

THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 2018

(The House of Representatives was called to order at 11:00 o'clock a.m., Speaker Joe Aresimowicz in the Chair.)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Gavel] Will the House please come to order? Will members, staff and guests please rise, direct your attention to the dais where Representative Betts will lead us in prayer.

GUEST CHAPLAIN REPRESENTATIVE BETTS (78TH):

Good morning. Let us pray. Almighty God, as we attend to the business of the State, we seek Your guidance to ensure the needs of our constituents are the priority for us every day. Make us the true voice of the people we represent so that the good of the State and her people may be well served. Amen.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Amen.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Originally we were slated to have Representative James Albis come up on the dais to lead us in [Laughter] in the pledge. Representative Ritter of the 1st District.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure of the rules involved in this, but if we could convene a committee to look at the seating of the General Assembly? Representative Albis sits to my left. I'd like to request a change. Frankly, you could put him way over there for all I care at this point in time, but when you know how I could do that, please let me know, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Ritter, I think a seat that may be more appropriate given the current standings is he can sit behind you. [Laughter] Representative Albis, will you please come up and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance sir?

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

(All) 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):

Is there any business on the clerk's desk?

CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Favorable Report Senate Bills to be tabled for the calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, I move we waive the read in the Senate Favorable Report and the bills be tabled for the calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

So ordered. [Gavel]

CLERK:

The last piece of business is the daily calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Representative Zawistowski of the 61st district. Madam you have

the floor.

REP. ZAWISKTOWSKI (61ST):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed madam.

REP. ZAWISKTOWSKI (61ST):

Mr. Speaker, I am wearing here today on dress down Friday a t-shirt that expresses pride of my district. It's for Old Newgate Prison and Copper Mine. If you're not familiar with it, it's a state-owned historical museum in East Granby, and it's not only a national historic landmark, but a state archaeological preserve. It was first chartered as a copper mine as early as 1705. When they stopped mining, they used it as a state prison beginning in the Revolutionary War where they prisoners of war and also the Tory's. Eventually it became a tourist attraction in the 1860's and has had a long history of a lot of entertainment for people as well as a lot of historical context. It closed at the end of the season in 2009. When it was closed, it was for

renovations and after that period of time, because it was not producing any revenue, nobody was really interested in getting it going again, even though it supported the other state-owned museums when it was open. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to announce that after efforts with considerable people and a lot of dedicated volunteers, Old Newgate Prison and Copper Mine is reopening officially on July 14, 2018.

[Applause] I do encourage you and my house colleagues to visit. Information about it will be on the Old Newgate Prison and Copper Mine website and also on Facebook and thank you for the opportunity to speak about this.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam, and I know summers and everything else are very tough around here, but maybe we pick a day and just open it up to all the legislators, I'd be happy to assist you with that.

REP. ZAWISKTOWSKI (61ST):

I would love to do that.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

All right, thank you, madam. Any other

announcements or introductions? I know folks are making their way in, but if I can have the leniency of the Chamber for a moment? I know last night we were here pretty late and normally, the communication we have between all side of the aisle is outstanding in an effort to get bills moving and really address an issue some of our caucus members had. We tried to run a bill. I don't think the communication was as good as the majority leader and I hoped for so we dropped the ball on that so I want to personally apologize the entire Chamber. We ended up getting you home at a decent hour, but that's not our goal and we will double down our efforts for more communication. I apologize for any inconvenience it caused all of you, so thank you. That being said, Representative Ritter. Oh, hang on, my friend, Representative Ritter can I pause for a moment so we can go to Representative Buckbee?

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Of course, but he has not goat today, so.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

No, but I am the goat whisperer Mr. Majority

Leader [Laughter]. Mr. Speaker, I rise just for a simple statement and it kind of ties into what you said, but I'd like to remind all today is International Star Wars Day, may the Fourth be with you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

And also with you?

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

And I have to say it's really important now. Let's see if this works, see if there are any Jedi mind tricks. No bad bills will pass today.
[Laughter] Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Zupkus of the 89th district. Madam, you have the floor.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good morning.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

I just wanted to remind everybody today is

dress down Friday, but it's about giving to the Home for the Brave. It's the women veterans and their children that are homeless and hungry. You have all been very generous, a lot of you. I know there's still a few of you that we need to collect from, so there's no minimum. Everyone in this building can give. It's the only time we can ask you for money so please give and be generous. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Looks like I lost Representative Ritter so I have Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good morning.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

I don't know if I should thank you or be upset about that ruse this morning, but I really wanted to acknowledge my good friend Aaron Judge who happens to wear the same number as my district, so that was part of the reason why I wanted to wear this jersey

today, but I also wanted to announce that upon recess, the House Democrats will be caucusing in room 207A.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Vin Candeloria of the 86th. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. CANDELORIA (86TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker and I think Representative Albis also is clearly wearing that jersey because he's representing the superior team in the MLE and I'd like to [Applause], I'd also like to announce the House Republicans will be caucusing briefly in room 110.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Well thank you very much, sir and again, I will state, it's good see that they're number one in your hearts, but still number two in the standings.

Representative Albis! [Applause] [Laughter]

REP. CANDELORIA (86TH):

Mr. Speaker, it's only May 4, there's still a lot of baseball left to play. [Laughter]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

You see how the debates can go in the Chamber. This could go on all day. Representative Albis, please let us recess, what do you got to say sir?

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

I move that we recess subject to the Call of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on recess subject to the Call of the Chair. Without objection, so ordered. [Gavel]

(On motion of Representative Albis of the 99th District, the House recessed at 11:11 o'clock a.m. to meet again at the Call of the Chair).

(The House of Representatives reconvened at 1:12 o'clock p.m., Speaker Joe Aresimowicz in the Chair.)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Gavel] At least someone's happy we're coming back to session. [Laughter] What school are you guys from?

CHILDREN:

Eli Whitney.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Can we just give a round of applause to the kids from Eli Whitney School in the infield down in the well of the House please? [Applause] The House will return to order. I think Representative Stokes, that's up in your area isn't it?

