senate Joint Resolution No. 34, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF HOLLY HOWERY OF BRISTOL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative DiMassa of the 116th.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on

acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Ms. Howery is from Bristol. She is currently associative director of audio technology at ESPN, again another great all-around candidate. I move adoption Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I also stand in very support although I'll be honest it's not as strong a support as I would like to be saying. She is on the advisory board, I think the Board of Regents needs to do a stronger due diligence on this consolidation. I'm not sure she totally understands all the details, but I will give her the benefit of the doubt as she is on the advisory board going to the board of Regents. I hope she takes seriously this role and the opportunity we have to either do it right or not do it right. So I will stand in

support and urge my colleagues to do as well. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Will you remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted in concurrence with the senate. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 289.

CLERK:

On Page 6, Calendar 289, Senate Joint Resolution No. 37, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF MICHAEL MAHONEY OF WESTPORT TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CONNECTICUT COMMUTER RAIL COUNCIL. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative DiMassa of the 116th.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Mahoney is from Westport, currently senior vice president of Land Transport Finance at DVB Bank, and I would urge all my colleagues to vote in favor. I move adoption.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you very much sir. Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I also stand in support, very capable candidate. This is a nomination and I think we are lucky to have him

serve. Thank you. Urge support.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Will you remark further?
Would you care to remark further on the resolution
before us? If not, let me try your minds. All
those in favor of the resolution, please signify by
saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted in
concurrence with the senate. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 290.

CLERK:

On Page 6, Calendar 290, Senate Joint
Resolution No. 38, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE
NOMINATION OF THOMAS ANTHONY SHERIDAN OF WATERFORD
TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
CONNECTICUT AIRPORT AUTHORITY. Favorable Report of
the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and
Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative DiMassa of the 116th.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Sheridan is from Waterford, currently president and CEO of the Chamber of Commerce of eastern Connecticut. An excellent all-around candidate. I move adoption Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Would you care to remark further? Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I also stand in support. Tony brings tremendous experience to this.

I think he understands the issues surrounding the airport authority and a strong candidate. I urge support.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Representative McCarty of the 38th.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I also stand in strong support of Tony Sheridan to be a member of the Connecticut Airport Authority. I've known Tony for about two decades or more. I know him to be a very hard worker, conscientious and professional, and I think he will make an excellent member. Thank you Madam Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Will you remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you, much better. All those opposed
"Nay".

The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted
in concurrence with the senate. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 292.

CLERK:

On Page 7, House Calendar 292, Senate Joint
Resolution No. 5, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE
NOMINATION OF PAMELA K. ELKOW OF REDDING TO BE
REAPPOINTED TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY. Favorable Report of the
Joint Standing Committee on Executive and
Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative DiMassa of the 116th.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of
Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of
the resolution Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on

acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark sir?

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Mrs. Elkow is from Reading, and excellent all-around candidate, currently a business development partner at Carmody, Torrance, Sandak & Hennessey and I would adoption and encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you very much sir. Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I also stand in support of Pamela Elkow for the Connecticut Port Authority. Brings a lot of strong suits and well-suited to the responsibility. Thank you. Urge support.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please

signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted in concurrence with the senate. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 293.

CLERK:

On Page 7, House Calendar 293, Senate Joint Resolution No. 6, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF FELICE GRAY-KEMP OF HAMDEN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative DiMassa of the 116th.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you very much sir. The question before the chamber is on acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Ms. Gray-Kemp is from Hamden and she is currently a general council for the Lego Group in Enfield, an excellent all-around candidate and I, as always, move adoption.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you very much sir. Would you care to remark further? Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Yes I stand in support as well of Felice Kemp-Gray for this re-nomination. We did have a conversation about the Board of Regents and the consolidation of the community colleges. She understands the importance and that you need to do a deep dive. I do stand in support. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Would you care to remark

further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted in concurrence with the senate. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 294.

CLERK:

On Page 7, Calendar 294, Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF SAOMAI NGUYEN OF WEST HARTFORD TO BE APPOINTED A NONVOTING STUDENT MEMBER OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative Vargas of the 6th.

REPRESENTATIVE VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark sir?

