

THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 2018

(The House of Representatives was called to order at 11:34 o'clock a.m., Speaker Joe Aresimowicz of 30th District in the Chair.)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

(Gavel) The House will please come to order. Would members, staff and guests please rise, direct your attention to the dais, where Rabbi Alan Lefkowitz will lead us in prayer.

HOUSE CHAPLAIN RABBI ALAN LEFKOWITZ:

Good morning. Dear God, we often wonder where You come in our lives. Do You come in our lives? We often think that when God takes something from our grasp that God is punishing us. Actually God is not punishing us, but merely opening our hands to receive something better. As we concentrate on the phrase, "The Will of God will never take us where the Grace of God will not protect us." To ask

ourselves the question why is this happening for me as opposed to why is this happening to me? God, our Creator, walk through our house, this house, and take away all our worries, illnesses, and please watch over and keep our families healthy, our State healthy, our USA as well as the people on the planet. In Your name, let us pay attention and watch what God does. We say, Amen.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Would my partner in Berlin, Representative Abercrombie from the 83rd District, please come up to the dais and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

I'll be your partner in crime any day.

(Laughter)

I pledge 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):

Thank you. Thank you very much, Representative. Good morning, Mr. Clerk. Is there

any business on the Clerk's desk?

CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there's favorable reports and House Bills to be tabled for the Calendar and printing. And there's also the Daily Calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Ritter of the 1st District.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Top of the morning, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good morning, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

I move that we waive the reading of House favorable reports and the bills be tabled for the Calendar and printing.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

So ordered. Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Demicco of the 21st District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good morning, sir.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

We are joined in the House Chamber today by a friend and a constituent from Farmington, Mr. John Tucker. John is an Assistant Attorney General for the State of Connecticut and a good guy and a hardworking guy and I just wanted the House to afford him the usual welcome and felicitations. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good morning, sir. Welcome him to the Chamber please ladies and gentlemen. (Applause)
Representative Ferraro of the 117th. Good morning.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. How are you today?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Excellent, sir. How are you?

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Great. It's with great pleasure that I'm here with Representative Staneski and a member of the Milford residents who came up to check out the

process today. Mark Macchio from Milford, Connecticut. He's very interested in the political process and can't wait to watch the operations of the day. So, I'd like the Chamber to give him our usual good welcome.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you for coming up. (Applause)
Representative Buckbee, not that I didn't appreciate our two previous guests, but I think you have a unique introduction.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I do.
(Laughter) I think maybe for the first time in at least 100 years+, we have a goat in the House.
(Laughter) And I believe he is the greatest of all time. He was born last Saturday. He's less than a week old. He's with Goatboy Soaps who's part of New Milford Day downstairs today. So, he and his sister, Fodie (phonetic), will be here. Now, Billy Moe is his name. He's my namesake. Yes, I know, he's excited. (Laughter) He's my namesake. They named the goat after me. I'm thrilled to have that.

So, this is Billy Moe. Can we give him a round of applause? (Applause) I brought him in by himself.

We do have some other esteemed colleagues and guests I may be asking to stop up here, but. I invite you all to come downstairs and join the Milford Day, where you cannot only meet Billy Moe and his sister Fodie and Goatboy Soaps, but are friend from Kimberly Farms who brought us the chocolate milk last year. The chocolate milk is back and I wouldn't be Santa Claus if there wasn't cookies to go with the chocolate milk. The Girl Scouts are here as well. Also, in my pocket here, showing that we're not entirely an agricultural community since 1958, Kimberly Clark has been making tissues like these here in the great State of Connecticut and in the Town of New Milford. They're downstairs.

I invite you all to stop down, meet Billy Moe, enjoy some chocolate milk and some cookies and visit all the wonderful businesses who are here from New Milford that are representing our community. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You have any questions for Billy?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I don't know about Billy, but you know what they do refer to baby goats as? Correct, Representative?

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

Kids.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Yes. So, thanks for having the kids up here.

(Laughter)

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. That was a baaad joke, just so you know. (Laughter)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

It's a two-man gig, Representative Buckbee. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Announcements or introductions? Just to inform the Chamber, I have been getting text messages from many of our colleagues. It's my understanding there's an accident on 84. We imaging the first bill there will be some debate. But if folks aren't here by the time we're ready to vote on that first bill, we may wait to allow folks to get here. We can't

control accidents. With that being said, would the Clerk please call House Calendar 260?

CLERK:

Connecticut General Assembly House of Representatives, April 19, 2018. On page 45, House Calendar 260, House Joint Resolution No. 28 - A RESOLUTION PROPOSING A STATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT EARLY VOTING; favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good morning, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the resolution.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question in on acceptance of the Joint

Committee's favorable report and passage of the resolution. Will you remark? Representative Fox, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the State Constitution requires that voters appear on election day unless they meet one of the requirements for an absentee ballot. The proposed constitutional amendment before us would allow up to five days of early voting within two weeks of election day. They may be days immediately preceding election day or may be the two weekends before election day or some other configuration. House Joint 28 removes language that prevents us from having early voting in Connecticut.

Specifically, it modifies section 7, article 6 of the Constitution. It provides the qualification of who can vote before election day from unable to appear to do not appear. The resolution allows for at least two and no more than five days of early voting. Should the resolution pass the Legislature, this body would make determination of the number of

days that are provided for early voting. The amendment says that the two to five days of early voting will take place within two weeks of election day.

This allows for enabling legislation to work out what exactly -- when exactly these days would occur. The resolution requires the early voting days to have at least eight hours of availability each day. If the resolution passes, it would eliminate the constitutional deadlines by which election moderators must submit their election returns to the town clerks and the Secretary of State.

The Connecticut General Statute set earlier deadlines by which they must submit these returns in section 9-308 and 9-309. Lines 33-74 of the resolution amends article 4, section 4 of the Constitution. And this is the provision in our Constitution that says that the votes must be received and counted on the day of the election in the presence of the electors. It also provides for the submittal of list of persons voted for the town

clerk and of the Secretary of State within specified times, and those times would be determined by this new resolution.

This section of the resolution applies only to our state officers -- our state constitutional officers. This language is now addressed in the statute, section 9-309. Lines 23-30 of the resolution does essentially the same thing as the prior section just mentioned except that it applies to election of members of the General Assembly, this body. This situation now addressed in the statute in section 9-308. These prior two portions essentially just clean up some language in the State Constitution.

Finally, if House Joint 28 goes forth to the ballot, the question that appears in lines 82-85 will be the question that appears on the ballot. I'd like to emphasize what this resolution does not do.

It does not make any changes in our current election laws. What this resolution does is it is essentially an enabling legislation and that it puts

for forming our election laws in the hands of our lawmakers who are responsible for their constituents, the people in this room. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's time for Connecticut to have the opportunity to join the other states that have enacted some form of early voting.

I believe that in light of today's increased civic engagement as well as allowing our constituents options that reflect today's busy, hectic schedules and unpredictable lifestyles, allowing the voters to have the opportunity to decide if they want the opportunity to vote early, allowing their representatives to determine -- to consider these options is timely and appropriate. I move adoption and request that when the vote be taken it be taken by roll. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will you remark further on this resolution?
Representative Devlin of the 134th.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning. Through you, a few questions for the proponent of this

resolution?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, madam.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you. So, if I understand correctly from the summary that was provided, in essence, House Joint Resolution No. 28 would enable municipalities in the State of Connecticut to establish a period of 14 days prior to election day in order to allow early voting. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

If I may just change our order just for a moment. I believe there's a roll call vote that was -- so, the question before the Chamber is whether there will be a roll call vote. All those in favor say aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Those opposed nay. (Gavel) The twenty-percent rule has been met. You may continue.

Representative Devlin, I believe you asked the question. Representative Fox, do you understand the question?

REP. FOX (148TH):

Yes sir, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You have the floor, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Representative for her question. The proposal would allow for up to five days of early voting within the 14 days before elections. So, it's not up to 14 days of early voting, it's identifying and defining the period that early voting would be allowed to the four -- two weeks before election day, and of those two weeks, it would be five days. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, through you, as I am reading this resolution, it would be not less

than two days and not more than five days. So, a two-five-day window within 14 days prior to election day. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

That's correct, yes, Mr. Speaker. Through out.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you. And as I understand this as well, it would be for a minimum of eight hours a day, but there is no specification for the amount of time per day. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

That's correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, reading this then, it would seem to me that a town like Stamford may be able to choose perhaps October 22nd to October 28th and have early election maybe for eight hours, nine hours, ten hours. It could vary each day. And a town like Fairfield might choose to have October 31st to October -- or to November 2nd. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is not my understanding. My understanding is that first off the General Assembly will be asked to make the specifics as to the timeframe after -- should this resolution pass and be accepted by the residents of the State of Connecticut. So, my understanding is that it would be much more uniform. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, through you, it is intended, but there will be a set number of days, which could be two, it could be three, it could be four or five. Not a mix of those. One of those, within a 14-day window with a specified number of hours per day that would be uniform across every municipality in the State of Connecticut. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, my understanding is it's the General Assembly that will decide, not the individual towns. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you to the proponent of the bill. Could -- I'd like to understand what the proposed costs would be of implementing an additional voting procedure within the 169 municipalities of our state. Through you,

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the proponent for the question. as of now, the fiscal impact as noted in the bill analysis would indicate that should this resolution pass and be immediately by a three-fourths majority be on the ballot this coming November, there's a belief that it would cost approximately \$5,000 dollars to the Secretary of State's Office to advertise in essence for this procedure. But in order -- in essence -- in terms of what the costs would be to the individual municipality, that is very difficult to ascertain now because this only, as I said earlier, essentially enabling legislation, so the specifics and requirements as to two days, three days, four days, five days, at hours per day will have to be determine at a later date by this body. It's very difficult to ascertain what that cost would be.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But it's probably pretty safe to say in a day and age when our municipalities are facing continued reduced support from the State of Connecticut and our local residents are facing increased property taxes that this would be an additional unfunded mandate on our municipalities in order to implement early voting within our state. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Again, through you, Mr. Speaker, I thank the proponent for the question, but it's very difficult at this time to determine what would be the cost assumed by each municipality. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you. While the good proponent of this bill can't estimate the cost, I think he could agree there is a cost. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, ultimately, there could be a potential cost, but there could also be some savings. Should the towns be provided to the opportunity to have early voting on days prior to election day, there is the hope that that would potentially alleviate some of the burden on election day. So, while there may be an additional cost, there could be some savings as well. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the good proponent; however, I don't believe there is any

expectation that by implementing early voting municipalities would have fewer polling locations, fewer polling workers, less hours at the polls that somehow would offset that. Now that said, you know, our good Secretary of State has proudly pronounced on multiple occasions how proud she was of the voter turnout in the State of Connecticut that I believe she proclaimed as unprecedented. And it probably is unprecedented, maybe in the entire nation, because we had 77 percent voter turnout in the State of Connecticut. So, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the good proponent of the bill, what is the intent of opening our Constitution to enable early voting for our voters that in the last election, in 2016, participated 77 percent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and again I thank the proponent for the question. I think the intent is we're trying to open up the opportunities for voting to the residents of the State of Connecticut.

Benefits of early voting are that it will alleviate long lines at polling places by creating other voting opportunities. They will accommodate voters who may have to commute long distances, particularly in our neck of the woods down in the Fairfield County area who live and die by the train schedule often times and often find it very difficult to get to the voting polls before their early trains or after their train ride home. It accommodates elderly or sick voters who may have good days and bad days and not feel well enough to make it to the polls on the assigned day. So they can vote when they know that they feel well. The other voting process allows certain election administrators to ease into election and troubleshoot problems and fix them without the constraints of a sudden rush on election day. It's opening up the doors to set engagement and creating more opportunities for people to be involved in the voting process.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I believe, to the good proponent's points, our state does also offer absentee ballots as another alternative and is particularly for those who are permanently disabled. I believe we have a no excuse absentee ballot in place. So, there are tremendous accommodations that are made, and particularly having 77 percent voter turnout for the municipalities that also had well planned and organized their election day operations, everything seemed to move quite smoothly. So, I do thank the good proponent for that. One question, through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe a similar resolution was on the ballot before Connecticut voters. Is that true, Mr. Speaker, through you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct. It was on the ballot, I believe, in 2014. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, I believe in 2014 Connecticut voters resoundingly said no to opening the Constitution for early voting. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- they did say no. I'm not sure if I'd define it as resounding. I believe it was about a 52-46 percent, 50 -- it was not as resounding as I think the proponent may allude to. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you. I believe we could characterize a majority of Connecticut voters voted no just three years ago. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct.

Yes sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the proponent of the bill. I believe, you know, one of the points that he had made is that by implementing early voting there would be less congestion on election day. So, how would municipalities be handling early voting? Would there be multiple voting locations? Would they have to be the same locations as those that were currently in place? You know, how would this actually work? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again I thank the

proponent for the question. Those are all specifics which will be worked out by this body at a later date. As I mentioned earlier, this is essentially enabling legislation which would -- if permitted and voted and approved by the residents of the State of Connecticut, the specific details would be determined at a later date. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And at what later date would these details be worked out? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The timing -- there are two possible timelines for passage. The first, the resolution passes today with support from three-fourths of both this Chamber and the Chamber upstairs. This resolution would appear on the 2018 ballot. If the resolution passed with just a simple

majority in this Chamber and the Chamber upstairs,
it would have to be reintroduced after the next
General Assembly convenes in 2019, and then passed
again by both bodies, and thereafter it would be
placed on the 2020 ballot. Through you, Mr.
Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, through you, if
the good proponent of the bill could please clarify,
are we essentially then asking that there is this
sort of vague notion put before the voters with some
pretty significant details to be worked out, but
with the promise that we will do that going forward?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, is the
proponent asking what the specific question will be
that will appear before the voters? Through you,

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry; could the good Representative please repeat that answer?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you. What I'm asking is, is the proponent asking what the specific question will be that will be put forth to the voters? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

I'm sorry. One more time.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Is the proponent --?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you. Is the proponent asking what the specific question will be that will asked of the speaker -- of the voters? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, through you, yes, and coupled with that, is there a -- is that an implied promise, then, that some of these critical details such as costs to municipalities, unfunded mandates, etcetera, would be worked out in a way after voters would be voting on this resolution? So, two parts. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the proponent for that. I'll answer the first question first. The specific that we'd put before the voters appears in lines 82-85 of the resolution. I'll read it. *Shall the Constitution of the State be amended to allow the General Assembly to provide opportunities*

for early voting in person during the 14 days prior to the day of the election? That's the specific question that'll be asked of the voters should this resolution go through the process of being approved. And the second question, the specifics will be worked out by this body and so in terms of whether or not it's vague or not, it's gonna be up to this body and the individuals in this room and upstairs to determine what the specifics are. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, through you, in fact, we are asking the voters to just trust that we'll work out those critical details at a later date. Is that correct? Within a specific timeframe. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I -- to the

proponent, I suppose the answer is yes in the same sense that we -- that the voters were asked to trust us in all of our wisdom on all of the matters that face the State of Connecticut. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Back to some specific, maybe more granular details about how this would work. Does this require that early voting be done by tabulator, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there are no -- there is no specific requirement in the underlying resolution that would require by tabulator, but I can say that in conversations I've had with town clerks, the registrars and other groups over the past several months and years, actually, my understanding is that the tabulator's a

more secure form of voting and so my inclination would be that, ideally, should this resolution pass and this body move to make -- move to implement these procedures, that voting by tabulator, in light of the fact that it's been seen to be the secure way to vote, would hopefully be implemented down the road. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, just another clarifying question to the good proponent of the bill. In terms of locations, then -- so, if in fact we were to vote by tabulator, what those security procedures would be around those tabulators and where would they actually be located in order for voting to occur within municipalities? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the proponent

for the question. Again, I'm somewhat at a loss in light of the fact that this is more or less an enabling legislation. The specifics of how the voting is gonna occur, where the voting's gonna occur, the time when the voting's gonna occur will be determined at a later date. So, unfortunately, I don't have a specific answer to the proponent other than the fact that this body will determine the specifics. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that answer from the good Representative. And give me just one moment here. So, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the bill. How would municipal - - voters in municipalities be informed of this new process should it move through the Legislature?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'm -- through you.