REP. STOKES (58TH):

Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker. I wanna welcome the kids from Eli Whitney. We had a great time having three or four classes last week. I also want to introduce my oldest daughter who is part of the teaching staff there. Angela, raise your hand.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Oh nice.

REP. STOKES (58TH):

And a year ago at this time she was recovering from breast cancer surgery and she is cancer free

today so I'm glad to see her here.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

A true survivor, thanks for coming up.

[Applause] Representative Albis of the 99th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Mr. Speaker, I let you and the Majority Leader have some fun this morning, but I just wanted to point out for the benefit of the Chamber that

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Coughing] I'm sorry Representative. [Laughter]

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Sure, sure, so in the last ten games, the Red Sox are 5 and 5 and the Yankees are 9 and 1, just wanted to point that out for the record. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

In effort to move the bipartisan, bi-team nature of this Chamber forward, we're just gonna move on Representative, thank you. Mr. Clerk, it's my understanding we have a bill to call. Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 212?

CLERK:

On page 15, Calendar 212, Substitute House Bill 5384, AN ACT CONCERNING PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Insurance and Real Estate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The distinguished Chairman of the Insurance and Real Estate Committee, Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you explain the bill please, sir?

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

One moment, please. We seem to be lacking a computer operator and can't get this on the board. The House will stand at ease. While we're waiting for the machine operator to get up here, would anybody object if we allowed Representative Byron to do an introduction? Hearing none, Representative Byron?

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Wow it got real quiet in here. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you very much for waiting as well. I was waiting for Representative Rick Lopes, and I understand he's here, but he's not necessarily here in Chamber, so I stand with Representative Tony Guerrera and wherever Rick Lopes is, Representative Rick Lopes, as we all represent the great town of Newington. With me today is a very special guest, a man who in many arenas who doesn't need any real

large introduction after winning the Nobel Peace Prize, he went on to be a gold glove player for the New York Yankees. Lately he's been a master shark hunter, truly, truly a legend in his own mind.

Ladies and gentleman, I introduce to you the Mayor of Newington, Mr. Roy Zartarian. [Applause] What an introduction, what a round of applause for you, Mayor. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Byron, you said Yankees?

REP. BYRON (27TH):

I beg your pardon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

You said Yankees? Yes, Representative Albis is very happy to hear that after his announcement and where's Representative Camillo? I'm sure he's also delighted that that happened. Welcome to the Chamber. Thank you so much for visiting with us and see you on the field. All right we seem to be up and running now, so let me go back to Representative Scanlon. Representative, if you could make the motion please.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you explain the bill please, sir?

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My good friend, Representative Sampson and I will discuss the bill at length after the amendment, so all I would say to you at this point is that this bill deals with bringing transparency to the cost of prescription drugs. There are several different sections and I look forward to talking to you and the amendment here before us is simply a strike all amendment that replaces this bill in small ways from where we were in the committee and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

How about we call it. Did we call it? We didn't call it.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Oh excuse me, yeah, I'm sorry. I apologize, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 5048, and I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The Clerk is indeed in possession of LCO No. 5048, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A? Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A LCO 5048, offered by Representative Scanlon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The gentleman seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Without objection, Representative Scanlon?

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we got off to a very disjointed start there so I apologize for that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

We were here late this morning you know?

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

So again my friends, this is basically just a strike all amendment that improves the bill that we passed in committee. The ranking member and I will talk about this bill at length and I move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The question is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Representative Sampson, the ranking member of the Insurance and Real Estate Committee.
REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. As my distinguished colleague mentioned, the amendment before us does in fact improve the underlying bill. I look forward to the debate once the amendment is voted on, but I would encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment. It does improve the bill versus the underlying. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Are you ready for the question? Let me try your minds. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and good afternoon to everyone here today. I rise to talk about a bill that I feel like all of us have probably talked to our constituents about at some point or the other and that is the topic of the cost of prescription drugs and frankly, not just the cost of prescription drugs, but the ever increasing cost of prescription drugs and there are lot of reasons for that and we may get into some of those reasons pretty quickly, but I just wanna start by acknowledging the fact that I worked very hard on this bill with our State Comptroller, Kevin Lembo, who has been working with me and with members of our committee every step of the way in this process, and what this bill does is five simple things that I'll just briefly outline and I think that Representative Sampson and I will talk about them. It's a piece of transparency legislation and the reason for that is

because there is no denying that the cost of drugs is increasing. It's something we hear anecdotally. It's something that we've seen data on, but few people have answers as to why that's actually happening and our goal in this bill is quite simple. It's to try to get some more information that is not currently available to the general public so that we can really understand what is driving these costs and then ultimately from that understanding, hopefully be able to work together in a bipartisan way to reduce the cost of prescription drugs for our constituents. So the five quick points, very quickly Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, it requires the manufacturers, when a drug increases by more than 20 percent in one year or 50 percent over three years, to share information on why that is. Second, when new drugs are coming through the FDA approval pipeline, the information needs to be shared with us at the State level, specifically with regard to the State Employee Benefit Plan and Medicaid because that will allow us as policy here in Connecticut to better understand potential cost increases that are

going to be coming to us very quickly and so that we can better plan to manage the taxpayers' money in that regard. Number three, it requires that when insurance companies file their annual rates with the Insurance Commissioner, they now have to report some very important data such as the top 25 most used drugs in the bill, the top 25 most expensive drugs in the plans that they're offering, and what part of premiums exactly was used to combat and offset these costs. Number four is the part dealing with rebates which are the mechanism through which drug manufacturers give discounts to pharmacy benefit managers to then pass along to constituents which we'll talk about I'm sure at length and finally, it requires Mr. Speaker for insurance companies to denote whether they are offering a point of sale rebate or passing along the rebate throughout their premiums that are before their constituents. So all in all, Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is a tremendous bill in terms of allowing the consumers of the State of Connecticut to finally get the answers that I believe they deserve and that they

are demanding with very loud voices to know as to why the cost of their drugs continues to rise year after year. This bill will help get those answers and I look forward to hopefully passing this bill today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to the Chairman for his description of the proposed bill before us. I think his analysis is pretty accurate. I would say that I've only had a short amount of time to review this. We got the final language yesterday and I've kind of gone through it and I think have a pretty good understanding, but if it would please the Chamber, I'd like to ask some questions of the proponent of the bill just so I'm sure what we're voting on falls in line with what we've indicated the bill actually does.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed, sir.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