REPRESENTATIVE VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Nguyen is from West Hartford and his professional experience includes currently being a mentor for the West Hartford public schools mentor program, currently the leadership network member for the Connecticut Youth Forum. He's got vast experience and I think he is very well qualified for this position, so I urge a favorable vote.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Are there -- would you care to remark further? Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I also stand in support of Saomai Nguyen -- sorry, these

young adults that serving of the State Board of Education are really so talented and it's a blessing to have them serve and hear their wisdom and hear their thoughts, and embrace their leadership and inspire them. So I stand in strong support. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted in concurrence with the senate. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 295.

CLERK:

On Page 7, Calendar 295, Senate Joint Resolution No. 8, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE

NOMINATION OF JAWERIA SHAH OF HAMDEN TO BE APPOINTED
A NONVOTING STUDENT MEMBER OF THE STATE BOARD OF
EDUCATION. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing
Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative Vargas of the 6th district.

REPRESENTATIVE VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of
Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of
the resolution.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on
acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and
adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Ms. Shah is from
Hamden. She is currently a student representative
of the Hamden Board of Education, currently the
editor and chief of The Dial, Hamden's High School
newspaper. She is involved in a lot of
organizations, a volunteer, and like our previous
nominee will be a student representative at the

State Board of Education. I urge a favorable vote.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Representative Wood of the
141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I also
stand in support of Jaweria Shah. She is another
gifted student and a beautiful voice in our State
Board of Education will be a great representative
for students. Very proud to have her serve. Thank
you. Urge support.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Would you care to remark
further? Would you care to remark further on the
resolution before us? If not, let me try your
minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please
signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted in

concurrence with the senate. (Gavel)

Clerk please Calendar 296.

CLERK:

On Page 8, Calendar 296, Senate Joint Resolution No. 21, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF MITCHELL M. FUCHS OF FAIRFIELD TO BE REAPPOINTED A MEMBER OF THE CONNECTICUT COMMUTER RAIL COUNCIL. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative Vargas of the 6th.

REPRESENTATIVE VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you Madam President. Mr. Fuchs is from

Fairfield, currently president of the Wellesley Corporation and he is currently serving as a board member of the Greater Bridgeport Transit Authority. So it's with great pleasure that I ask my colleagues to support him for the Connecticut Commuter Rail Council. I think he'll do a great job.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Representative Wood of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Also stand in support of Mitchell Fuchs for this responsibility. He brings broad experience to this experience and will do a very good job. Continue to support his re-appointment. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Representative Kupchick of the 132nd.

REPRESENTATIVE KUPCHICK (132ND):

Thank you Madam Speaker, and I stand in strong support of Mr. Fuchs. He is a long-time friend, a constituent and someone who has been a long-time

commuter as well and has served on the Commuter Council. He brings a wealth of information and he really fights hard for commuters, and I'm glad he's at least willing to serve again. So thank you Madam Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

All those opposed "Nay".

The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted in concurrence with the senate. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 291.

CLERK:

On Page 6, House Calendar 291, Senate Joint Resolution No. 39, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF ELISSA WRIGHT OF NOANK TO BE

REAPPOINTED A HUMAN RIGHTS REFEREE. Favorable
Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive
and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative DiMassa of the 116th.

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of
the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption
of the resolution Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on
acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and
adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

REPRESENTATIVE DIMASSA (116TH):

Ms. Wright is from Noank, a former state
representative of the Connecticut general assembly,
and I would move adoption Ma'am.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you very much sir. Representative Wood
of the 141st.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Executive nominations

we -- as you all probably know we do interview everyone up for a board of commission whether gubernatorial appointment or majority leader et cetera. In the process of interviewing our former colleague, a number of us had a number of concerns about her suitability for this re-nomination and for that reason I would like when the vote is taken, I would like the vote to be taken by roll.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Roll call has been requested. All those in favor of a roll call, please say "Aye".