I'm assuming that -- is the proponent asking how would the voters be informed should this resolution ultimately be approved by the voters of the State of Connecticut? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Could I ask the good Representative to please repeat that?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox, will you repeat the question, sir?

REP. FOX (148TH):

Of course. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the proponent asking how will voters be informed of this should it ultimately be approved by the voters of the State of Connecticut or -- is she asking for how voters will be informed should this pass both Chambers this number of times and then be voted on and approved by the residents of the State of Connecticut? Is that what's she's asking? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

So, my question to the proponent of the bill was, again, thinking from a municipality standpoint and potential costs that may be incurred, the need to inform voters of additional voting options and locations, etcetera. So, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the bill, you know, how would that work and is that factored in?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the proponent for the question. I think in terms of the fiscal note attached to the current bill that might be a basis to answer the question to give the proponent some ideas as to my understanding of how voters will be informed should this resolution pass by three-fourths of this body and the body upstairs and appear on the 2018 ballot. The Secretary of State's anticipated to incur a cost of \$5,000 dollars,

providing posters for the proposed constitutional amendment in question and explanation in each polling place in every municipality. So, the essence of how the municipalities will be informed is through the Secretary of State's Office. Through you, Mr. Speaker, that's my understanding based on the fiscal note that's provided here. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you. So, just to clarify, Mr. Speaker, through you. It is through posters provided by the Secretary of State that our electorate will be informed?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that's what's listed in the OFA fiscal note. I presume the publicity could be taken in other forms of electronic and word of mouth. I'm not sure exactly the Secretary of

State's advertising capabilities, but I presume that they'll find a means to make -- let the word get followed. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just some, I guess, final comments, I don't have any further questions at this moment for the proponent of the bill. However, one thing we can take pride in in the State of Connecticut is significant participation in terms of our electorate voting. In the 2012 election, we were just shy of 74 percent of the State of Connecticut voters participating; in 2016, 77 percent. So we do have a very active electorate already. I think it is very clear that this, in fact, would increase or add to costs as an unfunded mandate to our local municipalities at a time when one of the things we're not discussing at all is the fiscal condition of our state and the impact of that on our local towns and the taxpayers who are left here.

Lastly, it was just four years ago that the voters in the State of Connecticut said no. So, I think at this point we have far more important issues that we should be discussing before us. This is not a prudent move to go forward and I would encourage my colleague to not support this resolution. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Okay, just as a point of information for the body. There's an error on the board that needs to be corrected. So if you see that change happening, that's what it's all about. Okay? All right. Will your remark further on the resolution that is before us? Representative Ackert of the 8th District.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In not having sat in GAE, I've been trying to do some quick scrolling of this resolution. And I appreciate the dialog between the two parties to date. I have talked to my town clerks regarding early voting. So just a quick question to start off with, through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to the good Chair.
Is there any opportunity now to date for anybody to
vote prior to the election day in the State of
Connecticut? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, yes, by
absentee ballot. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And if that individual
so chooses to go in early to get that ballot and to
provide vote. It's just a process. It's not a
complicated process. There's no excuse required
anymore. Is that true? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding of the absentee ballot law is that section 9-135 of the Connecticut General Statutes identifies the six different areas and categories that an individual would have to fall in to be accessible to an absentee ballot. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you. The gentleman is so knowledgeable of this. Is that a -- was that a -- that there is no yes, if you could for clarity for me. You're more knowledgeable than this -- than I am, having served on that committee. But, there isn't really a way that anybody could stop them, through you, Mr. Speaker, if they're a registered voter to vote early using that process. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the proponent for the question. I apologize for my prior response. The AB ballots are -- there's six categories of individuals that are unavailable to vote by absentee ballot. Unless the individual falls within those six categories, they cannot vote early. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I do appreciate the good gentleman's response. What I have pause with right now -- and I believe that we want to give every opportunity for everybody to vote in this state and in this country. We can't make it so convenient that they can vote anytime that they want throughout the year. There's gotta be some catch and balances, you know, checks and balances on that. So, what I have concern with as we move forward here is in my small town they are strapped for funds. I did look at the cost analysis and it's very limited to the state.

But I can assure you that the concerns that they have brought to me in my communities is that there is additional cost and its' not in anyway reflected in the policy that we're looking at -- or the resolution that we're looking at right now to allow somebody to offset, the State of Connecticut to offset the Town of Coventry or Columbia, or Vernon, or Tolland, the towns that I represent. So, I have some questions regarding that.

Now, a lot of this is that we've added, in our community when it is election day, we usually use a fire department and/or a school. Now, it's to my understanding that the days as we -- if this were to pass by three-fifths, it would go to this fall's election to be voted on by the body of the State of Connecticut, the voting body of the State of Connecticut. And in that process right now that they go to a specific location, we actually have handicap opportunity where somebody can come up and ring a bell, and its' pretty elaborate. Would this type of a setup have to be set up again for those days prior to the regular election day, for the

couple of days up to to five days? Is that the understanding, through you, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, the polls as determined by this body, whether it be one day, two days, three days, four days, five days, and the hours of each and the location of each would have to be accessible to, whether it handicapped individuals or just the same standards that are currently set for voting locations would have to apply in this situation as well. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so -- I believe most individuals take pride in getting out and doing their -- making their vote on that given day, that they understand when it is and that this body, it sounds like, will then, if given the opportunity in

the future, will then choose the additional days. And in our case, we flip from a fire department on certain elections and then the next one we switch to the schools. So, it seems to be that we might create some confusion because now they're confused because we switched one year to the schools and one to the fire departments.

As it is now, we gotta -- so it sounds like we couldn't close the schools for those additional days and we wouldn't want to impact our local fire departments other days. We would have to choose a third potentially location that would be accessible handicap and otherwise and be staffed for either two up to five days. Is that, through you, the understanding of what the process may be in early voting for our community?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is my understanding as well, that the location would be determined -- my conversations and discussions about

this legislation over the past several years, that ideally you choose, whether it be a town hall or a library or some facility that already is ADA accessible and would be able to facilitate this type of process. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And that brings a little bit of pause. Unless a community -- I think maybe they would make -- ability to make those adjustments, I would think at some type of cost, whether it's a room that now becomes a voting room or maybe the town clerk's office, which our is, unfortunately, not very large to begin with. I give them a lot of credit to work in that small of an office, but they get it done. So, I will continue to listen to the dialog. I think -- listen, I want and I think everybody wants people to have the opportunity to vote.

I almost think we should have a state holiday that says this is voting day in the State of

Connecticut. We're closed. People can come vote. Take the day off, whatever it is. Bring your children, see the process, you know, and have it actually be a day that nobody works and you go and vote. And we'll see what the numbers change. It may go from 77 percent to 78 percent! But at least we get more people voting and I think that might be a better approach than trying to accommodate people that can't take that given day off and, you know, find a way that they can -- I understand we have a process, absentee ballot; can't be there that day. I'm out of the country. I'm out of the state. I'm out of my voting area.

So, I think we already have a process, but I think another approach might be better. But I will listen to the dialog today and look forward to hearing what all those others have to say. I thank the good Chairman for his answers and his advocacy for this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on this resolution? The good gentleman from the 113th

District, Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

If I may, through you, a few questions to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As we talk about early voting, we've talked about this in the past in terms of absentee ballots. Could the gentleman tell me whether or not this would apply to absentee ballots? Like I said, in the past, it's often been an extension of ABs. How would this be implemented right now as proposed? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the proponent for the question. Is he asking -- there were two parts to the question. I believe one was if it would affect absentee ballots. The second one was how would it be implement? Through you, Mr. Speaker, is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

The gentleman is correct. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you. To answer the first question about AB ballots, AB ballot -- the process would not be affected at all or impacted all. The second question of how would it be implemented would be up to this body. And so the guidelines as proposed in the legislation is that it be not more than five days and not less than two days for eight hours each day within two weeks of election day. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and a followup question. And that voting early, that would have to be in person? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, sir. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the answer to the question. As I mentioned, in the past we've talked about an extension of absentee ballots being, you know, the end result of early voting. I'm glad to see that's not in the bill. But I want to talk a little bit about that in-person voting. One of the things that I've experienced when I go to the polls, in my district, in my hometown, you know,

the poll workers there, they always ask me for a photo ID. So they want -- they know who I am. They know exactly who I am. But they always ask for a photo ID and when I tell them that I don't need to provide them a photo ID, they're always surprised and they think I'm wrong, but, as we all know, I'm not. There is no requirement that you present a photo ID here in the State of Connecticut. Yet, in seven states it is required.

Most states have stricter identification requirements than we do. And that's a shame. We always worry about the integrity of the ballot box and I think a significant portion and effort that we need to move forward here in this Chamber is advancing policies that preserve that integrity. And Mr. Speaker, with that, I have an amendment and the Clerk is in possession of that amendment and I ask that he please call it. It is LCO 3848.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 3848, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A".

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 3848,
offered by Representative Devlin, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative Perillo, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much. As stated, this amendment strikes everything after the enacting clause and would put forth a constitutional amendment -- obviously, if supported by this body and by the body upstairs, would put forth a constitutional amendment requiring the presentation of a photo identification by those voting at the polls. And as I said before, Mr. Speaker, we must preserve integrity at the ballot box. Because without that integrity, we essentially disenfranchise those who are properly at the ballot box, who present the identification that needs to be presented and who are doing the right thing.

Because there are bad actors. There are folks who vote and maybe aren't the person they say they are. The person they represent themselves to be. And that in and of itself, Mr. Speaker, is a disenfranchisement. And with that, I would move the amendment, and I would ask, though, that when the vote be taken, sir, it be taken by roll.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The question before the Chamber is a roll call vote. All those in favor say aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Oppose, nay. The twenty-percent rule has been met. The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, again. If you asked Connecticut residents, do you have to present a photo ID, the vast majority would say, yes, you do even though you don't. If you ask Connecticut

residents should you have to present a photo ID, the vast majority would say yes, you should. And if you ask Connecticut residents do we need strong integrity at the ballot box, nearly 100 percent of them, let's be honest, though, not all. Nearly 100 percent of them would say yes, absolutely, we need that integrity at the ballot box. Mr. Speaker, I would position to you that this amendment preserves that integrity and it preserves that integrity, as I said, in a manner consistent with what Connecticut residents expect and, in fact, demand. That's what this amendment does. I would urge the Chamber to adopt the amendment. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? To be very clear, this will be on the amendment that is before us. Will you remark further? Representative O'Neill of the 69th.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I rise to speak in favor of this amendment. I think that the issue of vote integrity and the issue of preserving

the integrity of the election process is one that -- it really deserves more attention than it has been getting in this Chamber, but also across the country.

If we look around we see that people, many people commit various kinds of fraud. There's tax fraud. There's insurance fraud. There are all kinds of fraudulent activities. And yet, if we believe the information that we have been provided over the years by the Secretary of the State of Connecticut and also if we look at some of the other situations across other states, we are led to -- we're told that the number of instances of fraudulent conduct in behavior when it comes to elections is one or two out of a million voters, or 2 million voters -- votes being cast in the State of Connecticut. We are told, basically, that fraud doesn't really exist. That everybody in the State of Connecticut is totally honest all the time. And this flies in the face of the reality that we know.

Just driving up here, look out the window of your car, just briefly as you're driving up here,

and take note of the number of people who are obeying the speed limit. And yet we are led -- told there's nothing going wrong on election day. There's no fraud, no misrepresentation, no impropriety whatsoever. It is completely contrary to our shared human experience here in the State of Connecticut to believe that we can just say trust everybody to do the right thing when it comes to elections, especially because in this country, we have a long history of election frauds that have been perpetrated over the decades and centuries. This is something that's; and I hate to say it quite this way, almost as American as apple pie.

So, we need to have procedures and protections in place. And having a photo ID, which in of itself is not a guarantee that the person is who the photo ID says they are, but at least it's something more than just taking their word for it, which is what our current system says is all you have to do. That if you don't have a photo ID or you don't have a utility bill, you can just sign a piece of paper saying "I am me," and that's it, you get to vote.

So this is a very commonsense, reasonable proposal and it's something that if it were put into the Constitution, I believe would do far more to reassure people that our system of elections is safe and it's well protected and that their votes really do count. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Representative Fox of the 148th District.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to the amendment. I believe that as, although I'm -- I believe that as currently drafted, section 9-261 of the Connecticut General Statute addresses this situation very clearly and efficiently. Should an individual arrive without a photo ID, they are to sign an affidavit affirming who they are and then if that is proven to be false, it's actually a felony. I think the repercussions of a voting violation of the affidavit are significant and which is why I stand in opposition

to the amendment before us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Zawistowski of the 61st District.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My comments are on the underlying bill. I'd like to stay on the board, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Further on the amendment that is before us? Representative Smith of the 108th. Representative Smith of the 108th.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an interesting topic really when you think about it and I was intrigued by some of the comments that have been given so far about the thought process that we have here in the State of Connecticut, because I know --

I'm sure when you go to vote and I go to vote, we all get asked the same question. The question is would you please present with your photo ID, and we do. We do as a matter of course. We don't even think about it. Sometimes, as Rep. Perillo said, we decide, well, maybe we'll just say I don't have to give a photo ID, and the people behind the counter kind of look at you quite shockingly. They say, well, yes you do. That's the law. But the law, as we know, as the Chairman of GAE indicated, is if you don't have a photo ID you can just simply sign an affidavit.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, if somebody wishes to commit fraud, they're not too worried about -- and vote when they're not supposed to be voting, they're not too worried about signing an affidavit and moving on. Because they'll put some name down that will be whatever it may be. Having been a Ranking Member of the -- I was looking at Mr. O'Dea. He started dancing and I wasn't sure what he was doing. (Laughter) I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. May I have a moment, Mr. Speaker, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The House will stand at ease.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that accommodation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The House will come back to order.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

I was just talking about the voting process, how we all go in and we're surprised when we're actually asked about presenting an ID. You know, when we go for a driver's license we have to get a driver's ID, a photo ID. Pretty much anything we do nowadays we need an ID for. I don't think anybody's offended by it. I know there's been arguments in the past when I was Ranking Member on the GAE Committee that some people felt it was an affront to them to require a person to have an ID. I never really quite understood that, personally, but -- especially with all the other IDs that you have to present. You hop on an airplane, you better have an ID or passport or you're not getting onboard.

That's just the way it is.

So, we live in a world today where your identity is known no matter where you go. Whether you want it to be known or you do not wish for it to be known. So, I think the arguments in the past about not having this as a proper way of identifying a person; it could cost money for those who do not have an ID. My thought would be, listen, if you do not have a photo ID, we'll get you one at our cost. The State of Connecticut can afford -- if you don't have one already, you don't drive, you may not have a driver's license, may not have a passport. I think the state should accommodate that. So, I guess just one question, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the amendment. If there is no photo ID for that particular person because he or she does not drive, how would that be provided to them? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo, the question is to you, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Could the gentleman please repeat his question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Smith, would you kindly repeat the question for the gentleman?