It looks like the first section has to do with definitions and most of these are pretty straightforward, but I think for the benefit of the people in this room and anyone watching, it might be beneficial to talk about item No. 10 which is on line 25, pharmacy benefits manager. Through you, Mr. Speaker, would the Chairman let me know what a pharmacy benefits manager is.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Let's be careful as we ask questions going forward because asking questions for benefit of people in the Chamber or outside of the Chamber is not allowed under masons. For everybody, just ask the question and don't try and gussie it up with reasons. Just ask the question and then we don't get into trouble. Representative Scanlon, are you prepared to respond?

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just say that I've learned a lot working on this bill for the last year and a half and I was not quite sure what a pharmacy benefit manager before we began working on

this bill, but basically the pharmacy benefit manager is the middle man between drug companies and insurers, and what they do and the most important function that they have is to determine what drugs are on what's called a formulary, and the formulary is the list of drugs that an insurance policy covers for a person. So the PBM's are again, the middle man between the companies that make the drugs and the insurance companies that insure the constituents that we serve.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the Chairman for his answer on that. So if you go to section number two, it looks like this section deals directly with requirements on pharmacy benefit managers and I noticed that it sets up a system where we're going to require them to report certain information, and I noticed that there are a few different categories of information regarding

rebates; the aggregate dollar amount of rebates for certain types of drug formularies, and I'm just curious if the Chairman might describe for us what the intent of this section is.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the intent of this section is very simple which is that right now in every state in this country and at the federal level, there is no State and there is no federal law that requires transparency for pharmacy benefit managers and so, quite frankly, our constituents have no idea what happens within that pipeline between a manufacturer and an insurance carrier with regard to that rebate, and what we're doing here is asking for two simple pieces of information. Number one, we want to know the total amount of the rebates received and number two, we want to know the total amount of the rebates that the PBM is keeping and therefore, not passing on to the insurance company

and therefore, to the insurer.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that answer and I can certainly understand why someone might want to look for this particular information, but I think if we go forward through the bill, we're going to find out that the information that we're looking at here actually is provided in another way because of the responsibilities of the health carriers for some reporting. I'm not saying that's necessarily good or bad, just I think that we're gonna find out that there are mechanisms in place. I have two over-arching concerns with this legislation. The main one really is what we need to know and what is important I think should absolutely be in the language of the bill and we should be practicing. Second, I think the things that we don't need to know that are important to the proprietary nature of how a private industry

operates and what their business practices are is something we should be avoiding at all costs, so moving onto line 71 and you know that section from 71-84, it deals with the Freedom of Information Act. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what exactly is protected under the Freedom of Information Act regarding this reporting from the pharmacy benefit manager to the insurance commissioner?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, what is protected is any proprietary information.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, well I appreciate that answer since it goes to what I just stated is a concern of mine. If you go to the immediately following section which is section D, it goes on to

say that this report that has been provided to the insurance commissioner will be used to produce a report from insurance commissioner that will go to the Joint Standing Committee of the General Assembly on the Committee for Insurance, on which the Chairman and I both serve in our official capacity. So what prohibits the insurance commissioner's report from becoming public once it's released to the Insurance Committee?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that's an excellent question and one that we went to great lengths when drafting this bill to ensure that we were protecting. Basically, Mr. Speaker, what we're trying to do hear is to get some information, but without doing so at the risk of exposing very important proprietary information from these companies, and so the way that we chose to do that was to require that the commissioner could not

release anything that would implicate or give any sort of indication as to which company it was, and the way that he or she would do that is to report simply on the aggregate as opposed to a plan by plan basis, and we believe that we have found a way to do that, that satisfies both their concerns about privacy which I certainly fully understand, and our desire to finally get some information that can tell us a little bit about the trends going on with regard to PBM's and rebates.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'm very appreciative of that detailed response. There is a penalty, if I'm reading correctly in lines 98-100, of \$7500 dollars for a pharmacy benefit manager that violates this section requiring them to provide this information to the insurance commissioner and it makes it clear that the insurance commissioner is actually adopting those regulations to determine

what is in that report. Between you and me, Mr. Speaker, this makes me a little bit uncomfortable that we are giving the authority of the insurance commissioner. I will say that I have great confidence in the current Insurance Department and the commissioner to act responsibly in this area and I wouldn't say that it's a life-threatening issue with the bill, but I would say that we ought to be very careful when we are granting authority to our various state agencies to impose penalties and when the penalties are significant; \$7500 dollars is something that is not a small amount.

Just moving onto section three, this looks similar to section 2 in that it is requiring some reporting, but this time, instead of the pharmacy benefit manager, it is the health carrier themselves that must be reporting to the insurance commissioner various things about how they handle the cost of outpatient prescription drugs. Through you, Mr. Speaker, would the Chairman let me know what exactly is required in this report?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would just point my good friend's attention to A, B, C and 2, so lines 116-129. Basically what this report is doing is trying to ascertain from the health plans when they file for their premium rates what were some of the trends in the preceding year when it came to their policies, such as what were the top 25 most utilized in the plan, what were the top 25 that increased the most, what were the implications on premiums? This is all new information that is being asked of them to report for the first time, through you, Mr. Speaker, as part of the rate filings and information that we believe will help us understand some of the trends that are happening in the marketplace.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So just looking at this, I could ask a lot of detailed questions. I

wrote quite a few notes in the margin on my page here about this, about why we chose the top 25 versus the top 20 or top 50, that sort of thing, but the language pretty much speaks for itself and I assume those are somewhat arbitrary, but we're doing the best we can to try and nail down the largest areas of concern. One thing I would just mention and point out while looking at this language is that when you get down to 133-136, there is a discussion about the total cost of mandated types of drugs, whether they're brand-name drugs or generic drugs and so forth. I would just point out that I appreciate the desire of this bill before us to kind of reach into the goings on in the cost of outpatient prescription drugs in the insurance industry, but we need to remember that we are a primary cost driver. The bill that we just passed last week that created a series of new insurance mandates for contraception, for instance, is going to end up showing up on this list I think, and we are the cause of that. We have told the insurance company that they have to provide these types of

drugs, so I would just caution in the future that even though this is valuable information and we want to use this to help drive down the cost of prescription drugs and insurance premiums overall, that part of the reason why this happens is because of our actions.