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Roll call has been -- the requisite 20% has been met and a roll call will be ordered.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative Vargas -- oh I'm sorry Madam. Sorry to interrupt you.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOD (141ST):

No, I would just like to summarize on why I am opposing the re-nomination of Representative Elissa Wright. She was someone I certainly enjoyed serving with. We overlapped by four terms. We were on a couple of committees together. I know she is passionate for public service. I just didn't feel in her interview she exemplified why this would continue to be a good fit for our state. When I asked her a question on what a typical day was, she had a very hard time articulating that and I just -- it struck a number of us that she didn't seem to be very clearly able to communicate what she did and what she wanted to do. The job pays \$83,000 dollars a year plus benefits. That's a huge salary. I just feel very -- many of us felt very strongly that there is someone better for the job. So that's why I stand in opposition. I don't think we should be a rubber stamp group. We tend to be -- we have the responsibility to choose the right people for these boards and commissions, and I do stand in opposition, regrettably to Elissa Wright for this responsibility, and I urge my colleagues to vote no

on this nomination. Thank you very much.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative Vargas of the 6th.

REPRESENTATIVE VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I would just like to say that the position -- we were surprised because originally we were told the position was a voluntary position and as we moved in and asked questions we realized it was a paid position and compensated quite well. It's a position that apparently the person arbitrates on these issues and issues decisions and is on payroll. And although I believe that Ms. Wright probably could have done a little better explaining you know what the position was about, I believe that she -- I've known her for many, many years as an activist. I've worked with her, I knew her as a colleague here in the Connecticut House of Representative and I feel she has the passion and fairness to issue well-reasoned and fair decisions that come -- you know on issues that come before her. And I think primarily and

fundamentally, that's what we expect in people that hold these quasi judiciary positions whether it's Worker's Comp, arbitrators, whether its people that work at the labor board as arbitrators. Would we want our people to do well reasoned decisions that listen to the parties that come before them and try to be fair to the parties? And I think that Elissa Wright has the material to be a fair person. And for that reason, I urge all my colleagues to vote on her appointment. Thank you very much Madam Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Will you remark further?

Representative Conley of the 40th.

REPRESENTATIVE CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I've heard some of my colleagues say some things about Elissa Wright who served with many of you in the 41st district, currently held by Joe De La Cruz who hopefully will be here to talk about our good friend Elissa Wright. Elissa has worked very hard on behalf of Groton for many years. She continues to work very hard for social causes in the town of Groton, especially she

has done a tremendous amount of work for Open Space and for the environment. She is a very passionate woman, an excellent woman in Groton. And I understand that some people didn't like what she had to say in her interview, but I would hope that those remember all the good times they had with Elissa, her passion, her drive, and her work that she's done in this building and that we expect her to do the same work in human rights. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Representative Ryan of the 139th.

REPRESENTATIVE RYAN (139TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. I just want to add my words to those of Representative Conley. I ran into Elissa the week before she was interviewed, had a very nice conversation. She was lucid, she was still very passionate about issues and serving the state. She was looking forward to that interview that day, and I can't imagine she didn't come up here prepared to do -- answer the questions that were presented to her and as Representative Conley

has presented she has always had a great interest in public service. It's her family that's had interest in public service and the day I spoke to her I saw no evidence of any reason why she wouldn't be able to fulfill her duties. Thank you Madam Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Representative Urban of the 43rd district.

REPRESENTATIVE URBAN (43RD):

Thank you Madam Chair. I too served with Elissa Wright and found her to be an incredibly thoughtful legislator with an extraordinary background and I can only think having good real respect for my colleague across the aisle that there might have just been a bad day and we all have bad days, and I would never ever say that we should not vote a yes on Elissa because she might have had a bit of a day that she was not feeling great. But she is an amazing person, amazing background and wonderful to work with. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Will you remark further?

Will you remark further? If not, staff and guests please come to the well. Members take your seats. The machine will be open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Will members please check the board to make sure your vote is properly cast? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked and the clerk will take the tally. The clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Joint Resolution 39,

Total number Voting	147
Necessary for Adoption	74
Those voting Yea	79
Those voting Nay	68
Those absent and not Voting	3

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The resolution is adopted in concurrence with
the senate. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 215.

CLERK:

On Page 27, House Calendar 215, Substitute
House Bill No. 5450, AN ACT CONCERNING THE STAFF
QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENT FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD
EDUCATORS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing
Committee on Education.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative Sanchez of the 25th.

REPRESENTATIVE SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I move
for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable
Report and passage of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Question before the chamber is on acceptance of
the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage
of the bill. Representative Sanchez you have the
floor.