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Be happy to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the question is if you -- if a person does not have a photo ID, how is then that person to be able to vote? Will the state provide a photo ID, or how is that accomplished? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you. Photo IDs are available through the State of Connecticut through the Department of Motor Vehicles.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

And I'm happy to hear that answer. So, it kind of takes away the issue of the costs. You know, if somebody doesn't have the money to reach into their

pocket to get the ID then that will be provided for by the state. You know, we just went through a federal election where -- and there's still ongoing investigations about whether the Russians tampered with our election process.

I know the Secretary of State of our state has indicated that she's concerned about potential tampering in the upcoming elections. I know there was some discussions and public hearings on that this particular year. So, I think we should do everything possible, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that we are in fact having those who vote be the right people who should be voting. So I strongly support the amendment. I hope my colleagues will do the same. I know it's been a concern in the past, but I think it's time we move forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Dubitsky of the 47th District.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

I was wanting to comment on the underlying bill, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. But I do support this amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. If the Clerk would kindly clear the board or any members who wants to speak on the underlying bill, please clear your microphone so we can just focus on those who want to speak on the amendment. With that being said, Representative Miller of the 145th District.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have questions for the proponent of the amendment, if you may, sir? Or if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, madam.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I had a couple questions. I was wondering valid -- the term *valid photo identification*. What does that mean?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The difference between a valid photo identification and an invalid one would be that a valid photo identification would be active. You know, just as your driver's license is valid when it has not yet expired, yet it is invalid when it has.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, how would one obtain getting a valid photo ID?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the question was how you would obtain a valid photo ID. As we all know, both driver's license and non-driving photo identification is available through the State of Connecticut Department of Motor Vehicles.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I know that driver license are obtained with a cost. Are the non-driver license -- non-driver's license, I guess, or photo IDs obtained with a cost as well? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I do believe there is a cost associated with them.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

So, through you, Mr. Speaker, what happens if someone does not have the funds to purchase or obtain a valid photo ID from the State of Connecticut?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Mr. Speaker, if someone does not have the funds

to purchase a photo identification, I believe it would be appropriate for the State of Connecticut to figure out a way to make that happen so that those individuals would not be deprived of the right to vote.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, if -- when you said -- when the proponent said that it would be up to the state to provide that, would it be at a cost to the state then, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Right now, the cost of a photo identification at a DMV branch is \$22.50. As we know, all those employees currently work at the Department of Motor Vehicles. While I certainly don't know the cost of the plastic associated with the photo ID, I believe that cost in the case that I mentioned would be borne by the State of

Connecticut. That said, I think we all believe that the state has an obligation to help folks vote. The state also has an obligation to do it in a way where we ensure the integrity of the process and we ensure that the individual who is voting is the individual they say they are.

So, when we talk about cost, I do believe that we need to keep in mind that, though in this case that cost is very, very small, could be very, very small, it's probably worth it in that we want to make sure that those voting are the person they say they are. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the proponent's answer, but I really didn't hear an answer to my question. The cost to the valid ID, who would assume that cost? Would it be the state for those individuals that cannot afford to purchase or to obtain a valid photo ID? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sorry I didn't answer the question as asked and I will try to do so again. Obviously, for individuals who can afford to purchase a photo ID, that \$22.50 every six years, they would pay that, just as they do now. The Representative referenced individuals who might not be able to afford that \$22.50. My response was that it would be the obligation of the State of Connecticut to ensure that whether or not you can afford that ID at \$22.50 every six years, the state's obligation should be to make sure that those folks who can't afford it can get it.

The Representative asked if there was a cost associated with that. I do not know exactly what that cost is per license. Like I said, I don't know what that plastic costs the State of Connecticut, but indeed it will have a cost. And I believe in those situations where an individual can't afford that \$22.50, the state should bear that cost of that

plastic license, whatever that cost may be.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, through you, if the case -- if the state is going to or should assume that cost, then that means that it has to -- the monies have to come from somewhere. So, are you saying or would you presume that the monies will come out of the general fund? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the question. As we know, funding for the Department of Motor Vehicles is derived largely from fees associated with licenses, with registration, etcetera, etcetera. You know, that revenue still comes into the Department of Motor Vehicles to pay for all those functions. This cost of photo identification for individuals would be borne by

those fees. And again, we're not talking about large dollars here. We're talking about a subset of the population that is relatively small and a cost for each license; again, the plastic, that is very, very low as well.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I appreciate the proponent's answer, but I didn't hear an answer to my question. So, my answer is, I'll rephrase it. Would this mean that it would be a loss of revenue to the state if the state was to bore the cost of those -- of that plastic for those individuals who cannot afford to purchase a valid photo ID. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'll try to -- I'll try to do a better job of answering the question. I think I've made it clear that the cost of these

licenses would be borne by the State of Connecticut. Again, the DMV is largely funded by license fees, registration fees. It's also worthy of note that individuals eligible and who receive assistance through DSS are currently able to get a photo ID at no cost. So a lot of this issue is already addressed right now. We have not deprived -- the State of Connecticut has not deprived individuals who can't afford a photo identification the right and ability to obtain that photo ID. We currently do it. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the proponent for the answers to my question. Mr. Speaker, I will be voting no on this amendment and I'll explain why. The proponent mentioned that DSS -- those individuals that are currently on DSS do not have to pay for the cost of that valid photo ID. Well, not everyone is on DSS that cannot afford -- that would not be able to afford to purchase a valid

photo ID. My concern with this -- well, there are a host of concerns, but my main concern is those individuals who could not -- who cannot afford that \$22 dollars for every six years. It may be a nominal amount to some people, but it's a lot when you don't have income coming in.

I know of individuals who do not have jobs, but they're eligible registered voters. And so would this preclude them or prevent them from voting because they can't afford to purchase a Connecticut ID, a valid photo ID? So, I think that what this particular amendment does is that it excludes individuals, a large population of individuals, who would otherwise be able to vote. So, for those reasons or that particular reason, I will be voting no for this amendment. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Oh, Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the

Representative's concern about those individuals who don't have the means. But again, I think it is worthy of note -- and again, to be clear, I don't want to deprive those individuals the right to vote either. But it is worthy of note that here in the State of Connecticut for those folks who don't have the means -- if you live in a homeless shelter, you are eligible to get a free photo ID. If you live in transitional housing, you are eligible to get a free photo ID. If you're a blind veteran, you're eligible to get a free photo ID. If you are a DSS client, you are currently today eligible to get a free photo ID.

The State of Connecticut believes, as do I, as do we all in this Chamber, that if you don't have the means to get a photo ID, we'll get one in your hands. A) We want you to have a photo ID, and in this particular case with this amendment, we want you to be able to vote too. We currently do it right now. That's not changed by this amendment and I want to make that very clear. And I appreciate the Representative's concern because I share it too

and the State of Connecticut is already addressing it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Winkler of the 56th District.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Yes, some questions for the proponent of the bill, Mr. Speaker? Of the amendment. I'm sorry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo, will you prepare yourself for questions? You may proceed, sir.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

To understand the previous point you made, is it your statement that if what you want to happen, happens, that everybody who buys a Connecticut driver's license will pay for photo IDs for everyone else?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the question.

If the gentleman could clarify?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler, will you rephrase your question, sir?

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Is it your hope that if somebody needs a photo ID and can't pay for it, those of us who purchased license will have our fees increased to cover the cost of those photo IDs?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the question. It is neither my hope nor my expectation that what the gentleman just puts forth is actually what happens. I repeat; if you are a DSS client, if you live in a homeless shelter, if you're in transitional housing, if you're a blind veteran, we currently already provide for you a photo identification at no cost. Could there be a subset of the population that does not fall into that category and who still cannot afford a photo

identification and can prove that fact? There may be such a segment of the population. And I do believe that DMV has the resources, again, to serve that very small subset of the population and pay for whatever pennies it costs for a little piece of plastic.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Yes, thank you. The Town of Vernon, which I represent most of, has, I've been told, the greatest percentage of people over 65 of any town in the State of Connecticut. And I knock those doors and many of them are elderly women, not very mobile, don't have a driver's license because they don't drive anymore and hey don't want to pay the expense. They -- there's no public transportation for them to get to DMV. There's no car available to them. They're alone and in many cases their friends are other people who have no cars and are infirm. So, how would you get them a photo ID, to the proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

So, to paraphrase and just to make sure I understand the question. How do you get a photo -- is the gentleman asking me how you get a photo ID to someone who is otherwise infirmed, homebound, unable to get to a DMV photo licensing center? Is that what the gentleman is asking me?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Yes, that is part of my question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, these folks right now, is my understanding, and obviously we're talking about voting, these folks right now are able to vote. They get themselves to the polls or they vote by absentee. If they're able to do that, I would imagine we can find a way or they can find a way to get to the Department of Motor Vehicles to

get a license if need be.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

My question was asking what the way is. I would ask the proponent of the bill; if we're gonna consider this bill seriously, that he identify a way that they could get their absentee ballots, if he would.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

I apologize. I'm actually having a very difficult time hearing the gentleman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will the House please tone our volume down so that the gentleman can hear the debate?

Representative Winkler, if you could kindly restate your question it would be appreciated.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

It is not sufficient that we say we will find a way. If we're going to take this bill seriously,

could you identify a way? Through the Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Mr. Speaker, thank you. Can I identify a way to do what?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

To provide a photo ID to someone who cannot get to a place to have their picture taken. Through the Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The question is to you, Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Throughout the State of Connecticut, we have a number of social service organizations, nonprofits, transit districts that do just that. They get folks to places that they otherwise could not get to themselves. The State of Connecticut goes to great length to make sure that folks who are infirmed, who are homebound can get to

the places they need to go, who can get to their doctor's appointments, who can get to important appointments. We already have that system in place right now. I suspect we would continue to utilize that system that's in place right now. I see no reason why we would not. We have a very strong social service program here in the State of Connecticut and I know that many in the Chamber here are very proud of that social service program. Part of that is the transit that we offer folks and I would imagine we would continue to leverage that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Yes. The funds for Dial-A-Ride were cut. The funds for social services agencies and various other agencies haven't been increased in a decade. My town, we only really have access to doctors. There might be an exception for somebody who needs groceries desperately. But there is no additional money for taking people to a place where they can have their photo taken. In fact, we don't go to

those towns. We have a strictly limited set of towns that we go to and none of them currently has a photo ID operation. So, if you could -- would the speaker please identify the programs that he's talking about that would enable the elderly in my district to get to a place that takes a photo ID. Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I freely admit that the gentleman knows his district far better than I know his district. So, I can only talk about my district. The 113th District, which is in the City of Shelton, is served by the Valley Transit District. The Valley Transit District has vans and buses that take largely seniors pretty much wherever they need to go. And again, I can only speak to my area of the state. That is how these folks would be able to access photo licensing centers. But again, the gentleman knows Vernon far better than I do.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

There is nothing in this bill -- I'm sorry, this amendment that in any way shape or form says that the State of Connecticut will pay any of this additional cost for anybody to get anywhere to have a photo ID taken. Is that correct? Through the Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Could the gentleman please repeat the question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler, please rephrase -- restate your question.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Is there anything in this amendment by which the State of Connecticut commits to paying what it cost to get everyone in this state a photo ID? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The answer to that question is no, but let me tell you why. As I referenced earlier, the State of Connecticut has a robust social service program. A key component of that are the transit services we provide those who need them. I don't think we should be reinventing transit here in the State of Connecticut. I don't think we should be reinventing the social service program here in the State of Connecticut, but that issue is silent in the amendment before us.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

So everything we've heard today about what will happen is strictly in the proponent's mind. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is in my mind because it is in truth; it is in fact, it is in

reality here in the State of Connecticut. We have these services. They are offered. They are known. A gentleman -- a friend of mine from the northwest corner just informed me that he has access as a state legislator. Because he cares about his residents' ability to get photo ID that DMV has come out and served his community with mobile service, with mobile photo licensing. I imagine the Representative from Vernon would love to do the same thing for his constituents.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Yes, thank you. And I will certainly look into that. But it also leads to the question of cost. Those services are not -- let me just go on. I am very familiar with the social services in this state. I worked for the Department of Social Services for almost all of my 38-year career and I have taken Title 19 applications for eight years. And I can tell you that the social services in this state are nothing like what is being claimed. And

the mobility of our seniors is nothing like what is being claimed. It is difficult to get placed. It is hard to find rides. It is not -- it is not easy for the seniors in this state and to say that this is no problem for them I think is incorrect.

Let's talk about the poor for a moment. So, I'm too poor to own a car so I don't have a driver's license. It is the proponent's belief that everybody in that situation should find their way to the DMV locations and get a photo ID. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Could the gentleman repeat the question, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Kindly restate the question, Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Speaking of those in poverty, and this state has the widest range of incomes in the country. For

those in poverty who don't have a driver's license because they don't own a car and don't want to pay the expense, is it the proponent's opinion that all of those people should be forced to somehow make it to the motor vehicle office to have their photo ID taken? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the question. I understand it now that the gentleman has clarified. As we've discussed previously and as I discussed with the Representative from Stamford, we recognize that there are folks who can't afford to get a photo ID or a driver's license. We do. We don't just recognize it here as we debate this amendment. We recognize it in reality in the State of Connecticut right now, which is why folks who live in homeless shelters are able to get a license, or photo ID, rather, for free. That's why folks who live in transitional housing have the right to get a photo ID for free. It's why blind, disabled

veterans have the right to get a photo ID at not cost. And it's why all DSS clients, some of our neediest folks in the State of Connecticut, rightly, have the ability to get a photo ID at no cost here.

The gentleman asks an excellent question about whether or not these folks will need to get an ID. They would. And I think it's very important to know. And I think we should all be very proud of the fact that they would be able to get one at no cost.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Yes. Given the lack of public transportation in this state, would the proponent of the amendment have any advice to the people who are poor as to how to get to the DMV offices? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Far be it from me to

advise specific individuals how to live their lives and how to accomplish certain things. Everyone's situation is different. Everyone's community is different. But I think the gentleman from the northwest corner gave us a great example as how we, as representatives of the people, can help those folks obtain what they need. And the example he gave, and I think it's a very good one, as I said, is that DMV has services, has mobile services, and it will come out to your district, come out to your communities, and help folks who can't get to a motor vehicle center to obtain the photo IDs we're talking about right here and right now.

And I think we should follow the gentleman's example and work with DMV to bring those mobile centers out to our communities. I think it's an excellent idea and I think it's something that we all should pursue. I would urge everyone to do so. And I know the gentleman agrees with me on that and will do the same for his district.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Yes. How would the photo ID process work in conjunction with the absentee ballot process?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I don't necessarily understand the premise of the question. He's asking how the photo ID process would work in conjunction with the absentee ballot process? I don't understand.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

If a person voted by absentee ballot, could they do so without a photo ID? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And they're doing it

right now.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

So, if I understand the answer correctly, people who vote by absentee ballot would not need a photo ID. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the gentleman asks an excellent question. Indeed, individuals who obtain an absentee ballot would need to present photo ID. I freely admit that I don't have the answers to the question as to how that would happen. But again, I want to point out that the goal of this is to preserve the integrity of the voting process. I think we could all agree that that's an important thing to do. But the gentleman asks a very good question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

So I'm certain I understand the answer.
People, who vote by photo ID, if this were to pass,
would still be required to have a photo ID to vote
absentee ballot. Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

The gentleman is asking me whether or not you
would need a photo ID in order to get an absentee
ballot. Is that what he's asking?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

The answer to that question is, given the
language in this amendment, the answer is yes. The
natural followup question is how do we do that? And
the answer to that question is I don't know. But I

think it's important to note that we are talking today about placing a constitutional amendment on the ballot. As well all know, that doesn't happen overnight, and I think the onus is on us as lawmakers to work with the Secretary of the State's office, to work with registrars, ROVAC, to determine how best to make that happen. So the answer -- the immediate answer is I'm not sure we have a system in place to do that. But the long-term answer is, obviously, A) it's supremely important, and B) we have the time to make it happen and we will obviously work with the relevant agencies to do so.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems that there are a lot of things that haven't been thought out yet that I would argue should be committed to paper before we vote for such a thing. The way it stands now, at least as far as my constituents go, it seems almost like a poll tax on the poor and the elderly, and it's not something I could support. Thank you,

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I appreciate the gentleman's questions, particularly that last one where he discusses that perhaps all these issues have not yet been worked out. And that is a common theme. It's not just a common theme on the amendment; it's a common theme on the underlying bill. And in fact, the proponent acknowledged that much of what's in the underlying bill needs to be worked out. So we acknowledge that. So, we can't be okay with it on one and not okay with it on another.