So moving onto section four, this is a very short section and maybe the most important section in the bill with regard to this reporting piece. It says each health carrier shall submit to the commissioner a written form prescribed by the commissioner about the rebates that they receive from the prescription drug manufacturers. My question, through you, Mr. Speaker is, aren't insurance companies already doing this part of their rate filing process?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, they are, but we're asking them a more detailed and specific and

direction question that we hope will give us a little more information about what exactly is happening with regard to the rebates in the context of the premium.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I can appreciate that. I guess so we're just making clear in this section that even though insurance companies already do provide us with this information, and by this information I mean the cost of the drugs that they are paying for as part of the insurance plans that they provide and the amount of the rebates that they get back from insurance companies, whether they are done directly with the PBM or the manufacturer or they happen at the point of sale, so I wouldn't say this section is unnecessary based on the response from the response from my good friend, the Chairman. It just, I wanna make it clear that we are already doing the vast majority of this in current law.

Even the notice of being required that there is a certified document is already required in the rate filing process. So let's just move onto section five for now. I wanna come back and touch on that when we get a later section, but in section five, it says the commissioner is going to submit another report to the insurance committee. What is this report for?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the report outlined in section five is merely reporting. It's requiring the commissioner to report on all the data that was gathered in section three of this bill, Mr. Speaker, and giving that report to us on the Insurance Committee.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Okay, so I've got it so section five goes along with section three where we collected the information about the top 25 drugs that have a change in cost and so forth. That makes perfect sense and then in section six, there is another report describing the rebate practices of health carriers. Through you, Mr. Speaker, who does this report go to and what is this for?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. This report deals with what's known as a point of sale rebate, and that is, in some instances, some insurance companies, two in particular, one of who is headquartered here, Aetna, deals with passing along a rebate at the pharmacy counter for a person that is one of their customers. What we're trying to do in this section is require that an insurance company is telling us very clearly, and therefore telling the general public, whether they are giving people that rebate at the point of sale, AKA when they go

to the pharmacy, or whether they are using that rebate to offset premiums in other places, and so we're asking them to certify the either/or aspect of that and therefore, tell us their report and that report would be made available to the general public, not the insurance committee.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you again for the answer. So this report is a public report. It's essentially what the insurance commissioner has determined is happening and is putting out for the public's consumption, the rebate practices of health insurance carriers. I just wanna ask for clarification and for legislative intent, and reiterate my concerns from before which are, well first thing, can't they do this now? Is there is a

requirement for us to put this in statute? The insurance commissioner I imagine would be able to produce such a report without requiring us to tell them to do so, but is there any danger in this language that any of that proprietary information we discussed could become part of this report?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that all of this information as to the either/or is available to the public, but it is not available in an easily discernible way for most human beings that are not well versed in the insurance statutes, and so what we're simply trying to do here with this provision is to say in a very clear and easy to find place, there will be a list of all the different insurance carriers operating in this State and there will be a simple explanation next to that name of that company as to whether they're doing it at the point of sale or doing it

through premiums, and so oftentimes you know there may be information that is publicly available to people. I frankly as the Chairman of the Insurance Committee wouldn't even know where to look for this myself and so I think what we're trying to do here in this section for legislative intent is to give our constituents an easier way of finding out some pretty important information because if you're shopping for a health plan, and you are somebody who has experienced high costs at the pharmacy counter, you may be more interested in finding a plan that offers the point of sale rebate because it would save you some money up front. If you're not somebody who's worried about that, then maybe you want a lower premium, and so this just allows our constituents to find in a very easy place what the exact truth is between whether they are doing it through the point of sale or doing it through premiums.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

All right, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Moving on, sections seven, eight and nine all seem to go together and reference different types of insurance products, whether individual policies or group policies and that sort of thing. If I'm correct in reading this, this goes to verification that the insurance company is taking into consideration the amount of the rebates when they determined what the rate filing is and asking for approval of the insurance commissioner. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

That is correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is reference in each of these sections called a loss ratio, and I'm

wondering if the Chairman might share for us what his understanding of a loss ratio is and what the relevance to these sections is.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is a very common industry term to describe where an insurance company is from year to year in terms of you know the overall cost of their delivery.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding here is that we're referring to the medical loss ratio which is both a state and federal requirement that insurance companies are only allowed to make a certain amount of profit when they sell a health insurance policy. Essentially they can make, I don't know exactly what it is in Connecticut, I

think it may be 15 percent or it may be even 10 percent for some products, but essentially, once they pay off all of the claims that they have received and are left with the premium, that is the amount that they are allowed to hang onto. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what happens if an insurance company exceeds the amount that is allotted to them in the medical loss ratio?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

One moment, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Of course.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that that is addressed through this bill, in this language.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that. Only the loss ratio is referenced here and we are indicating that insurance companies must abide by it when it comes to these dollars in question having to do with the insurance rebates. I just think it's important to note that we are driving at a goal here and the goal is to reduce the cost of prescription drugs and therefore, reduce the cost of health insurance for everyone, and I share that goal with my colleague. The thing that I wanna stress for people is to recognize that there are lots of forces that determine the cost of health insurance. Prescription drugs is certainly one, but one thing people don't realize is that insurance companies are actually pretty heavily regulated to the profit that they can make. There are other forces at work. There is the cost of the healthcare. There is the cost of prescription drugs that certainly have an impact there, and we need to keep in mind that when we are affecting policy in this room, if we are making healthcare cost more, we are therefore making

insurance cost more.