REPRESENTATIVE SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, this is a bill that we took out about two years ago in the staff qualifications. We moved up the dates. There is a phase one, phase two and phase three in the bill. So basically what we are doing here is we're moving up the dates another two years and we are also asking the office of early childhood to come up with an analysis. If these staff qualifications moving forward are attainable, if not to bring forward to the Education Committee another plan. And I urge passage of this bill Madam Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Will you remark further?
Representative Lavielle of the 143rd.

REPRESENTATIVE LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Good afternoon.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Afternoon.
REPRESENTATIVE LAVIELLE (143RD):

I just have one question for the proponent and then a remark. I rise in support of the bill. So

I'd like to ask the good representative what exactly are the requirements that are being pushed out for two years.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Representative Sanchez.

REPRESENTATIVE SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. To the good representative, the requirements are the same as two years ago. The phase one would be 50% of the teachers would have to obtain a bachelor's degree in early childhood or something similar to that. And the other 50% would be working toward the bachelor's degree. That would be pushed off for two years from 2018 to 2020. Phase two would then push the 2021 date to 2023 which requires 100% of all the head teachers to have a bachelor's degree in early childhood. And then the third phase, of course, would mean and moving forward that all the teachers in those classrooms -- and by the way these are state funded programs only, would have those requirements. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REPRESENTATIVE LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you Madam Speaker. And I thank the representative for his answers, which should make everything clear. This is a necessary bill, actually. For a long time, it was very difficult to find people with some experience and qualifications, some academic qualifications in early childhood --

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Excuse me Madam. (Gavel) Members are having difficulty hearing. They are cupping their ears to show they can't hear. Please respect the debate. If you have conversations, take them out in the hall. Thank you. Representative Lavielle.

REPRESENTATIVE LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you Madam Speaker. So I will repeat what I said. This is a necessary bill that has no fiscal note. For a long time, it was quite difficult to find people to teach preschool who had some knowledge through classroom and some training in dealing with early childhood learning. And so a few

years ago, the Education Committee and the Office of Early Childhood made the decision to increase the qualification. And Representative Sanchez, I have to say, has done incredible work on this and has remained very persistent and really cares about how this turns out. What happened, however, was that when we got people with these good qualifications they wanted more money. And it's a delicate balance between how much you have to pay someone and being able to afford it, and also making sure that they have qualifications that demand -- okay they are going to demand a higher wage, but not so high that it becomes unaffordable and that they will leave to go and teach some other level of schooling.

So what we put into place a few years ago is still not quite there, and the Office of Early Childhood hasn't quite come up with the right combination either. So this year because it's imperative that that is a level of schooling that is probably more important than any other, early childhood, that we get this right. So this isn't one of those things that well we paid a lot of money

to get it up and running and then it's not right so we're gonna change the whole thing. This is not going to cost any money. And it's just making sure that it actually is hitting the target reconciling the wages with the qualifications, and I'm sure particularly with Representative Sanchez's hard work that we're gonna get there. So I would -- I do rise in strong support of this bill and I urge everyone else to support it. Thank you Madam Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further? Representative McCarty of the 38th.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you Madam Chair -- Madam Speaker excuse me. I also too rise in very strong support of this bill. I know that it was very difficult for a lot of our nonprofit providers of early childhood programs with the heightened requirements, so this will give more time for everybody to adjust. And I'd also like to recognize the leadership of the Education Committee as well as the commissioner of

the Office of Early Childhood Education. And just very one quick question to the proponent.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative Sanchez, prepare yourself.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you. Representative Sanchez, could you just clarify that these programs are just for state funded early childhood programs.

REPRESENTATIVE SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you Madam Speaker, yes. It's only state funded programs.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you very much. Thank you Madam Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Representative Cook of the 65th.

REPRESENTATIVE COOK (65TH):

Thank you Madam Chairman. Madam Chairman, I just want -- Madam Speaker, I just want to stand in complete support of this bill. We obviously have a visitor here. This is little Randy Collins [phonetic], and mom has just walked in the door.

And I just wanted to thank our chairman's for bringing out this bill because this is why we do early childhood pieces of legislation. It's really about making sure that we take care of our youngest. So thank you, and thank you to the chairs.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you and now we understand why the ruckus on the democratic side of the aisle, there's a visiting baby. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on this bill? Representative Sanchez.