We're a relatively intelligent body of individuals and I think the onus is on us, on the amendment, to work out the details, just as the onus would be on us on the underlying bill to work out those details. The proponent of the underlying bill believes that we could do that on the underlying bill, therefore, I would suggest that perhaps we can

also do so on the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Further on the amendment before us?

Representative Albis of the 99th District.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon. You know --

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, when I see proposals like what we have here in this amendment, I think about people like my grandmothers. They are both over 90 years old, God bless them, still fairly active and recently, within the last few years, made the decision, the tough decision, to decide that they didn't want to drive anymore. That they were relinquishing their right to drive because they felt like it was not necessarily safe or they didn't want to do it, but it was a life-altering, life-changing decision that was not an easy one to make.

And with that, means that they no longer had a

valid photo ID, a valid driver's license. They don't travel out of the country so they no longer had a valid passport. My grandmothers are not the only ones in this situation. And my reading of what this amendment says is that for people that make that tough decision and no longer have a valid driver's license, unless they take a proactive step that they may not know that they need to do, they would not be able to vote; something that they possibly have been doing for the last 60 or 70 years.

What's more troubling to me, Mr. Speaker, is that we found out through this debate that this amendment would require folks to vote absentee with a valid photo ID. So, my grandmothers could probably get out to the polls and vote in person, but for people who cannot, that means they would have to provide a photo ID when they are simply voting absentee, when they know they can't out to the polls. I just think that this is a very problematic situation. It changes the lives of people who have been voting regularly for decades

and it's a situation we should not be putting our senior citizens in.

And again, I think about folks like my grandmothers who have been good citizens and exercised their right to vote since they turned 18 and registered and I don't want to be putting other people in that same situation. So, Mr. Speaker, with that I hope that this body will reject this amendment, and thank you for the time to speak. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Lemar of the 96th District. Good afternoon, sir.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. How are you today?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Very good and you?

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Mr. Speaker, through you, a few questions of the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Kindly proceed, sir.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm listening to the debate with some great interest. The proposer of the amendment and I have a decent relationship. We disagree on a lot of things, but we actually get along fairly well on a number of other issues, and I do in fact trust his underlying motivation is to ensure the integrity of our local election system. But I want to highlight a few facts and get some clarification on this exact reasoning for this.

I was wondering, through you, Mr. Speaker, if the proposer of the amendment can point to any studies, any evidence, of the need for this photo ID requirement here in Connecticut. Is there anything with empirical value that he can specify that would provide some impetus for this proposal? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the gentleman has asked for a study. What I will do is give you a firsthand example. In 2010, I was very involved in my friend's race for congress in the 4th Congressional District. And one of the things that the campaign did was locate campaign volunteers at polls in the City of Bridgeport and it wasn't too long after the polls opened; I want to say maybe it was about 6:45, that I, as someone who was engaged in the campaign, received my first phone call from one of those volunteers at a polling place. The individual who called me said "Jason, I just saw the same person vote for the second time in 15 minutes." Now, obviously, that individual didn't have two different photo IDs with different names on them and the same picture on them, unless they got a really good fake. What they did was they signed an affidavit that said I am who I say I am.

So the gentleman asked if there's anything I can point to that raises concerns as to why this would be an issue, the answer is yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the anecdotal evidence that this speaker has provided us. There is actual empirical evidence, though, to suggest that since 2000 there are 31 total documented cases of voter fraud in the United States. Over one billion ballots were cast in that period of time. So, Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering if the proponent of the amendment is aware that you are literally 75 times more likely to be hit by lightening than to see a case of voter fraud come before the State of Connecticut?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not know that because I don't know the likelihood of being hit by lightening.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker. That too has some empirical data to support it. (Laughs) We'll move on. Mr. Speaker, the proponent of the underlying amendment again articulated his desire to see every individual who is constrained either by mobility of finances afforded the opportunity to vote. And in outlining his commitment to that, he suggested that free IDs should be made available. He then proceeded to outline the process by which someone could access these free IDs. And I know that he's aware of this, I just want to outline the procedure as it was made clear.

The State of Connecticut would provide a free ID. Right now, through the DMV is where you'd go to get that ID. The proponent of the underlying -- of the amendment has suggested that would be the likely place that people would go as well. Right now, in order to get that ID, you need access to an original birth certificate or other identifying information. I was wondering if the proponent of the amendment knows who is most likely to not have access to an

original birth certificate in the State of Connecticut.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not, but I have a feeling the gentleman's going to tell me.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you. The first barrier to entry that was identified in this process would disproportionately impact African Americans, particularly those born in the south and those born prior to 1950.

Secondarily, it would primarily impact new arrivals and immigrants who have been made citizens of this country who cannot get access to that one specific identifiable piece of information that the DMV requires. Recent empirical studies have shown that 11 percent of all American citizens do not have a valid government issued ID, but 25 percent of African Americans do not have one.

The second process that the proposer of the underlying -- of the amendment, sorry, indicated people could undertake doubts with mobility in their inability to get to the DMV given their lack of mobility. He suggested in his town they could access the local Valley Transit service to provide that mobility to that site. I'm wondering if the proponent understands the process by which someone would have to register to access that free service to the DMV. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to get to that second -- that question in a bit. But I also want to further answer the question that the gentleman asked previously. We talked about what an individual would need to present at the Department of Motor Vehicles to get a driver's license or a photo ID, and there are a number of different things and ways in which you can prove your identity - with a Social Security number, simply proving your

residency in Connecticut is enough to get you an ID card. That's something that I would imagine most people can prove. If you live somewhere, you have a utility bill to prove your residency in Connecticut. And obviously, if you have a current driver's license or a current photo ID, you can renew that. If you have a license and you want to switch to a photo ID, you can do that. And it's also worthy of note that you can renew a license by mail. You can't get a new one, but you can renew it by mail.

So, I did just want to address those issues because the gentleman had a legitimate concern with his previous question and I wanted to answer that to the best of my ability. And if the gentleman wouldn't mind, could he please repeat the question he just asked?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Yes, no problem. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you. The process by which the proponent indicated mobility could be addressed. He suggested

that you could access the local Valley Transit service in his district. I think it's the Greater New Haven Transit service in my district and I think there's a relevant service in most parts of Connecticut. I was wondering if the proponent was aware of the process by which someone would have to register to be provided that access and that service to the DMV.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Again, Mr. Speaker, no I am not, but I suspect the gentleman might tell me.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, yes I will. In order to access that transit service, you must qualify via a review board that will require a series of unique identifiable information to verify that person is able to access that service and qualify for that service. And additionally, in

order to qualify for the free and reduced cost of that, that individual will be required to provide income verification forms.

I'm just gonna highlight that the proponent of this bill, in order to vote now, a constitutionally protected service that I know he believes in, in which we've worked tirelessly across this country to make as easy as possible. The proponent of this amendment has now indicated a process by which an individual will have to engage with up to five different government agencies and now provide income qualification verification, residency qualification information, a series of personal identifying and mobility standing verifications. All to access this free service.

Now, the State of Indiana, when developing their voter ID laws, also claimed that this would -- we'd make free IDs available. Now, I don't think it will surprise anyone -- once we go through all the government processes in order to make a free ID available to somebody, it won't surprise the proponent to learn that it cost the State of Indiana

over \$10 million dollars to provide free IDs in order for folks to comply with their voter ID law. And it probably won't also surprise anyone in this Chamber to learn that recent studies have indicated up to 18 percent of their population was disenfranchised by this new process.

Mr. Speaker, we stand strongly in this Chamber around the basic concept of one person, one vote, of providing access and integrity to our voting systems, to providing the right to every person in our community of valid age to cast a vote for us and anyone else who was willing to put their name on the ballot. Voter ID laws across this country have been erected, challenged, and removed under the basic finding that they purposefully disenfranchised hundreds to thousands to, in some cases, millions of residents in their individual states.

The process we heard today that we'd invoke in order to protect that right to vote would be both costly, cumbersome and an unnecessary government intrusion into every aspect of an individual's life in order to access the free ID. And I'll go one

step further.

There is numerous military personnel who reside in the State of Connecticut. They are issued a government ID due to their employment and station here in Connecticut. Currently, that government ID is not eligible to be used for identification purposes because it lacks an address. So when we talk about requiring a government ID, we know right now that it wouldn't be as simple as just showing what the U.S. Army issues to its individuals. That we would actually require specific information and specific types of IDs. We would deem some IDs to be worth and others to be not. The greater the requirement to establish an ID, the more personal identifying information one would need.

For example, in Texas, the government IDs allowed to be used include a concealed carry permit is -- you can use to illustrate your right to vote. But a student ID at the University of Texas would not be allowed. So as we construct these types of voter ID laws, as we look across the country to see what has happened in other states, to see why

millions of people have been disenfranchised due to these laws and why more and more voter ID laws are being overturned, we can see it's not because through good intentions of the person proposing this amendment today. But that it's enactment despite those intentions have a disenfranchising impact upon all of our residents, particularly those who are of limited economic means, limited mobility means and who are African American and Latino.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important that we stand against this amendment today and show that we are committed to preserving the right of every individual in our state to vote in accordance with our Constitution. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Morin of the 28th District.

REP. MORIN (28TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. MORIN (28TH):

Mr. Speaker, I may have a question for the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. MORIN (28TH):

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving this body as the Chair --House Co-Chair of the GA & E Committee. Seems to be many years ago now. I might add that listening to this debate, I've felt a bit of anxiety over remembering th time I got to stand up for many hours and answer questions, so this is a little more relaxing for me and I've appreciative of that.

I remember the discussions back then and I've been doing some research of the committee's work on the underlying bill and I guess my question for the proponent would be based on my experiences and understanding of working with clerks, registrars and the Secretary of State's Office over the years. Where are we coming from on this and where are the reports of widespread voter fraud? Because I just don't see this as an issue.

And I took it seriously when it was brought to me before and I talked to all the people that oversee elections in my town and throughout the state. That was one of the most exciting times anyone could have, meeting with clerks and registrars from across the state, asking them what's going on. And those people are the front lines of our election system in making sure that they're done with integrity. So, would you please -- maybe I missed it, but has there been any real data showing that we have a concern -- well, I understand you have a concern, but a widespread problem? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to hone in one word the gentleman said, because it's a fair question and I think I answered it in some degree when the Representative from New Haven had asked it previously. Part of your question was "widespread," and I would argue that we should deal with the issue

of voter fraud and the integrity of the ballot box whether fraud is widespread or not. Because any bit of fraud is disenfranchising to every single voter who voted properly, presented proper identification, was the right person, did it in the right way. So I don't think, Mr. Speaker, whether or not it's widespread or not should be the tipping point as to whether or not we pursue this or not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Fair enough. So, has there been any proof brought forth by any election body showing that there is voter fraud and that we need to go this route? Because, I'm gonna just step back to what I heard Representative Albis mention about his aging grandparents. He's probably referencing somebody about my age. (Laughter) My -- you know, but I have an elderly parent that lives -- resides with me that doesn't drive anymore, who's, you know, worked her whole life. And I'm just trying to wrap my arms around why this is absolutely

necessary because I have not -- when I was Chair of the GA & E committee, I was never made aware of any fraud. As a matter of fact, our election system run beautifully, with some blips. Right? There's always some blips. But please explain to me where there has been fraud reported and actually substantiated. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the question was sort of a repetition of whether or not I've seen specific data. Just to -- if the gentleman could clarify. I'm sorry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, I guess -- I know you've tried to answer it and other people have said they haven't heard it. So, where is the proof that voter fraud actually is occurring right now? Because I've heard previous speakers discuss, well,

people break laws, they text, they drive, they do this and they do that. Okay. Has there been proof provided to the leadership of the committee, to the Secretary of State's Office that there is voter fraud occurring that people can show us and prove to us? Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll read a headline from the *New Haven Register* dated September 26, 2014. "*Bridgeport State Representative Christina Ayala arrested on 19 voting fraud charges.*" That's just one. I can go on.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28TH):

I bet she had a photo ID, right? So, I guess - you know, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is not the right way to go. I read through the bill, the underlying bill, there was, it looks to me, like a hundred folks that came out in support of what we

were trying to accomplish with this bill and what this amendment is going to do is just, in my opinion, an opportunity to waylay a good piece of proposed legislation that's gonna go in front of the people of the State of Connecticut.

I think it's important that every citizen in the State of Connecticut, whether they drive, don't drive, has the access to vote. That is the most important thing to all of us, I do believe, and I think we're going a roundabout way of trying to stop that and I will not be supporting this amendment and I'm going to ask my colleagues to join me in that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to the proponent for answering my questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Repre -- for the second time, Representative Miller of the 145th.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, questions to the proponent of the bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, ma'am.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Did I hear you say that recipients of DC-- DSS services receive or waive -- receive a waiver for the non driver's license photo ID? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

They are eligible, yes, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm looking at a printout from the DS -- from the DMV website that indicates who is waived for the photo ID, non-driver's license photo ID and it say those individuals that are in homeless shelters and the second one says blind veterans. I don't see anything regarding DSS recipients. So, Through you, Mr. Speaker., I would like to ask the proponent of the bill if this is true, how would individuals who are receiving DSS services and those that are not

receiving DSS services, who cannot afford to buy the driver's license, how would they obtain the photo ID, non-driver's license photo ID?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The question is to the proponent of the amendment, not the bill. Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'll try to answer the question. I can't speak to what is or is not on that piece of paper from the Department of Motor Vehicles. If the question is how these individuals are going to find -- for example, let's just take the folks receiving DSS services. If the question is how are they going to find that they're eligible for this service, that's not the question. I'm sorry. Could the Representative from Stamford reframe the question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller, would you kindly restate or reframe the question?

REP. MILLER (145TH):

I'd like to thank the proponent for giving me

the opportunity to reframe my question. So, I'm looking at a piece of paper which was printed from the website, the DMV website, on what to bring and it states that there are two groups of individuals who are waived the fee for a photo ID, non-driver license for a photo ID, non-driver's photo ID - blind veterans and those individuals who are connected or part of the homeless shelters.

There is nothing regarding DSS recipients; those individuals who receive DSS services. So, my question to the proponent is this, if that is true that DSS individuals who receive social services are not waived, their fees are not waived, how would those individuals as well as those individuals who do not receive the services and who do not have the funds to purchase the IDs, how would they then pay or have access to the photo IDs? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'll answer the

question. I think I've said this before. Again, I can't speak to what's on the piece of paper from DMV. But as I represented before and will again represent; those individuals who are receiving services from DSS are eligible for a photo ID at no charge. They're currently eligible for that now. So I imagine if this amendment were to pass, those individuals would access their photo ID at no cost in the same way they do it now.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you for the answers, through you, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, if what the proponent is saying is true about the DSS recipients, then I think DMV needs to update their website to include that. That's the first thing.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, is this. I grew up during segregation. I grew up during a time that my mother, my grandmother, my great-grandmother could not vote because there were rules put in place that says that if you can't write your name, you

cannot vote. So, there were individuals who thought that they were protecting the integrity of the system who put those things in place so that my ancestors, my relatives could not vote.