Section ten looks to me like another list of definitions up until you get to line 320, where there is a reference to something called a sponsor and I'm hoping, Mr. Speaker through you to the good Chairman if he can let me know who is being referred to with that language.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there is a reference in lines 315-317 to a code of federal regulations, but it is my understanding a sponsor is somebody who is making a drug or trying to make a drug.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and there is also a reference to the Office of Health Strategy. The language says each sponsor shall submit to the Office of Health Strategy information regarding

their sponsorship in what I think are referenced as different types of drugs, maybe biologic drugs, and then I saw something regarding pipeline drugs a little bit later. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

That is correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

I noticed on line 323 and line 324, it says that this information is already provided to the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration. Is there a reason why we would require drug manufacturers to duplicate this effort and report it to our Office of Health Strategy?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes there is a reason and it starts on line 332, which is the next section. Maybe this is where my friend, Representative Sampson was heading with this, but what this basically does, I sort of said this at the top of my comments here, we spend a tremendous amount of money as a State government on the State employee plans when it comes to prescription drugs and also on Medicaid, and we believe that the intent of this bill here in line 332 is that the comptroller's office, who obviously administers all these plans, and the Office of Health Strategy which was a newly formed entity to try to ascertain what was going on with healthcare and work on healthcare issues could take a look at some of the things that are coming down the pipeline and to determine, based on actual information, part of which we're giving to them in other sections of this bill, what the impact may be on the State employee benefit plan and what the impact may be on Medicaid so that we can better plan for what's coming down the pike for us in terms

of government spending.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly appreciate that. It does interest me that we have the first part of the bill essentially creating all of this requirement for reporting from PBM's and the insurance industry health carriers and all of that's going to the Insurance Department and then it is being filtered back to the Insurance Committee where we can debate and focus on policy changes, but also to the public. But this part seems to be very, very different in that we are not sending it back to the legislature to make policy, but rather sending it to a newly-created bureaucracy state agency, the Office of Health Strategy, and also the comptroller. I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the Chairman can let me know what interest the comptroller has in these pipeline drugs that are already being regulated and monitored by the FDA?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated earlier in the day, my good friend, Comptroller Kevin Lembo and I have worked significantly on this bill and I know that he spends a great deal of his time as does the staff at his agency trying to you know figure out what's going on with the bills here in Connecticut and how we may be able to save some money and to that end, on line 337 it says drugs that may have a significant impact on State expenditures for outpatient prescription drugs. That kind of information and those kinds of things that would have significant impact absolutely do impact the job and function of the State Comptroller, and therefore, I believe that's why he or she would be involved in this.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that answer, although I would debate the merits of the comptroller's role in determining the costs to the State. I think his role is limited to essentially processing those costs and handling that sort of thing where this legislative body and the Executive Branch actually are the ones that determine what our policies are. I mean but that's a small point for sure. In lines 359-368, it kind of lays out I think what is the substance of this section, and essentially it says that the executive director of the Office of Health Strategy in consultation with the comptroller, I'm not sure exactly what that means, and the commissioner of public health and the commissioner of Social Services are going to prepare a list of not more than ten outpatient drugs that the executive director, at their discretion, determines are A, provided at a substantial cost to the State, considering the net cost of such drugs and B, critical to public health. I'll just state for the record, on the surface that does not look

like a big deal. It seems to me that we do have obligations to manage our cost as a State, certainly when it comes to the State drug plan, but I am a little concerned that this seems to be as a prelude to what you would wanna do if you were at some point going to develop policy to start determining what the private sector can do as far as the cost of these drugs, and it does raise a red flag for me, but the language here does not go that far and I will acknowledge that. While we're on that issue, it seems to me that the comptroller's relevant role here would have to do with things that affect the State Employee Plan. Does any of this even affect the State Employee Plan?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The drugs that could be on one of these lists absolutely would impact the State Employee Plan. An example could be Humira, for example, which is the most commonly prescribed

drug in the United States right now. It deals with rheumatoid arthritis. That affects both people that are on private insurance plans and obviously the folks on the State Employee Plan, so there could be an overlap of some of these drugs that are impacting both sets of folks.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All right certainly that might apply to an informational purpose only as far as the State's cost when purchasing certain drugs, but the first, I think nine sections of the bill are dedicated only to the individual and group market and specifically leave out self-insured plans and therefore, only affect a small segment of the actual insurance industry in our State. Just moving on, after that section we just discussed, it looks like there is a threshold established for what particular prescription drugs are captured, and then there's a section that goes on to say that the

pharmaceutical manufacturer of these drugs shall provide some information, goes on to say that a form will be created, of all of the factors that caused the increase in the cost of the outpatient drug. I'm curious to know what the purpose of that section is.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this section is to try to understand what exactly is driving these cost increases. Is it because of research and development? Is it because of marketing? Is it because the cost of making this drug has increased for some reason? None of that information is readily available to the public in an easily discernible way and the goal of this section right here is to ask the manufacturers of these drugs to tell us very plainly what it is that's responsible for that cost increase.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I appreciate the response and I think that it was a very logical and thoughtful response and I understand the intent of the legislation, but I would again caution my colleagues that while this doesn't go quite off the edge of my concerns, it does raise a red flag for me because it seems again that we are going to be digging into what is really none of our business when it comes to how a private entity, a private business operates and determines the cost of manufacturing and what they sell their product for. We don't do that for a lot of other things. We don't dig into you know Ford Motor Company and demand to know why they you know use certain type of leather for you know their seats in the new Ford Taurus or anything. We don't do that because we understand that that's proprietary information. It's something that that industry is doing on its own. Healthcare is a difficult thing obviously,

much like utilities. These are things that people need to have affordable access to and I am very sympathetic to the notion that we have an obligation as a government to make sure that we look out for the public safety and we protect consumers.

Incidentally, who currently, through you, Mr. Speaker, is the State Agency that regulates prescription drugs?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I believe that would be the Department of Consumer Protection.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that goes to my point that we have DCP there for a purpose, to protect consumers, to make sure that the prescription drug manufacturers are acting in a way that is not harmful to the people on the street.