REPRESENTATIVE SANCHEZ (25TH):

Madam Speaker, I'd just to thank the ranking member of the Education Committee and all the members for their support. This bill did come out of the Education Committee unanimously. And we'll see what happens in the next two years. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the house. Members please take your seats. Machine will be

open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast. If all members have voted the machine will be locked. And the clerk will take a tally. The clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5450,

Total number Voting	146
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	146
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	4

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 256.

CLERK:

On Page 34, Substitute House Bill No. 5533, AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE'S CONSOLIDATED PLAN FOR HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee of Planning and Development.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative Lemar of the 96th.

REPRESENTATIVE LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you Madam Chair. I move the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Lemar you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the bill before us would require the Department of Housing in conjunction with the Connecticut Finance

Authority to specify certain fair housing goals in the state's consolidated plan for housing and community development and to report progress made toward such goals on a basis which we could evaluate and incorporate in our state planning and processes. I move adoption.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Representative Zawistowski of the 61st.

REPRESENTATIVE ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. This bill conforms state and federal requirements. It requires no additional staffing in the Department of Housing, and I urge passage. Thank you Madam Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further? If not, will the staff and guests please come to the well of the house? Members please take your seats. The machine will be open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

Members to the chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Members please be aware the next two bills will go rapidly. Please stay in the chamber so we can complete the voting in a timely manner. Thank you.

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast. If all the members have voted the machine will be locked. And the clerk will take a tally. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5533,

Total number Voting	145
Necessary for Passage	73
Those voting Yea	145
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	5

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel)

Clerk please call Calendar 132.

CLERK:

On Page 17, House Calendar 132, Substitute House Bill No. 5193, AN ACT CONCERNING BINGO PERMITS AND MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on General Law.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative D'Agostino of the 91st.

REPRESENTATIVE D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Good afternoon Madam Speaker. I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative D'Agostino, you have the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Briefly this bill makes some conforming changes to the statutory changes we made last year with respect to games of chance. It, as you recall, we put authority and

oversight over those games like bingo, bizarres and raffles under our municipal authority and this statute just -- this bill just simply lets the chief municipal authority, the chief police or the chief executive officer of municipality designate someone to oversee those games of chance in the municipality. It also allows qualified organizations to pay \$60 dollars for each Class III bizarre permit which lasts 60 days rather than getting that same permit every day that the bizarre continues. And for those interested, a bizarre is a place maintained by a sponsoring organization for the disposal of merchandise or it's by means of chance. I had to look that one up. I move adoption.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Representative Smith of the 108th.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH (108TH):

Madam Speaker. I have an amendment that I was gonna hand out with a bingo card for every member of the chamber, but it's late in the day, I'm gonna

hold off on that. This is a good sensible bill and it ought to pass.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the house.

Members please take your seats. Machine will be open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the chamber.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast. If all the members have voted the machine will be locked. And the clerk will take the tally. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5193,

Total number Voting	143
Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	143
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	7

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel)

Representative Ritter.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER (1ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. Just cause we have the democratic caucus most of us here before we wrap up for the day. We are having a caucus tomorrow at the conclusion of session, which we estimate will be around 4:00 o'clock, so everyone on the democratic side will be caucusing tomorrow. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you sir. Clerk please call Calendar 253.

CLERK:

On Page 33, Calendar 253, House Bill No. 5507,
AN ACT CONCERNING THE SOUTH CENTRAL CONNECTICUT
REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY. Favorable Report of the
Joint Standing Committee on Planning and

Development.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Representative Conley of the 40th.

REPRESENTATIVE CONLEY (40TH):

Hi Ma'am. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

The question before the chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE CONLEY (40TH):

This bill is intended to provide a technical revision to the South Central Regional Water Authority Charter to allow in emergency situations the process to be streamlined to prevent harm to the public in the clean water as soon as possible if there is an emergency in that water authority.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Do you move passage Ma'am?

REPRESENTATIVE CONLEY (40TH):

I do.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you. Representative Zawistowski of the 61st.