When I look at this amendment and I see what I see in black and white, it reminds me of the same thing. Whether you exclude one person or two people, it's also has excluded those individuals who have the right to vote. They're individuals like Martin Luther King and individuals both black, white, purple, green, Jew and Gentile, who died so individuals would vote. So, I stand here today to ask every member in this Chamber not to vote for this amendment. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam. Representative Camillo of the 151st District. No Representative Camillo. Let's move on to Representative Hampton of the 16th District. Okay, not here. Representative Sampson of the 80th District. You're here.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Hello, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Hello, sir. How are you today?

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

I just -- I've been listening to the debate on the amendment for the last half hour or so and I certainly appreciate the passion on all sides of the issue. But I want to just remind everyone what this amendment is about because the debate has been about the cost of a photo ID and I don't think that's really the point of the amendment. The point of the amendment is that if you're going to have an election, it should be a legitimate election, and the only way that we can have legitimate elections is if we can determine if the people who are voting have the right to vote and vote only one time.

Now, I know there's a lot of discussion about whether or not voter fraud exists or not. Well, voter fraud does exist. We had a member of this Chamber who was caught. Not a current member, a previous member, who was caught engaging in voter fraud. It is a real thing. Is it as prevalent as some might claim? It is it as nonexistent as some

might claim? But there is definitely voter fraud. I just looked it up. I found a whole bunch of different examples where elections were decided by 50 votes that happened to be obtained fraudulently.

There are elections where they have to throw out the ballots because more people voted than were eligible to vote in the district. A lot of times these things are not investigated. They are not documented in a way that we can refer to easily. But to say that it does not exist is not true either.

The issue here is that this amendment is very simple. It says, look, if you want to vote in Connecticut we would like you to be able to show that you're an eligible voter. And it's already been explained that people that cannot afford \$22.50 every six years, which is \$3.75 per year, which I would argue is not a real strong impediment. It cost more than that to feed yourself every day, \$3.75. And the law does make provisions for people that can't afford that. Connecticut is a very generous state. This body, the Connecticut General

Assembly is a very generous body. And I'm happy to work with anyone. I'm happy to make a commitment right here and right now that I would be willing to find a way within our available means to make sure that anyone that cannot afford \$3.75 per year still gets their ID so they can vote.

But let's not use that as a mechanism to say this is a bad idea. This is a perfectly legitimate idea. If you believe in legitimate elections, then you believe that we should make sure that people have a valid ID when voting. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us?

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

For the third time, the gentleman seeks to be

acknowledged. Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing none. Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you and I appreciate that latitude in this case. It looks like we're gonna conclude debate on this, but there's something I think I need to say and this has been a very productive debate, and for the most part, a very kind one. But it was suggested by two individuals very, very clearly, and I don't know if it was intentional, but it was suggested twice here today that the proponents of this bill, of whom I am one, have a goal of disenfranchising voters. It was suggested very, very clearly, crystal clear. And I just need to state very clearly for this Chamber that that is absolutely not true. And anyone who thinks otherwise has taken this to a very, very low level of civility.

So, I just want to defend everyone who is gonna vote in favor of this amendment, regardless of their party, that their yes vote has nothing to do with wanting to keep people away from the polls. In

fact, it has everything to do with making sure that the people who get to the polls are doing so properly. And sir, I'd be doing this Chamber a disjustice if I did not say that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats, and the machine will be opened.

(Bell)

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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the 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 Amendment "A",

Total number Voting	146
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	68
Those voting Nay	78
Those absent and not Voting	4

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The amendment fails. (Gavel) Will you remark further on the bill? Representative Dubitsky of the 47th.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a few questions for the proponent of the bill, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox, will you prepare yourself for question? You may proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm looking at this bill and I see that it is -- it gives the General

Assembly the power to enact laws for the voting in-person in the choice of any officer to be elected. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what does that mean "any officer to be elected?"

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I think the proponent for the question. That addresses the officers of the -- state officers of this assembly and upstairs. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, am I to understand that any officer to be elected does not include town or municipal officers? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Technically, and this is where it gets a little gray, the Constitution

sets a timeframe for elections for legislative and statewide offices. It does not establish similar time requirements for municipal offices or elections. So it's just in the absence of these provisions. Early voting could be established for municipal elections without a constitutional amendment. However, ultimately, municipality could potentially create early voting on their own, but in all likelihood they would require a constitutional amendment. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, did I hear the word "in all likelihood?" Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

That's correct. Yes, sir, Mr. Speaker, through you. In all likelihood municipalities could potentially establish an early voting procedure on

their own, but they would possibly require a constitutional amendment. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have just been thoroughly confused. So, does this proposed constitutional amendment, is there any possibility that this would affect municipal elections? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Constitution sets the timeframes for elections for legislative and statewide offices. So, the idea being that, ultimately, if the General Assembly deems appropriate, they could specify that this would be addressed to municipal elections, because in all likelihood -- as I stated earlier, in all likelihood, the municipalities would require a constitutional amendment to do, but there is an

argument that they would not. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I -- that answer, I'm sorry, didn't clarify my curiosity because it sounded to me like the Legislature could enact a statute under this constitutional provision which would indeed affect municipal elections. Did I interpret that incorrectly? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize for a potentially confusing answer. What I'm trying to get it at is the Constitution of the State of Connecticut sets the timeframe for elections for legislative and statewide offices and does not specifically address the timeframes for municipal offices, which is why this amendment before, if

enacted, the General Assembly would be provided the authority to enact rules and guidelines for statewide and legislative offices and there's -- it's -- the Constitution does not specifically set or address time requirements for municipal offices or elections, which is why I said there is a bit of gray area.

Because the Constitution does not -- only specifies elections -- only specifies the time for elections of legislative and statewide and not a municipal. So, ultimately, I believe, in my opinion, that municipalities would need a constitutional amendment to establish early voting on their own. But specifically, because the Constitution just addresses timing for elections for legislative and statewide offices, this proposal before us would be going towards that. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I think it is very dangerous to be enacting a provision that it appears that the proponent of the proposed constitutional amendment is not 100 percent certain whether or not this would affect municipal elections. I think it would be -- it would be a very large and -- a very large change to our Constitution and I think a very large surprise to our municipalities if they learned that this constitutional amendment allowed the General Assembly to provide by law for the voting in person in the choice of any officer to be elected, which would include municipal officers.

Because one could only imagine the chaos that could ensue if every municipal election for everything from judge of probate to planning and zoning to board of finance, zoning board of appeals, all had to comply with this provision and allow for a multiple-day election. I represent some small towns. I can't possibly fathom how they would make that work. Another question. It further says that the General Assembly may provide by law for voting

in person in; I'm sorry, upon any question voted out -- voted on at an election. Any question to be voted on at an election. If I could ask the proponent of the bill what that means?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the proponent. That provides the General Assembly with some flexibility and leeway in terms of down the road in determining the specifics of the ultimate legislation that would be enacted should this be approved by the general population. That provides us some flexibility would the General Assembly permit any early voting to address officers as well as questions or just be limited to just officers. Again, it's a means why which -- the hope with this legislation is that ultimately it would come back to this body to provide the specifics as to what's going to be addressed and worked on. So, including the word "question" there was just to give us some flexibility in the ultimate scope of the underlying

proposal should it prevail. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

To provide the General Assembly with some flexibility. It sounds like a placeholder to me. Sounds like a dummy bill that can be fixed later. But this is the Constitution we're talking about. We're not putting dummy bills into the Constitution. And, through you, Mr. Speaker, would this -- any question voted on at an election, would that in any conceivable -- any conceivable form affect municipal questions? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It could. In line 14 of the proposed bill, the General Assembly may provide by law for voting, and then it goes on, to provide some -- it's not a narrow scope-- its intention is not a narrow scope. It's providing the

General Assembly some flexibility in providing ultimately what may be included. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

That was the answer I was not hoping for. That answer says that should a town have a vote on the budget, they would have -- they may have to comply with this. Can you imagine a five-day vote on a town budget in a small town? Who's gonna administer that? We don't have the staff for that. We -- and most of my towns operate under a town meeting form of government. The town meeting is the legislative body in the town. So, the selectmen work on issues and they put in a ballot initiative -- I mean, they put ballot questions up to the town. People of the town show up at a meeting and they vote. If they vote yes, the question is approved. If they vote no, it is not approved.

This amendment to the Connecticut Constitution would essentially eliminate the town meeting form of

government in this state! And it's doing so in order to give the Legislature some flexibility. Flexibility. Is that what this Legislature needs, some more flexibility to make rules that nobody understands? Well, I'd be willing to bet that nine out of ten people reading this provision wouldn't understand that this also affects municipal elections, also affects municipal questions.

So, for something as simple as, let's say, the town is deciding whether to put a roof on a senior center, to spend a little money to do that, or put up their budget, or maybe to close a road. To have the Constitution of the State of Connecticut provide that this Legislature can mandate that the towns have -- hold the votes open for five days. It literally destroys the town meeting form of government and creates something else. I don't know what it creates, but it certainly creates some other form of government that virtually all of my towns would suffer under and many of the towns in this state.

So, it's just baffling to me that without -- it almost seems like this is either -- we're either trying to sneak something through with this to give flexibility to the Legislature to do whatever it wants later on down the road or this is poorly thought out and nobody considered the possible ramifications of this. And I think it is very, very dangerous to allow this to go through as is.

A couple other quick questions, through you, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you. In line 40, there is a provision that, in current law, that talks about the lists -- when the lists should be delivered to the town clerk. They have to be delivered currently within three days. That language is now being removed. Through you, Mr. Speaker, why is that language being removed?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The language is being removed that they're -- these changes are needed so that votes can be received before election day. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure that answered my question. Why is it that the deadline for delivery to the town clerk is being removed? It does not say anything. It does not add anything about having the clerk receive it before -- at any given time. So, I'm confused by the answer. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Current general statutes tied to timeframes and are required by the current constitutional requirements. And so this language is necessary so that the early voting, if

it should take place, the votes would be received before election day and a change needs to be made for that to happen. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, if I could ask the proponent to point to any language, whether in this bill or elsewhere, that indicates when the lists shall be delivered to the town clerk?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe the proponent is seeking sections 9-304 of the General Statutes, which set tighter timeframes that are required by the current constitutional requirements as well as 9-304, I believe it is, of the General Statutes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you. So, I don't have those specific statutes up in front of me, so I would ask the proponent, so in those specific statutes that are currently in law, it indicates that when those lists need to be delivered to the town clerk? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

That's correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So am I correct to say that right now in town -- in state law we have two different deadlines, one being three days and the other deadline being that which -- that in the statutes which the proponent just recited? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

That's correct. They are addressed to different individuals who are running for office. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

So, through you, Mr. Speaker, is there currently a conflict in law with two different deadlines? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

The conflict, Mr. Speaker, is the statutes are a little more restrictive and have tighter requirements than that of the Constitution. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So is the answer yes, there is a conflict? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

A conflict in the sense that the statutes are a little more restrictive, yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay. And removing the three-day provision would do what? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

The three-day provision -- the proponent is seeking the language -- lines 33-74 of the resolution? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

I'm talking about the -- just in line 40 and 41 where it removes the three-day provision. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that section is in our Constitution and says that they votes must be received and counted on the day of the election in the presence of the electors and also provides for the submittal of the list of persons voted -- who the person voted for to the town clerk and the Secretary of State within specified timeframes, and those times would be eliminated by this. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay. So if I may ask, once that three-day deadline is removed, what will the deadline be?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The language as provided will indicate that -- the deadline, I guess

you could say more or less remains the same, but order of receiving the votes changes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, I -- so, the good proponent said there was a conflict between the statute he mentioned and the current law of section 4 here, and that there was a difference between that deadline and the deadline that's being removed here and therefore this needed to be removed. And my understanding of what the proponent just said is that if we remove this three-day deadline, it will not change. So, I -- again, I ask -- if I could just -- if the good proponent could just tell me how many days would the deadline be for the list to be delivered to the town clerk once this three-day deadline as removed? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe -- the proponent is referencing the word "deadline." Is he referring to the -- the change is necessary in order -- so that the votes can be received before election day because if we allow early voting, obviously votes are cast prior to election day. So the change is going towards when votes are received and how they can be received before election day. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

The deadline I'm referring to is in line 40 and 41. The sentence that says *one list shall be delivered within three days to the town clerk*. The words "within three days" are being removed in this proposed bill. So I'm asking, if that language is removed, when shall the list be delivered to the town clerk? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

As stated in the proposed amendment, one list shall be delivered to the town clerk and the other should be delivered under seal to the Secretary of State. The votes to be delivered shall be counted, canvassed and declared by the Treasurer within the month of November, and then so on. It -- I'm not -- they'll be delivered -- this is just addressing the manner by which votes will be received before election day. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay. I -- the proponent keeps using the words "delivered before election day" and I don't see that in this language anywhere. Where is that stated? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

(Section) 9-309 and 9-308 address this section of the amendment. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay. So, the list -- so, if I understand this correctly, the list need not be delivered within three days to the town clerk. It must be delivered by election day. Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Currently, the General Statute set earlier deadlines by which they must submit these returns, such as midnight on election day to the Secretary of State. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay. In line 41, *the list shall be delivered within ten days after such meeting*. That language is removed. If I -- Through you, Mr. Speaker, why is that language removed?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Because votes will be occurring prior to election day. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, but there would also be votes cast on election day, presumably. Is that correct? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

That's correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

So, I don't understand why the -- *within ten days after such meeting* have been removed. If the good proponent could why that ten-day provision is being removed? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

I believe that's being removed, Mr. Speaker, because there are stricter guidelines in section 9-308 and 9-309 of the General Statutes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay, so again, I will ask on this ten-day provision, is there currently a conflict in law between the statutes that the good proponent just mentioned and what is currently in state law under this section 4? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you. The General Statutes have tighter timeframes than are required by the constitutional requirements. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry that -- I don't think I heard my -- an answer to my question in there. Is there currently a conflict that needs to be resolved by removing this ten-day provision? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

The conflict being -- I believe I understand the proponent's question. The conflict being that the current General Statutes have tighter timeframes than those required by the Constitution. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay, so, what that a yes?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

I believe so, yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you. I think this is a very dangerous bill. I think changing the Constitution in a way that is unclear and could potentially open this up to every municipal election for every elected official, from judge of probate to dog catcher, to alternate on the zoning board of appeals, I think it would be completely irresponsible of us to put this in the Connecticut Constitution.