Creating a relative new organization, the Office of Health Strategy, involving the comptroller and developing a lot of information that could be used maybe in some way to embarrass drug companies on why they do certain things because it might not be readily apparent to people the risks that are taken when they undergo development and research on creating drugs. I just think it's something we ought to consider if we revisit this type of policy in the future, that we are treading very close to things that maybe are not the business of this body.

What basically saves the bill for me and my objections happens in lines 389-395 where it says very plainly that the information that the pharmaceutical companies are required to provide under the previous language is only things that are already made public because it references to what they are reporting to the Securities and Exchange Commission. To me, that's what saves the bill from going a little too far, and I appreciate that that is included in the language.

Section 11, well through you, Mr. Speaker,

maybe the good Chairman might fill us in on what the purpose of section 11 is and then I can ask a question or two.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it's simply requiring that more information be easily accessible to consumers such as restrictions on the use quantity overcoming benefit, prescription drugs, how prescription drug are included or excluded from any applicable deductible, basically just giving consumers a little more information.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Who does this apply to? Who is required to make this information accessible and a two-part question, so who is providing this information and what exactly does accessible mean?

The language says make accessible to consumers in an easily, accessible and understandable format. I just, I don't know if there's a true definition. Does that mean a website? Does that mean they have to mail something?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe accessible is defined in this section. I think we would have to rely on the common you know generic definition of the word accessible, and that the folks that would be required to report, to answer your other question, would be the carriers, the healthcare centers, the hospitals would have to just rely on their best judgement as to what they deem to be the most accessible explanation of where that information would be.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All right so going on to discuss what information is required to be provided, most of these make perfect sense to me. A, is any coverage exclusions, B is restrictions on the quantity of a benefit and so forth, C goes on to talk about how prescription drugs are included or excluded from a deductible and so forth, but when you get to section E under here, I just, I highlighted this and I wrote huh with a question margin because I was shocked to see this. It says information regarding any process available to consumers and all documents necessary to seek coverage of a non-covered outpatient prescription drug. I read this to mean that we are going to tell a healthcare provider that when they are not providing coverage for something, that they have to tell the consumer where to get it. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is one interpretation of it. I think simply giving them the information, yes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a concern of mine. I mean we certainly would not tell Kentucky Fried Chicken that they must inform their customers where the local McDonalds is. When someone offers a product, you would probably leave that responsibility to the product they sell and not ask them to give information about other products and in this case, I believe we would be requiring them to give information about their competitors so just a small concern at the end of the bill.

Just a couple of final questions after going through this in some detail, and I appreciate the Chamber and the Speaker and my good colleague putting up with my questions. As I said, I wanted to just have an opportunity to go through it

together so we were on the same page as far as understanding it goes.

Your opening statement, Mr. Chairman, was great and I agree with pretty much everything you said. We have the same goal in every way which is to try and make the lives of our lives of our constituents better, to make sure that they have affordable access to insurance and to healthcare, and as far as prescription drugs, we wanna see prescription drugs as accessible and as inexpensive as possible. We also wanna make sure that prescription drug manufacturers stay in business because that is where cures come from. We have debated in the past offline, online about the nature of prescription drug manufacturers and how they should be regulated. I just wanna take a moment to remind folks that yes, prescription drug manufacturers go into business for the purpose of making money, but that's not necessarily a bad thing. If there was no great amount of money that could be obtained for coming up with cures, and new medications, people would simply not do it. There are millions and millions of

dollars invested by drug manufacturers for failed projects and failed products. They try and try again and sometimes spend millions of dollars in those attempts. It would be wrong for us to tell them that they can only charge what it costs for them to produce the pill and leave out all of that effort and investment in getting to that point, and I hope we never do. It is also our job to make sure that there are not bad actors in our world and that we are looking after consumers. We all know of the news stories over the past couple of years about ridiculous price gouging costs for Epi-Pens and that kind of thing and you know, as a small government, conservative, free market kind of person, even I've looked at that and said, that's just wrong because you're dealing with the health of our citizens. I would argue that there are mechanisms to prevent that far better than going in and telling the drug manufacturer what they can charge and that is to make sure that competition and the availability of that product from many different sources always exists, because then there's always an incentive for

someone to be able to try and win that contract with that insurer or that PBM and so on. My only real overriding question about this whole legislation, which I don't object to, for me it's a little much in the way of bureaucracy and collecting information which I think in most respects, the lion share of it is already collected. Insurance companies, as we talked about, are already required to determine in their rate filings that they provide to the Insurance Department how much they receive in rebates from pharmacy manufacturers and as we already discussed, we do regulate insurance companies on how much profit they can make, which is always an interesting topic for me to discuss with people too, and I'll just take a moment to mention that also.

Since we have something called the medical loss ratio and because we have that, we are essentially telling insurance companies that they can make, for round numbers, let's say 10 percent profit. So if I'm selling a product that cost \$1000 dollars and I'm allowed to make a 10 percent profit, that means

I make \$100 dollars on every one that sold. If I am that business, and in this case I'm a business that is in many ways partnered with the government, what is the only way I can make more money? I have two ways. I can either sell more products at a \$1000 dollars so I can make more \$100 dollars, or I can raise the cost of the product. I believe that is one of the major drivers in the cost of healthcare insurance in our world and something that we ought to address.