REPRESENTATIVE ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you Madam Speaker. This bill affects only the South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority and it conforms their notice requirements to what is currently required by PURA. I recommend passage.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you Madam. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on this bill? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the house? Members please take your seats. Machine will be open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives if voting by roll. Members to the chamber. The House of Representatives if voting by roll. Members to the chamber.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Have all the members voted? If all the members

have voted, please check the board to ensure your vote has been properly cast. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked. The clerk will take a tally. The clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5507,

Total number Voting	143
Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	143
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	7

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel) Representative Albis of the 99th.

REPRESENTATIVE ALBIS (99TH):

Mr. Speaker, good afternoon.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good afternoon sir.

REPRESENTATIVE ALBIS (99TH):

Mr. Speaker I move to refer the bills as indicated on today's go list.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Is there objection? Is there objection?
Hearing none, so ordered. Are there any
announcements or introductions? Representative
Hilda Santiago of the 84th district.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTIAGO (84TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have the journal
notations for today. Representative Baker, business
in the district. Representative Perone, business in
the district. Representative Fleischmann is ill.
Representative Berger, business in the district.
And Representative Roland Lemar, business in the
district. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much Madam. The journal will so
note. Representative Betts of the 78th, for what
purpose do you rise sir?

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Thank you sir. I have two reasons. One, I'm
gonna make an very announcement, a proud
announcement about one of our colleagues
Representative Ben McGorty went and left early for a

family affair, and that affair is his son is about to become a DEA agent and he's gonna get sworn in tonight at a ceremony down in Mexico. So he's gonna be dealing with that and also human trafficking, and I want to congratulate them and I know they are very proud of their son and that's why he missed the last couple of votes.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

That's outstanding. Thank you very much sir.

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

For the purpose of journal notation.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Thank you. Representative Pavalock-D'Amato on maternity leave. Representative Frey missed some votes because of funeral. Representative LeGeyt was in the district on business. Representative Kokoruda is out due to surgery. Representative Lavielle was out of the chamber on legislative business. And Representative O'Dea is in district on business. And as I said Representative McGorty

is out of state on family business. I hope it be recorded in the journal, and thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Journal will so note. Thank you Representative. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Lesser of the 100th district, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE LESSER (100TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. For purpose of announcement?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE LESSER (100TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow there will be ceremonies commemorating the 70th anniversary of the state of Israel in Room 310, and the relationship between Connecticut and Israel members and guests are please --are invited to attend if they are interested.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much sir. Are there any other

announcements or introductions? Representative
McGee of the 5th district, you have the floor sir.

REPRESENTATIVE MCGEE (5TH):

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I stand for the purpose
of an announcement?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed sir.

REPRESENTATIVE MCGEE (5TH):

Do we have a new speaker today I see? Oh man.
Cool. So I just -- on behalf of the black and
Puerto Rican caucus I would thank everyone in this
chamber for supporting our annual Spring Fling which
is an opportunity to fundraise and give away
scholarships. For those of you that will be here
between, well it's already 4:30, 4:30 until 6:00.
We'll be down on the main level presenting all of
our students with their scholarships, greeting their
families and it's because of your generous donations
and this building that we are able to do what we do.

And then on tomorrow, we'll host our annual
Spring Fling at the Red Rock Café. If you are
interested in attending, please see any members of

the black and Puerto-Rican caucus. Again, thank you so much for your support, your donation, that help many of the young people throughout the state.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much sir. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Albis of the 99th.

REPRESENTATIVE ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you Mr. Speakers. Just to remind everybody we will be back here again at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow morning, so looking forward to seeing you then. And there being no further business on the clerk's desk, I move that we adjourn subject to the call of the chair.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Is there objection? Is there objection?
Hearing none. We are adjourned subject to the call of the chair. (Gavel)

(On motion of Representative Albis of the 99th District, the House adjourned at 4:30 o'clock p.m.,

nh
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

287
April 18, 2018

to meet again at the Call of the Chair, sine die.)

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 283 pages is a complete and accurate transcription of a digital sound recording of the House Proceedings on April 18, 2018.

I further certify that the digital sound recording was transcribed by the word processing department employees of Alphatranscription, under my direction.

Alpha Transcription
3244 Ridge View Ct 104
Lake Ridge VA 22192