It would eliminate, essentially, the town meeting form of government and it would do it surreptitiously. We'd be sneaking this in past the voters of this state because they would think they're just voting on extending the timeframe for voting. Where, in fact, we'd be eliminating the form of government of just about every town in my district and many, if not most of the towns, in the state, without anybody knowing it. I think it's a very dangerous bill and I will certainly be voting

against it and I encourage strongly all of my
colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case of the 63rd District.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions to the
proponent of the bill. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, in the
Constitution right now, I believe there's a certain
number of days we have to set aside to have the
machines locked before an election. How does that
pertain to this bill? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the proponent is asking how the bill affects the security of the current voting tabulators? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the Representative. I'm not sure it does. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

So, through you, Mr. Speaker. In many towns, these machines are stored in off-site or stored outside of the town hall and in schools and they need to be in a locked down room for seven days

prior to an election. How would we do that with this? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Representative for the question. I think I now understand what he meant. If -- ultimately, if this were to pass, go through the proper procedures and ultimately be approved by the State of Connecticut and come back to this body to dictate the terms of early voting, whether it be two days or five days, and when, where, why and the timeline, ultimately, those decisions would be made at that time. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

So, we're voting on something that's not complete and something we have to come back and work on. Through you, Mr. Speaker, is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're voting on a constitutional amendment that would provide this body the authority and opportunity to address early voting. So the extents that it's not complete, we are dictating in this resolution the timeframes, the potential days, and the window of voting, but all the other specifics as to the actual underlying parts of that will be determined by this body latera. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Let's say we come back and the window of three to five days ends up on, let's say, November 2nd, and the vote in November 6th. It doesn't allow for seven days for those machines to be locked for the general election, but we could lock them prior for the early voting election. How would that work? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Representative for the question. Ultimately, if we were to dictate that a town is gonna have a certain number of voting days per election and that we would determine how many voting machines are required per town, and then thereafter, I'm presuming that we would establish a similar timeframe as now that we would do then. So, now, if it's seven days, I presume then that we'd say -- when the time comes again, if all this gets worked out by this body, then, ultimately, if now it's seven days then if the time come and we just say that each town has to have one voting location for X number of days, depending on how many tabulators were needed for that, then we'd say those tabulators need to be secured for seven days in addition to the seven days. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure I got that answered, but I guess I understand that we'll put this constitutional amendment through with not all the answers, which I have trouble with. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Will -- would this early voting, will they be allowed to have poll checkers? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, the specifics of the underlying bill are going to be worked out at a later point in time, but, yeah, I presume that there'd be no reason why they could not have poll checkers. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

So, through you, Mr. Speaker. By having poll checkers, there will be lists of people who voted.

Will these lists be locked down or will they be available to the public? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- again, it's difficult to -- it's speculative for me at this point, but I'm presuming that similar procedures that are used now will be used then. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If there are poll checkers, the poll checkers know the people that have voted, so they know how many votes have already been cast. The lists show the people who have voted, so people can go back and they can find the people who haven't voted to make sure they get out on the actual voting day. Are those lists locked down or is this free for anybody to take a look at? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I presume that the procedures similar for now, when you can find out who's requested an absentee ballot now, then you'd be able to find out then who's voted early. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So is that something that still needs to be worked out? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Mr. Speaker, through you. Much of this still needs to be worked out, admittedly. It's enabling legislation. We're dictating the timeframe. We're dictating the hours per day and the window within which early voting can occur. Beyond that, it's up

to this body to determine. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

So, through you, Mr. Speaker. In -- a previous speaker who spoke on this, let's say that this is a presidential election year where sometimes we have municipal elections also. So, the early voters would only be able to vote on the statewide or presidential election, but not on the municipal elections? Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, they would have to vote twice?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That will be a determination made by the members of this Chamber. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Mr. Speaker, we go onto the cost of this and it reads in here \$5,000 dollars for the Secretary of State. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's correct. Assuming that this resolution passes this Chamber by three-fourths this time and the Chamber upstairs by three-fourths and gets on the ballot for 2018, that that fiscal note attached is just one of that assumption. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Representing four -- three small towns and one small city, its' very difficult because our actual registrar's line items are running in the deficit. So now we'll have to lock down the machines twice. We'll have to have checkers twice. We'll have to cancel school twice. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Have all these things

been thought about when this bill was brought forward? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They have been thought about and I will say that, to the Representative, the ROVAC, town clerks have come out in full support of this method. There've been a number of registrars. I cannot recall if the registrars testified in a group or individually, but there were a number of individual registrars, specifically one from Wilton who testified in support of this process. So those issues are very important, I realize, to municipalities and towns, but they have been thought of, yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Dubitsky. I'm sorry, Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sorry. So, I guess I'll end it with a few comments and let the good Representative take a break. I'm concerned with

this. I'm concerned with this not only here, but in committees. We're putting something forward. It's the cover of the book, but it hasn't been written yet. We don't have the specifics of the bill, but they want us to vote on something that could happen. I understand the good Representative that said that the town clerks, the registrars, they're all for this. How can they be for it if they don't know the specifics?

In that case, I will be voting no for this. We bring things to this Chamber when we don't have a complete and accurate bill, meaning that there's only a cover. There's nothing within the book with any contents. And to top it all off, it's an unfunded mandate to our municipalities when we don't even have a state budget! So, one more question, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

I do understand the \$5,000 dollars is a very small amount. Is there a line item in the biennium budget for 2019 for this vote? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware of that. Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've done this many times this week. We have passed things. We have looked at things that are not in our biennium budget, whether they're \$5,000 dollars, whether they're \$40 million dollars. We have over a \$300 million dollar deficit as we sit right now. We have a multibillion dollar deficit going out in the future. We need to start looking at a budget before

we start putting legislation out that has no content.

If I can't see the content and alls I can see is the cover of the book, how do you expect me to vote on it? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin of the 37th for the second time on the bill.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment. It is LCO No. 3858. Would you please ask the Clerk to call it and I be allowed to summarize?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 3858, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "B"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B", LCO No. 3858, offered by Representative Devlin, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none,

Representative Devlin, you may proceed with summarization, madam.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a strike-all amendment that essentially would require that absentee ballots cast in the State of Connecticut are audited. And, Mr. Speaker, I would move adoption of this amendment and request that the vote is taken by roll.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The question before the Chamber is on a roll call vote. All those in favor say aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Those opposed? The ayes -- the twenty-percent rule has been met. The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule "B". Will you remark on the amendment?

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard a lot about the importance of providing access for our

voters, voting electorate, to get to the polls. We had a 77-percent participation rate in our last election. We also hear a lot about the importance of protecting our democracy by ensuring the security and the integrity of voting in our state.

One of the areas that comes up for concern over and over again, whether it was in 2006 in Harford where there were absentee ballot fraud issues. Whether it was 2015 in Stamford where there were absentee ballot fraud issues. Whether it was 2017 in West Haven where there were absentee ballot fraud issues, or when it was in February of this year in the City of Bridgeport where there were calls for greater oversight because of concerns of fraud with absentee ballots.

Currently, there is no audit provision for absentee ballots when they are counted centrally within our municipalities. And, by and large, 50 percent of our communities, and that would include Hartford, Stamford, Waterbury, Bridgeport, count their absentee ballot centrally and therefore there is no auditing of absentee ballots.

So, essentially, this would require, and I think we've heard a lot about the importance of integrity and security of voting, that, in fact, that occurred. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment? Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the amendment. I thank the Ranking Member for her comments and her efforts in this matter and all others and through -- before the GAE members, before the GAE Committee. I will note that currently audits are addressed in statute, section 9-320-F of the General Statutes.

I think that it'd be in the better interest of this body and of our state if further revisions to the audit procedure are taken by way of statutes and I would be more than willing to work with the proponent and any other members of this body who wishes to do so. I think this is a change which should be made in the statute as opposed to the

Constitution. Once the change is made in the Constitution, there is no wiggle room at all. And as such, I think this proposed change would be better fit for a statutory change as opposed to a constitutional amendment. Through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I do appreciate the good Representative's comments, and particularly the point that in a constitutional amendment, there really isn't any wiggle room. To the prior Representative's comments regarding a book cover without any sort of innards, which the underlying resolution does currently provide. Currently, within the manual that the Secretary of State provides in terms of managing elections, it requires only auditing of absentee ballots when they are counted in the District through a tabulator, and therefore, as part of an overall election audit, they are included. But if the good Representative

could give me an indication of when there have been audits across the board of absentee ballots in the State of Connecticut, that would be very helpful.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

That was a question directed at me? Through you, can you please rephrase, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin, would you kindly restate the question?

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the good Representative please tell me when -- how many audits have been conducted and when those occurred?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I do not have that information in front of me. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I think that's probably safe to say because there haven't been any. And one of the things that we hear over and over again in news reports is the concern about the validity of absentee ballots, and quite frankly, the concern of fraud with absentee ballots. And one of the things that we did hear from clerks and from ROVAC was the concern that of anything in terms of voter fraud, it does relate to absentee ballots. So, therefore, I would support, certainly, this amendment, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Further on the amendment? Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the amendment before us. An extensive conversation that we had previously talked about voter fraud and talked about examples and instances of documented

voter fraud. And I had talked about 2010 in Bridgeport and I have to mention it again because it's relevant to the amendment.

In October 2010, right before the election, a gentleman by the name of Sam Adoino along with apparently his son, Sam Adoino, Jr., registered 250 absentee ballots to be distributed. Two hundred and fifty absentee ballots registered to 1238 - 1-2-3-8 - North Avenue in the City of Bridgeport. It turned out that 1-2-3-8 North Avenue was, and I believe still is, an empty lot. There's not a house on it. There's not an apartment building on it. There's not a building at all on it. It is an empty lot. And at the time in 2010, it was an empty lot with a for sale sign, literally.

So, we talk about where fraud exists in voting. You can't argue with the fact that absentee ballots are ripe for it and in fact we hear about it every year in state elections and in municipal elections. My example of 250 fraudulent absentee ballots in 2010 is one of many and it is all the more reason to support the amendment before us.

Why on earth would we not want to audit absentee ballots, which are arguably the most ripe for the commission of fraud; the most easy to perpetrate a fraud? Why would we bit want those audits? Why would we not want to ensure that those absentee ballots are accurate, properly distributed, properly completed? Why wouldn't we want to do that? It's common sense.

When you look at risk, the risk is there. It's the easiest way to commit voter fraud and we have an amendment before us today that would address that risk specifically. For that reason and for many others, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption. This is a prudent measure. This is hardly onerous. This is common sense. I would urge the Chamber to adopt the amendment before us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too rise in support of this bill. As previous discussion on the earlier amendment indicated, there is a real

interest on the part of the government to ensure that voting is carried out freely and fairly. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court in the case *Marion -- Crawford v. Marion County Elections Board* which dealt with that very Indiana voter identification law which was referenced before, the court ruled that one of the most important interests of government is to ensure elections that are free, that are fair, and that are devoid of fraud.

Indeed, the Voter Commission chaired by former President Jimmy Carter and former Secretary of State James Baker said the same thing. That for all citizens to have confidence in the outcome of elections, we need to make sure that people who vote are entitled to vote and that they identify themselves and that this is all part of the process. So I think conducting an audit of absentee ballots is very much in keeping with that. We all want to know that the votes that we've cast are valid and that they're not cancelled out by someone who may have cast a vote to which he or she was not entitled.

We've seen in this state how a mere matter of one, two, three votes can decide an election, which is all the more reason why every single vote that's cast must be judged to be a valid one. So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment and I would urge my colleagues to do so as well. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam. Representative Ferraro of the 117th District.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I rise for a question to the proponent to the bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox, will you prepare yourself for questioning? No, no, no, no. Sorry. No, for the actual amendment is Representative Devlin.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

I'm sorry. To the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

We're still on the amendment. Representative Devlin, will you prepare yourself for question?

Sir, you may proceed.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the amendment. Does the proponent of the amendment know the reasons listed on the absentee ballot for qualifying for an absentee ballot?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Could the good Representative repeat that question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Ferraro, kindly restate the question.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Yes, sir, through you, Mr. Chair -- Mr. Speaker. Does the proponent of the amendment know the reasons listed on the absentee ballot for qualifying for an absentee ballot?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

So, Mr. Speaker, through you. I probably will not get them all, but it does have to do with being out of the town, out of the state. I think with illness. There may be some other elements to it, but, essentially, it gets to the point, unless you're permanently disabled, then you can have no excuse absentee ballot qualify for that. But that is probably the broad stroke. It's essentially that you are not going to be physically present within the vicinity, the town, the community, and potentially the state, to be able to cast a vote. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker. I than the good proponent for her answers. I do believe there was one more major reason and that was if you are working the polls that day.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Yes.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

So, the reason why I asked this question is, obviously, West Haven was named in one of the offending towns by one of the previous speakers, and I have some firsthand information -- or experience with that town and the absentee balloting that has taken place over the years. And I just want to point out, an unaudited use of absentee ballots in a West Haven election has produced, in very small districts with very small numbers of voters, in excess of 17 percent to 20 percent of the voting population voting by absentee ballot. And when you look at those reasons as to why someone would qualify for an absentee ballot, it's kind of hard to believe that that many people would fit those reasons.

And for that reason, I am rising in complete support of this amendment. I do believe that the absentee ballot system is necessary for those folks who have difficulty getting to the polls, but I do believe there's tremendous leverage and tremendous opportunity to abuse that privilege, and I do believe an audit would be absolutely necessary in

the future counting of absentee ballots. So, I rise in complete support. I urge this body to support this amendment as well. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you to remark further on the amendment? Representative Albis of the 99th District.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just have a question for the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you. My reading of this amendment suggests that the actual vote of the absentee ballot will be reviewed. Is that true, through you, so that the -- we will know a person voted if they voted absentee? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you. It would really be up to the Secretary of State to determine the appropriate way to be able to audit our absentee ballots, which may include, you know, however she would best determine that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you. Does the proponent have an idea of how that might -- how the Secretary of State might view that responsibility? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Well, I would trust that the Secretary of State would embrace that responsibility, considering one of her sole, most important roles is to ensure the integrity of our elections. And there are current provisions, again, in certain aspects, but a big

void in terms of the security in checking of our integrity of our elections is through the absentee ballots. I would trust that she would embrace that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I agree with the proponent. I have no doubt that the Secretary of State would take every intention of protecting the integrity of the system. I just worry that the way that this amendment is worded that it could open up the possibility of the votes of those who vote by absentee being made public or made known to some folks involved in the election system. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I'm urging my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, will staff and guest please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats, the

machine will be opened. (Ringing)

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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the 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. The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Amendment "B",

Total number Voting	146
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	68
Those voting Nay	78
Those absent and not Voting	4

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The amendment fails. (Gavel) Further on the

bill? Will you comment further on the bill?

Representative Carney of 23rd.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. So, listening to this debate and reading about the constitutional amendment before us got me thinking about a proposal, actually a bipartisan request, I should say, from the beginning of the year from myself and other -- a House colleague on the Republican side and a House colleague on the Democrat side. And what the resolution before us would do is essentially allow the good people of the State of Connecticut to decide on this question, whether or not they believe the State of Connecticut should allow no-excuse early voting.

And it got me thinking about that request from earlier this year that, unfortunately, did not receive a public hearing, and it's been brought forward many years by both Republicans and Democrats, supported by Republicans and Democrats, but never seems to go anywhere. So, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of LCO 3867. I ask that

it be called and I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 3867, which will be designated House Amendment "C".

CLERK:

House Amendment "C", LCO No. 3867, offered by Representative Carney, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing, none, Representative Carney, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. So basically what this amendment would do was allow for a resolution to go before the people of the good State of Connecticut to amend our Constitution to allow the people of the state to have a right to direct referendum, and the procedure for that would be established by the General Assembly, but it would start that process to allowing the voters of this

state to decide on certain policies that we send to them through referendum. I move adoption, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule "C". Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Carney.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And as I discussed, this is about more of a direct democracy for the good citizens of the people of this state. You know, we talk about polls all across -- about various issues throughout the state. You know, 70 percent approve this, 80 percent approve that. Nothing seems to happen here in the Legislature, though.