How does this legislation reduce the cost of prescription drugs?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I would just say that we will never be able to ultimately do what the Representative is asking me about, which is to reduce the cost of drugs, unless we know what the reason is for why they are increasing in the first place, and I would just respectfully say that I

believe there are ground-breaking new levels of information in this bill. The PBM reporting in this, as I said earlier, we would be the first state in the nation to require that the rebates would have some version of transparency. Some of the information that we are requesting at the point of rate filing is new information and obviously the top ten list is as well, and so I would just say that I think we could probably spend the rest of this day, I think we could probably spend quite a bit of time, Representative Sampson and I, talking about the fact that we know the costs are increasing, but I think that you know, as smart as he and I are, it would be hard for us to probably pinpoint the exact reason why the cost are going up and so that is precisely why I believe that we want this legislation to pass today because it will give us answers to questions that we want to have, but we frankly just don't know the information to and so my hope, Mr. Speaker, is that we pass this bill, we begin to find these answers and in successive sessions, God willing, if I have the right to be here and he has the right to

be here, we can try to work together to explore ultimately lowering these costs based on the information we're getting through this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I'm through with my questions and I appreciate the Chairman's comments, and I will just sum up very quickly by stating that going through the bill, I don't have any significant objections. The few things that I brought up that raise small concerns seem to fall just a tiny bit short of raising a really big red flag for me. I'm gonna support the bill before us partly because I share the same ideology I suppose when it comes to an expectation that there are people in this world who will do the right thing when it comes to the issue of public health, that they will put the care of their fellow citizens and neighbors ahead of anything else, and that anything that we can do together that might inspire others to share the

information that's necessary to lower the cost of prescription drugs and therefore, health insurance, is a laudable effort, so I'm with him on that, and I wanna show my support for that effort. I don't think the language in the bill is a panacea by any stretch of the imagination. I think it does very little as far as getting at that problem, but it does make a foray into that desire and I wanna work with my friend and colleague in the next session hopefully to maybe take the next step to find ways to actually improve competition in the marketplace to make sure, as I said, that there are lots of people offering Epi-Pens, who can fight over offering it at the cheapest price and maybe some of this transparency will lead us in that direction, so I urge my colleagues to support the bill before us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. The gentleman from Glastonbury, Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, just a few questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if the good Chairman in lines 53-65 essentially talk about the rebates and in these rebates that we are requesting the pharmacy benefit managers to share that information, through you, Mr. Speaker, is that information already available as we see that in the latter part of this amendment, somewhere in lines 389 and beyond?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no it is not publicly available.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, now that this information we are requesting the PBM's to provide, will that information be available publicly?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, in an aggregated form that does not denote specifics that would lead anybody in the public to know specific companies that were offering these rebates, it will then exist in the public sphere.

Thank you so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, for clarification purposes, maybe the good Chair can tell us about the aggregated forms that are obviously being discussed in this amendment. Through you, Mr. Speaker, how

would this aggregated form of reporting work for a pharmacy benefit manager?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the commissioner would disseminate this information in a report that would say perhaps \$1 billion dollars of rebates were offered in the state in the year 2017 and that would be the aggregated form.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, so this aggregated rebate information would not, the public knowledge would not include individual companies, would not include individual drugs?

Through you, Mr. Speaker

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, what the public information will say is the total amount whether it be a million or a billion or multiple billions, is the amount that the PBM's got as a rebate?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is the first part of it.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of that information, with that information being available, what is it that the commissioner will be

able to accomplish?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. What it will accomplish is there is no other state in the country right now that is making this kind of information available and so for the purposes of us understanding one of the very most important pieces of the pipeline from a drug manufacturer to a PBM to an insurer to you at your local neighborhood pharmacy, is there's a lot of money being spent there, and the second piece of this is to determine how much of that is then coming to the PBM and how much of it is leaving the pharmacy benefit manager to go onto to you, and we're hoping that, because of the two answers there, we would be able to see what the trends are amount PBM's and therefore, what the trends are in terms of how much the consumer is benefiting from the rebates being offered by the manufacturers to the PBM's.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I wanna thank the good Chairman for making it very clear. Excuse me. [Phone ringing] I apologize, I forgot to turn the phone off. Through you, Mr. Speaker, so I wanna thank the good Chairman for that explanation because that is critical for us to know in aggregate the total amount, and I'm sure there probably is in billions the amount would be, that is given to the PBM and what percentage, what part of that aggregate is then passed onto you and me and as a consumer and what is retained by the PBM. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I definitely, that information is important, it's critical, it's laudable. But through you, Mr. Speaker, would it not be more important and more relevant if we get information that we can dissect it out and see where the outliers are and who are within the bell curve rather than the aggregate?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I would tend to agree with the representative that that would be better information, but there are significant proprietary concerns that were brought to my attention as the Chair of this bill about the impact about that information being public and disseminated at that level of specificity would cause on the PBM's ability to do what they do which is to negotiate drug prices and they believe to negotiate drug prices to the benefit of consumers. If they were to, if their competitors were to know what they were being offered for certain drugs or what they were offering, so I agree with the Representative that that might be more helpful information, but I do believe that there is enough information here in this bill to tell us the overall trends and for us to see quite clearly what is happening here and to compel them, given that there is only a handful of

them that operate in this country without risking the proprietary information that is the foundation of their business.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, the percentage or the total amount given to the PBM and the PBM then passing it on to the consumer, that is the intent of lines 53-65 as an aggregate?

Thank you so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

That is correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Moving on to lines 122-125, what we are trying to do here is the 25

outpatient prescription drugs that experience the greatest year to year increase in cost, through you, Mr. Speaker, is this as a cost in its totality as to the amount spent on drug A or drug B, or just the increase in cost in that particular drug, whatever the 25 drugs are?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It's the increase from year to year.