So, this would put those policies to the test. Not overwhelmingly. Similar to what our neighbor up north does, Massachusetts. They don't propose too many direct referendums, but they do it on certain issues and policies. I think that this would be something that many people in the State of

Connecticut would want. It would be the purest form of democracy. It would allow important decisions to be strengthened by getting consent from the people. It gives decisions we make legitimacy and policies legitimacy. It would -- we could educate the public more about issues by going to them, because their voice matters. And I know a lot of folks in this state feel their voice doesn't matter up in this building, and it would give them that opportunity.

It would allow engagement with the citizens and it would resolve conflict within this building by saying, "okay, if we can't come to a solution that we can send it then to the people of the state to decide and say whether or not they support a particular idea or proposal." Twenty -- I believe 27 other states do this. Connecticut is not one of them. And, again, it would allow people in this state more of an interaction with government and allow them to have more of a voice in this building, which is, again, I think something the people of this state desperately, desperately want.

While I said, unfortunately, it did not receive

a public hearing this year. I am hopeful that next year it can receive a bipartisan proposal again and maybe we can get that public hearing before the GAE Committee to really see how the public feels about this type of a proposal. I think, overwhelmingly, the people of this state would support that.

I'm gonna end with a quote by our former president, Teddy Roosevelt, who said, *"I believe in the initiative and referendum, which should be used not to destroy representative government, but to correct it whenever it becomes unrepresentative."* I think it's a very powerful quote. I agree with it, but unfortunately, I don't believe the votes are there today. So, I would like to revisit this at another time. Hopefully, I've planted a seed for next year to explore this. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the amendment. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The amendment is withdrawn. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us?
Representative Candelora of the 86th.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which was similarly addressed, I think, in 2013 wherein we had a ballot measure that was seeking to allow -- or eliminate the absentee ballot provisions and had no-excuse absentee ballots which potentially could've led to early voting as well. And that referendum had made it to the ballot and the voters of Connecticut rejected that referendum.

And I think part of the fundamental issue here and why there is great concern aside from election fraud and issues associated possibly with people with voting prior to the election day, whereas events could occur that might've changed their vote. And we've seen that happen. It's rare, but it can happen. And what impact that would have and how people would have that inability to change their vote if, for instance, a candidate was found to committing a crime and they're stuck having their vote casted for that person.

I think it's better for the democratic process that we come together on one day to vote for our candidates as opposed to spreading it out. But I think there's a practical side to this that we need to recognize as a state. Philosophically, we could have all sorts of issues that we agree with or disagree with, but we're sort of beyond the philosophical discussions, because, financially, where we are as a state, finally where our municipalities are.

Most recently, my town has just gone through their early budget process and we're looking at zero increases for education from one year to the next. We're looking at teacher layoffs. We're looking at finding efficiencies. And I know we're all feeling that, statewide, for all of us. And the reality is that this is going to add additional mandates and additional costs on our community in order to try to administer it.

I think the State of Connecticut has survived and done very well in our election process, having the voting all take place on election day. And we

even opened up the process to allow people to register to vote on election day to cast a ballot. So, Connecticut is already in a unique position that makes it very easy for our electorate to get to the polls. To open this up now and to extend it even further where municipalities would now have to polls operating up to two weeks prior to an election is highly disruptive for town hall operations where many employees are already doing multiple positions.

So, I think I am certainly concerned and very mindful that those financial impacts and I think we should, as a Chamber, also be mindful of it. I enjoy having these type of philosophical discussions, but finances have to yield to those philosophies and we need to draw a line here and say no and begin to work on solving the fiscal issues and bringing stability to our municipalities and to our states. So, therefore, I stand in strong opposition to this resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Distinguished Majority Leader from the 1st District, Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to thank Representative Fox and the Ranking Member, Representative Devlin, for leading the floor debate today here. Anytime you're looking to amend your Constitution and put something to the voters, people pay attention, people read the history of this, and the voters do it. It's something we don't do lightly and we don't do often. So I want to thank them for their leaderships here on both side of the aisle for doing that.

What really eats at me about Connecticut's voting system right now, and I'm gonna give two examples, is I actually think our constitutional provision on voting is unconstitutional. And I believe a lawyer should challenge it because I don't know what the margin's gonna be here today, but my guess is we're gonna have to come back next year and try to get it on the ballot in 2020. And I acknowledge the questions are confusing, even the

wording of this to somebody, lawyer or nonlawyer, you know, not more than two, not less than five. It doesn't roll off the tongue. It's not a shall we do this, yes or no.

But I'm gonna tell you why I believe that if someone challenged the constitutionality of this provision about how you can vote by absentee ballot, and that's what early voting would alleviate, I think, I think the court would say, sorry, Connecticut, you gotta change it, and here's why. One of the first exceptions that allows you to vote is that you are absent from the municipality in which you reside during all hours of voting. So let me give you an example that happens a lot. Not once in a blue moon, but a lot. And some people refer to 77-percent voting turnout, there's a lot of communities where it's much less than that. And I happen to represent one of them. So let me give you an example.

You live in the City of Hartford and you have two jobs- two jobs. And the first job starts at 5:30 a.m. Polls open at 6:00 and they close at

8:00, set by state law. I go to my job at 5:30 and that shift ends at noon, 12:00. I still am in the city that I live in all day long, have not left. I have a second job that begins right after that. It happens to be across the street. I don't have time to go back to my polling place. I have to be at my next job. There's an overlap of the two jobs. That shift ends at 8:30.

So, I worked from 5:30 to 12:00, 12:00 to 8:30 to provide for my family, and I cannot vote because I am not absent from the municipality in which I reside during all hours of voting. So, as a State Constitution, and then we bring it into state statute. That man or woman who works two jobs in Hartford, if they voted by absentee ballot; it is illegal and it is fraudulent. Are you kidding me? America make it hard and in our state we make it unconstitutional to work two jobs in the city you live in and vote by absentee ballot. Please someone challenge that. Find me the plaintiff who does that and throw this provision out, and throw it to the voters was well.

But unfortunately, that example I'm giving doesn't ring true when you see a ballot question. You see a confusing wording. People go what does this mean? This example, everyone in the State of Connecticut agrees with me that that's not fair. Everyone in this Chamber agrees with me that's not fair. No one disagrees. Two jobs and you can't vote by absentee ballot. Are you kidding me?

Let me give another example. Mrs. Smith, Monday, day before election, is feeling fine. No problems at all. But Mrs. Smith is like me. She's got two young kids and they bring home some terrible stuff every once in awhile. And you feel fine, you have a nice dinner, you have a glass of wine, you go to sleep. No problems. And you wake up the next day, and anyone who has children, you get it, and you have the worst, worst stomach bug you've ever had for 24 hours. It knocks you out. You're on the floor. Done. You are ill on that Tuesday, but you had no idea you were gonna be sick. Who knew? How can you vote by absentee ballot? You can't. It's the day of the election now.

So, some would say maybe if we had another alternative like early voting on the Saturday before the election, where I was feeling fine and no problems and I had more alternatives or more options. These are common occurrences, folks. No one's looking to stuff ballots or commit fraud. There's no evidence of widespread fraud in Connecticut. There is many people up here who have been involved in recounts, Republicans and Democrats. When those recounts happened and you counted the ballots manually, one by one, how many votes changes? Two, three? The system's pretty accurate. Pretty good! Three votes change out of 5,000 cast? Every vote is hand counted? Pretty good system! Never heard of fraudulent voting once. Never.

So, the woman who gets sick, not knowing about it the next day, yeah, don't -- sorry, you can't vote. Don't get sick the next time. But the one that just eats at me is the man or woman who has two jobs, who works in their city to provide for their

family, and our Constitution says sorry, you figure it out. But if you vote, that's fraudulent.

One might counter, well, no one would prosecute for that. But I thought we were a nation of laws? So now we want prosecutors to have the deferent discretion? Because I've heard everything and we don't want that discretion. So, I ask this Chamber to support this amendment. I ask that we do it in a margin that goes on the ballot sooner rather than later. But I ask anyone listening out there, any young lawyer; in particular, you want to make a name for yourself? Find that plaintiff with two jobs and throw this provision out. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Ladies and gentleman, we're about to take up a resolution containing an amendment to our Constitution. At this time, I would like to point out that three-fourth of the total membership of each Chamber is required to place this amendment on the ballot in the next general election in November 2018.

If this resolution receives less than three-

fourths, but at least a simple majority of the total membership in each Chamber, then this resolution will be considered again by the 2019 General Assembly. At that time, a simple majority of each Chamber will place in on the ballot in November 2020.

Will the members and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats, the machine will be opened. (Ringing)

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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine whether your vote has been properly cast? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. Will the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Joint Resolution 28,

Total number Voting	146
Necessary for Adoption	74
Those voting Yea	81
Those voting Nay	65
Those absent and not Voting	4

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The resolution has received an affirmative vote of more than a majority of total membership. The resolution is adopted. (Gavel) The House will stand at ease.

The House will come back to order. Are there any notices or announcements? Representative Terrie Wood of the 141st.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the time to introduce a very good friend, Marcy Minnick, a resident of Darien and a third-generation owner of Excello Manufacturing in Milford. Understands the needs of business and is here and getting a lay of the land and understanding what happens up here.

So, thank you. I wish the Chamber would give her a warm welcome. (Applause)

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, and a hearty welcome. Are there any other notices or announcements? If not, we'll turn to the Call of the Calendar. Oh, here's one more, Representative Slap of the 19th.

REP. SLAP (19TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to acknowledge some special guests today, Erin and Meghan Striff-Cave, two West Hartford residents. They're sitting in the well of the House. They came to testify on the pay equity bill about a month ago and they're here today to lend their support. I also want to acknowledge my three children and wife who are also in the well of the House here. They've been following the pay equity issue for awhile and they're excited to be here as well. So, if the Chamber could give them a warm welcome, I'd appreciate it. Thank you. (Applause)

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 155?

CLERK:

On page 17, Calendar No. 155, substitute House Bill No. 5386 - AN ACT CONCERNING VARIOUS PAY EQUITY AND FAIRNESS MATTERS - favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Public Employees.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Porter, you have the floor, madam.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment, LCO 3879. I would ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The House will stand at ease for a moment.

(Gavel) The House will come back to order.

Will the Clerk please call LCO 3879, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A".

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A," LCO no 3879, offered by Representative Porter, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative Porter, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been 55 years since the Equal Pay Act of 1963 was passed, and women in America are still, still fighting to earn equal pay for equal work. Here in Connecticut, we look at the disparities and women, on average are making about 83 cents to every dollar that a man makes doing equal work. And the disparities are even greater when you look at minorities. Black

women are making about 59 cents on the dollar.
Latinas are making about 47 cents on the dollar.
And I just truly believe that there is a movement
right now going on. We have four states that have
already done what we're looking at doing here today
in the Chamber.

Connecticut would be the fifth state to join in
this movement and actually give women the power and
the equalization that they deserve when they go
seeking employment. I would like to just point out
who we've had support this effort.

I would like to first thank the people in this
Chamber, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle,
for the work that we've been able to do. I would
like to thank the staunch advocates that have
contributed to this and also to CBIA for their
support and efforts in helping to get this done.

I think that the time is past due. I would say
now, but I believe that the time is past due to get
this done and I hope that when it's all said and
done here today that we will be celebrating on
behalf of the women in the great State of

Connecticut and giving them the opportunity to declare that they have a pending pay day coming. So with that being said, I would move adoption. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam. The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Porter. No more?

REP. PORTER (94TH):

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Okay. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment? Representative Bocchino of the 150th.

REP. BOCCHINO (150TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick statement. This is, as Representative Porter, the good Chair of Labor, has said, a work in progress from day one. We had put together a bipartisan group, both Republicans and Democrats, to move this bill forward. We had some great input from various

organizations. Unlike things that we've heard in the media, CBIA was at the table. They were very staunch in letting us know the things that they needed, they were pleased with and representing many of the business community; the outcome that we were able to reach in a bipartisan manner.

This is not a Democrat bill. This is not a Republican bill. This is a bill for the State of Connecticut. This is something that we've heard very diligently on - equal pay for equal work. And we're very proud of the thing that we've produced here today. We look forward to strong support by this body and give it all our support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Forgive me that I actually just started looking at the amendment for the very first time, but I do have a question for the proponent of the amendment, if I could?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Porter, prepare yourself for the question. Proceed, sir.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

I -- my understanding of this bill from the title is that it has something to do with pay equity and fairness matters. But at looking at the amendment, it seems to me that there is nothing that addresses pay equity in this bill, just a section that restricts employers from asking potential employees about their previous wages and benefit information. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

That is correct, if I'm understanding what you're saying. So let me just try to clarify

through a response. The pay equity piece does come in because the great equalizer in making that women are equally paid for equal work would be to take away the employers' opportunity to ask the question around salary history. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks for the gentle lady for her response. I suppose that you could put those two things together. I just wanted to make sure that I knew what we were voting on here. And it seems very clear to me that this bill is simply a restriction on an employer about asking about previous wage and benefits and it would apply to anyone of either gender. Can I just confirm that this applies to everyone regardless of race or gender? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

That is an affirmative. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you again for that answer. I just want it on the record that this bill has nothing to do with equalizing pay between men and women, just equalizing pay in general because it would prohibit an employer from asking information. I think it's a laudable goal in our society to try and make sure that we put protections in for potential employees to make sure that they are treated fairly.

However, I also believe that that relationship between and employer and an employee is a very important relationship, and when the government decides it's going to be getting involved in that transaction, I think we have to do it in a very cautious and very limited way. I can understand that we certainly do not want to go back to the days of having people work for ridiculously low wages,

especially children, you know, working in mines.
We've all heard all those stories about years past.

But at the same time, I think that that relationship is between the employer and the employee. It is a voluntary relationship in our state. Either side can choose to either employ someone, or take the job, and either side can also end that agreement at anytime.

So, based on that, I think it is a bad policy for us to be restricting employers from being able to ask questions that they think are pertinent to making sure that they are hiring the best potential candidate. And because this bill doesn't actually address pay equity, as it says so in the title, I'm gonna oppose it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, a question to the proponent of the amendment?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you and I do want to thank the committees for putting the effort into this. I do have a question on just how do we reach -- I'm a small business owner and have -- and to be honest, my question typically when it comes to an employee is how do I get you to come to work for me, you know, what do you need -- what do I need for benefits? How can I get you to come here because you bring value to my company as an employee?

But how is a small business like myself or other small businesses gonna be aware of the change in this legislation? What we don't want -- we want to make sure that what we're putting here in place isn't an unknown issue, you know, that people are saying, hey, listen, this practice is no longer, if that's been the process, no longer a process that's legal. So, how do we make sure that people aren't caught unexpectedly doing a practice that would now be a violation of this? Is there -- the Department of Labor reach out, something that we can do as a legislative body? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for that question. A very good question. It was something that came up in our discussions in the workgroup with CBIA. That was one of their concerns. It would be their responsibility and in that being so, they had asked that if we would extend the effective date, which we have done. It went from October of this year to January 1, 2019, to take into consideration that businesses would need ample time -- enough time to make sure that their paperwork and business was in order to comply with this. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

And thank you for that consideration. That makes good sense. And so, I mean, one of the areas that we want to make sure is that, you know, us, in a small business, you know, wearing multiple hats.

I, unfortunately, lost a good employee of mine to another competitor. So, I'm doing the bookkeeping now and everything else. So, I'm gonna work to get a new employee. So, anybody out there? No, kidding. But, thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker and I thank to the good lady.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

All those apposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. (Gavel) Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Porter?

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Let's vote.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? No? Representative Slap. (Laughter) He's got his family here. Constituents who will follow this. Representative Slap, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SLAP (19TH):

I will be brief, I promise, but. The good bill ought to pass. We've been working really hard on this for a long time. I want to rise in support of this bill. I want to thank Representative Porter for her leadership on this and the work of the workgroup that really started in the fall -- last fall, and carried on through the winter.

And sometimes, you know, I've had the questions when people have come up to me and said "well, what's different this year versus last when it comes to pay equity and this legislation?" And I think the answer is nothing and everything. Nothing in that the pay gap still exists and it's still about 80 cents on the dollar, but everything, because, you know, I think the process has been a good one and it's been bipartisan, as my colleagues have said.

We've had all the stakeholders at the table. Yes, CBIA. We've also had -- we've had headhunters and, you know, people in the industry. We've had small businesses, large businesses. We've taken great suggestions and considerations from chambers of commerce as well. So, I think the end product is something that we should really all be proud of.

And if I could just remark quickly on, I think, why this is so important. You know, Connecticut ranks 47th in the country in wages lost over a woman's lifetime because of the gender wage gap - 47th - so over half a million dollars on average that women lose throughout their careers. So it's not wonder that AARP is supporting this bill because they know that the poverty rate for women over the age of 65 is double that of men. So, that's a lot of lifetime savings that are lost out on.

And this change, not asking for the pay history question, is not gonna singlehandedly solve all of the problems or singlehandedly close the gender wage gap. But it is gonna make a difference and I want

to just comment to one my colleagues who suggested that this has nothing to do with pay equity.

But I think the evidence is very strong in opposition to that claim, in part, because we know that when women graduate college, the pay gap appears and it's six and a half percent. That's controlling for jobs and specialties, six and a half percent right away.

So if you begin your career being underpaid by six and a half percent and then the employer is asking, "well, how much do you currently make," that gap is gonna grow and grow throughout your entire career. And we know that that's true because as careers progress we know that the average gender wage gap for doctors, even controlling for specialties, is over \$100,000 dollars in the State of Connecticut. And the gap exists in every county, in every profession, in every specialty all across the state. And we know that the gender wage gap is exacerbated by asking the salary history question.

I will finish by saying that it's a simple and powerful bill and it's based on the principle that

we should be pricing the position and not the person. Thanks again for everybody's support and I look forward to voting yes. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Belsito from the 53rd District.

REP. BELSITO (53RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have one question for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. BELSITO (53RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent. If this bill has nothing to do with pay equity, why is pay equity in the title of the bill? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you. My humble opinion is that it does have everything to do with pay equity. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Belsito.

REP. BELSITO (53RD):

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I have one more question. But the proponent in the last segment said that it had absolutely nothing to do with pay equity.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that that statement was made by someone else. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Belsito.

REP. BELSITO (53RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guest please come to the well of the House? Will the

members please take your seats, the machine will be opened. (Ringing)

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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Just as a point of information for everyone, we're gonna do two more quick bills so we'd ask that everyone would stick around. Okay?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine whether your vote has been properly cast? If all the 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. 5386m amended by House "A",

Total number Voting 146

Necessary for Passage 74

Those voting Yea	142
Those voting Nay	4
Those absent and not Voting	4

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The bill as amended is passed. (Gavel) The House will stand at ease.

The Chamber will come back to order. Do we have any announcements or introductions?

Representative Ferraro of the 117th, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have with me two outstanding young people. They actually come from Themis Klarides district, however, I do know the young man to my left because he's a young, budding martial artist, second-degree black belt in taekwondo, and they're up here visiting the Capitol

with their family to learn how the legislative process works. And I would like to introduce to you, to begin with, Ms. Angelina Rivera from Woodbridge, Connecticut. She is 10 years old and she is -- loves writing and hopes to be a writer one day.

And next to her is her brother, Alexandro, who is 14 years old and aspires to be a lawyer. I would like the House to give them a rounding applause for a good welcome. (Applause)

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you and welcome to the House of Representatives. Are there any other announcements? Representative Cheeseman of the 37th, what purpose do you rise, madam?

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

For a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

As we celebrate the vote on pay equity, I would like to ask us all, particularly as I sit next to a

famed aviatrix, the pilot Tammy Shultz of the Southwest Airline flight. She was one of the first Navy F-18 pilots and she successfully handled that terrible emergency on the Southwest flight, brought it down safely in Philadelphia. Thanked all the passengers, and I think is a wonderful example of something to which we can all aspire. Grace under pressure, and with my fellow pilot next to me, an amazing woman. So, just thank you, Tammy, and thank you all the great women out there.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you. Thank you, Representative.

(Applause) Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 80?

CLERK:

On page 9, House Calendar 80, substitute House Bill No. 5245 - AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY BEST PRACTICES FOR PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES, SENIOR CITIZENS AND VETERANS - Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Aging.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Serra, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a task force that the Aging Committee finds to be very important. It provides the Aging Committee with information to answer questions that were put before us at committee meetings. And you've heard it -- it's to provide transportation for disabled persons, senior citizens, veterans, which is an important part of our community. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I move for passage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will you remark further on the bill?

Representative Byron of the 27th.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in -- also in support of this bill. As the good Chair of the Aging Committee has stated -- or, just stated, this bill is to study the transportation needs of our senior citizens, of our disabled citizens, as well as our veterans, particularly beyond the boundaries of the municipality in which they reside. I have strong support for this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will you remark further on this bill?

Representative Belsito of the 53rd.

REP. BELSITO (53RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Oh my God! Another task force, number 14,545. I'm not saying that these individuals don't need transportation and help. They surely do. But what I'm saying is that we don't need a task force to go over this for at least year, a year, now, to determine that we need to have some kind of transportation. There is a

transportation there already that takes disabled citizens.

Why can't they take the disabled soldiers and veterans at the same time? My feeling is this. We don't need a task force. We already have senior citizen help out there to move them around and get them to the malls and everything else. I see it every day. What seems to be the problem? So if the proponent of the bill can answer a question for me, I would appreciate it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra, prepare yourself for question. Representative Belsito, you may proceed, sir.

REP. BELSITO (53RD):

Thank you very much. To the proponent of the bill, what is the problem with the transportation we have now? We are moving senior citizens. We are moving handicapped citizens. We're moving just about every citizen. Why do we need a study when we're already performing these services? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at our Aging Committee public hearings, we have heard that this is a moving situation involving veterans, disabled and seniors. You know, we may all think that all these systems are working perfectly, but they're not, and that's what we've heard. And to get a handle on what has to be tweaked to make it better for the three groups of citizens that are described in this bill; we've commissioned a task force that must report back by January 2019.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Belsito.

REP. BELSITO (53RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And you heard what the proponent of the bill said, we have heard. Do we have any actual proof? Do we have a number of letters claiming that there is no service for these individuals? But just going on the basis that we

have heard that they are not getting service, I find that hard to believe. We really need some hard facts. I know that a study might produce that, but if we've heard about that, why cant' we just look into what's going on now and increase the amount of service that we're giving? It's that simple. We don't need a task force. We just have to increase the service. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Fishbein of the 90th District.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too had some questions for the proponent, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Sir, are members of this commission supposed to be compensated financially? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So am I to understand that travel expenses for the individuals that are appointed to this task force, more specifically, would not be paid to the individuals of this task force? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the good Representative indicate -- I don't see language in this bill that specifically states that where that comes from. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Repeat that, where what comes from?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fishbein, if you would restate the question.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The representation that the individuals appointed to this task force would not be given travel. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

My knowledge is that the -- there'd be no fiscal impact and none from municipalities nor the state. Basically, through you, Mr. Speaker, these are volunteers who are very committed to this issue who want to serve on this task force. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to -- okay, my colleague has shown me language that indicates that Public Act 17-236 would prevent compensation for those task force members, and I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, another question to the proponent. The task force would terminate when it submits its report or January 1, 2019, whichever is later. Am I to understand that the task force could go on forever so long as it does not issue a report? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, I don't think that's the case. I think that January 1, 2019, the committee would like to have this report because these are crucial areas of our population that we want to address and if there's issues, we want to be able to address them. And with the findings of this

task force would give us a better handle on what we have to do to make it work. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So am I to understand that -- I'm looking at the language before us and it does not state that the task force would terminate on January 1. It states whenever its report is filed. So I don't understand the good Representative's representation that there's a mandate here for a report. So, I'm looking for clarification. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. from my perspective and the way I read this is that January 1, 2019, this report should be before the pertinent committee so it can be digested and take some type of legislative or whatever action that is recommended

in this report. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just by way of comment, Mr. Speaker, I --you know, I think we appoint a lot of tasks forces here. I think -- I was appointed to a task force in November. That task force has still not even met. Their report was due January 15, 2018, which is three months ago. I think we need to get a handle on task forces here, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to hearing the rest of the debate. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative McCarty of the 38th District.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a few comments and for clarification. I stand in very strong support of this task force. And to respond to one my colleague's concerns, we have over 20,000 senior citizens that are living in long-term care

facilities currently and many of those residents are nonambulatory. And as we all know, transportation is a critical factor in providing quality of life for many people. So, I'm very pleased --

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Excuse me, madam. If we can bring our voices down so that the debate can be heard. Thank you. Proceed, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, that transportation is a very critical factor in providing quality of life to many people and I think this task force is very greatly needed so that we can learn about the issues that are the barriers to providing such transportation currently, not only to our disabled, our seniors and our veterans. So I am very supportive of this task force, which does have a great need. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam. Again, before I call the next person, if we can just bring our voices down.

We'll be done soon, but we need to get the business done and allow the debate to be heard. Okay?

Representative Betts of the 78th.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A couple of questions, if I may, through you to the proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you. To the good Chairman, I'm looking at this bill and I was looking at the public hearing testimony. I only saw -- and I just want to find out if my reading is correct. I only saw two pieces of testimony in the public hearing on this particular issue. Is that correct? Through you, Sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. But as the good Representatives know, as a prior member of the Aging Committee, we have a lot of people who come before us and just testify for or against and

sometimes just to get us on their side. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much for that and thank you, sir, for the answer. Am I to assume -- or is it correct to say that if this task force is not formed and does not pass, for the sake of discussion, in this session, am I to assume that there is nothing that can be done to address the problems that the good Chairman has identified until the next session? Or is this the only group that has the ability, the resources and the skills to be able to address it? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As the good Representative knows, as he served on the Aging Committee, I will -- can rest assure that I will make sure through the Majority Leader and the

Speaker and our Ranking Member that this will happen this session. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much, sir. I have no further questions or comments at this time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Johnson of the 49th.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I just wanted to say I rise in strong support of this task force. I, as many know, sit on the Medical Assistance Policy Oversight Council, and one of the things that we've been discussing is the new contract for transportation for nonemergency medical services. So, I just wanted to say that I'm very pleased to see this task force.

I think that it will bring a lot of light to some of the difficulties we're having in moving our

senior citizens, our disabled people, our disabled veterans. These people need to have a dependable source of transportation. Why? Because are we trying to move people from nursing facilities back into the home. And if they are not moved back into the home, they will be costing us lots of money --
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

(Gavel) Excuse me, madam.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

-- in those nursing facilities.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Excuse me, madam. (Gavel) This is the third time. We cannot be heard. I'm asking for all conversation that is outside of what is happening here to be taken outside. We need to maintain decorum so that both sides can be heard. If you have any conversation that needs to be done otherwise, please take it outside. Thank you.
Madam, you may proceed.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. And so, with that said, I am very, very pleased to see this task

force. I have a number of ideas that I'd like to present to the task force about how we might be able to improve transportation for our disabled residents, for our senior citizens, for our disabled veterans, so that we will be able to do it in a most cost-efficient way and a way that will take care of all the regions. Many of us come from regions that have money that can pay for transportation at a much higher rate than other areas.

I come from a region that has a real hard time paying for regional transportation services. My regional transit district just goes between two towns primarily and doesn't go really much beyond that except for a couple of times a day.

So I am very, very pleased to see this because doctor services, medical services are needed in areas that are outside of some of these transit district areas and they need to be able to get to those places for specialized treatment. So, in order to get people out of nursing facilities like the Connecticut Business and Industry Association wants us to do, this is one thing that we really

need to understand from a whole state perspective.
So, I thank the good Chairman for his work. Thank
you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam. Representative Urban of the
43rd District.

REP. URBAN (43RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like
to associate my remarks with those of Representative
Johnson. But I would also like people to know that
there have been some comments about the validity and
the value of task force and working groups. The
Children's Report Card started as a working group
and it now the Children's Report Card. We are the
only one in this country and I actually been out of
the country, in Ireland, explaining what we do in
the State of Connecticut.

So there really is value to these working
groups and task force because they can lead to
significant legislation that helps children, that
helps elderly, that helps disabled. So, I am
strongly in favor of this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further on this bill? If not, will staff and guest please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats, the machine will be opened. (Ringing)

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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

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

CLERK:

Substitute House Bill No. 5245,

Total number Voting	143
Necessary for Passage	72

Those voting Yea	141
Those voting Nay	2
Those absent and not Voting	7

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel) Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 310?

CLERK:

On page 30, Calendar No. 310, substitute House Bill No. 5419 - AN ACT CONCERNING CENTRAL COUNTING OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS - favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Fox, you

have the floor, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the bill requires that within existing resources absentee ballots casted in an election primary referendum be counted at a central location in each municipality and that the registrars of voters agree to count them at their respective polling places. The bill was -- made it out of committee unanimously in a 17-0 vote and passed this Chamber last year. There is no fiscal impact. I urge adoption. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Will you remark further on this bill?
Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the good Chair of the GAE Committee for bringing this bill to the floor. It did receive wide support last time and it is a good bill, ought to pass, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further on this bill? If not, will staff and guest please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats, the machine will be opened.

(Bell)

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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

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

CLERK:

Substitute House Bill No. 5419,

Total number Voting

143

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel) Is there any business on the Clerk's desk?

CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The business from the Senate favorable report Senate Bills to tabled for the Calendar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Without objection, so ordered. Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that we waive the reading of the Senate favorable reports and the bills be tabled for the Calendar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Without objection, so ordered. Are there any announcements? Any announcements? Representative Rosario.

REP. ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise with the purpose of an announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. I want to invite everyone to the Black and Puerto Rican caucus spring fling tonight at the Red Rock Tavern at 5:30. It's gonna be a great time. There are tickets still available. It's gonna go to the Wilfred "Spike" Johnson Scholarship, so I hope to see you all there.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a -- I rise for the purpose of announcement, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you. The Republicans are gonna be caucusing immediately in room 110. Thank you, Mr.

Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Genga of the 10th District. Okay. Representative Betts of the 78th.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of Journal notes?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you. Representative McGorty is out of state on family business. Representative Pavalock-D'Amato is on maternity leave. Representative Korkoruda is out for medical reasons, and Representative Floren is back in district -- back in district doing district business. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Santiago.

REP. SANTIAGO (130TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purposes of Journal notations. Representative Rojas, business

in the district. Representative Lesser due to illness. Representative Berger, business in the district. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, madam. Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise as a Representative of the great City of Hartford to congratulate the State of Israel in its 70th anniversary since the creation of the State of Israel in the Middle East, a strong ally of these United States of America. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just an announcement to the House Democrats that we'll be caucusing in room 207-A immediately following this session. And is there no further business on the Clerk's desk? Well, in that case, I move that we adjourn subject to the Call of the Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORRIS (140TH):

The motion to adjourn is subject to the Call of the Chair. Is there objection? Hearing none, the House is adjourned, subject to the Call of the Chair. (Gavel)

(On motion of Representative Albis of the 99th District, the House adjourned at 4:21 o'clock p.m., sine die.)

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 245 pages is a complete and accurate transcription of a digital sound recording of the House Proceedings on April 19, 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