Thank you so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, is I am to understand it if last year X amount of money was spent, and let's take the example of Epi-Pen and that was a cost that we spent and now with the new cost, it has become one of the, it comes under one of the 25 that come into that category. Is that

what we are looking for?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I can answer this question a different way. The preceding section is the overall cost. The section that we're discussing right now, 122-125 is the percentage cost so perhaps in the first section 118-121, that would be the Epi-Pen that spiked an outrageous amount. The second would be a gradual increase and what the specific increase was, not the overall cost of it.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, I just wanna be clear. So the 25 outpatient drugs that experience the greatest year to year cost, these are individual drugs that we are looking at, individual drugs, is the list we are trying to compile?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

That is correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, is it the individual drug increase or is the total amount spent on that class of drugs? So that's what I wanna make sure, the separation between the two. Through you, Mr. Speaker, and just for clarification to the good Chairman, a drug could've gone up 20 percent, but we didn't spend that total amount as an aggregate because there was not a need for the drug, whereas another drug may have gone up only 10 percent in its increase, but we use so much of the drug, so it would come into a different group as the total amount spent on the drug, so what is it that we're looking for between

these two drugs that make that list of the top 25?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If I understand the question correctly, I believe what the good Representative is asking me, the answer would be it's the individual over year to year, not the totality so it's the individual drugs, the top 25 of them, different drugs, year to year experiencing the biggest increases.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and that is very useful because that's how we're going to be able to tell as opposed to a total cost to the State or to anybody else because that depends on how much it was used as opposed to the individual cost. Thank you for the clarification, Mr. Speaker. Going on to lines 359 and let me get, so through you, Mr. Speaker, earlier

we talked about 25 drugs, and now in lines 359-368, we talk about 10 drugs and through you, Mr. Speaker, I just wanna make sure that we're clear, the difference between what we just talked about and lines 359-368.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's a great question. What we were just talking about is requiring the health plans, when they file their rates, to voluntarily give us the top 25 information for their specific plan. What we're talking about here in lines 359-368 is the ability for the State to go to companies that had 10 of the highest or one company that was one of the top 10 and proactively go and ask them for more information. So one is a reactive thing where we are just getting information that happened from the plans. The second is empowering the State to actually go proactively and ascertain what the reasons were for up to 10 drugs

that experienced that percentage of an increase specifically.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, in this 10-drug analysis we are doing in a proactive way as the good Chairman said rather than reactive, once again we're looking at individual drug increase and not the aggregate of a drug used.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

That is correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, going to lines 389-395, through you, Mr. Speaker, that's information

that already exists in the public domain?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It's in the manner in which it's reported under the 10-K and the key phrase there is, consistent with the quality and type of information and data that is provided under the 10K.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, the difference is the way in which this information now gets to the public domain?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It's again, the key

phrase being quality and types of information and then it references the 10-K as sort of a standard form in which we could get this information, but it's not information that it is in the 10-K necessarily.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. When I look at the old phase analysis, which I don't think we have touched upon so far in our conversation with the good ranking member on insurance, through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the expense A, and who's going to bear that expense?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman could rephrase his question, I'm not sure I understand what he's asking.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan, try again please.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, for us to do all of this evaluation and come up with a list of 25, come up with a list of 10 and look at the aggregates and all of that, that work to be done, through you, Mr. Speaker, will obviously need the appropriate manpower and the cost factor involved, so through you, Mr. Speaker, A, who's bearing that cost and B, what is that cost?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Better Representative Scanlon?

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. On the top 25, that's coming from the insurance carrier themselves so that cost is not known to us and is not, you know an issue that we would have to worry about on the State budget side. With regard to the top 10 list, it is not a mandate. It's an option for them, whether it's the Office of Health Strategy to go and

do that work and that entity believes that they can handle this amount of work within their available appropriations.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, what the Office of Health Strategy we are requesting them to do is not a mandate, but we are suggesting that they look into the top 10, and it is my understanding from the Chairman to do the top 10 if they choose to do so, it will be within the available appropriations.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

That is correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, my question as far as the rebates, monitoring those rebates and you know, going through all of that evaluation, will that be bound by the insurance, the fund? Through you, Mr. Speaker, and what would be the cost to the insurance fund?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is also, as far as I've been told by the agency, that it would be within their available appropriations as well to compile that report annually.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

And so my final question, Mr. Speaker, is this information, which is valuable information as the good Chairman and or ranking member said, could we do more? Of course we can, but this is the right step for us to go and get that information, dissect

out that information in the year to come, and then hopefully we will work on that and improve as the years go by, and it is my understanding that to get this work done, neither the insurance fund nor our State will bear any additional expense because it will be within available appropriations.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

That is correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I wanna thank the good Chairman for his answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Gentleman from Coventry is not in his place.

The gentlewoman from Greenwich, Representative Floren.

REP. FLOREN (149TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this bill and I really wanna thank our Insurance Committee's leadership and our ranking member and the comptroller for actually spending a lot of time and thought on trying to unscramble the egg of the cost of pharmacies. I think this is a paradigm of transparency that protects the consumer going forward, and this is especially important because the landscape is changing so quickly with insurance companies merging or acquiring the PBM's, Signa and Express Scripts, Aetna, CVS Caremark, so going forward, you've done the formula, you've done the work and I thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, madam. The gentleman from Plainville, Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a couple of quick questions for the Chairman sir?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed!

REP. PETIT (22ND):

I wonder if the good Chairman could respond. I see that the pharmacy benefit managers and insurance carriers are involved. Would this also involve hospital entities that prescribe large medical practices that prescribe drugs?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is not my understanding that they would be responsible for any sort of transparency reporting in this bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you. I wonder if the good Chairman could let me know his thought on whether or not this will impact in a positive way on the high cost of orphan drugs for conditions that are uncommon that are a big cost to our State through the comptroller's office.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I hope that by shedding light on what is going on in the marketplace and shedding light through the marketplace on these drugs that yes, we can ultimately try to lower the cost of these drugs and therefore, help the folks out who are experiencing or having to take these drugs for life dependency reasons.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you and finally, I think something that the ranking member touched upon to the good Chairman, will pretty much all of this activity be done through the insurance department versus Consumer Protection? If he could just review with me again if all the information will basically flow

through insurance versus DCP?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the two State entities or the three State entities that are engaged with all this is the Insurance Department, the Office of Health Strategy and the comptroller's office. DCP is not included in this directly.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That answers my questions and I support the bill and applaud the efforts of the committee so thank you for your time.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. The gentleman from North Haven, Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Good Afternoon.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

A question to the good proponent of the bill
Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

I read through the bill and I think it's a
laudable bill and I plan on supporting it, but I
didn't see anything about trial drugs. Many times
cancer patients have to take experimental trial
drugs and they're very expensive, but the patients
need them, so could you address that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in
this bill specifically dealing with trial drugs.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you. I think it's something we have to look at. If you look at Canada and Europe, their drug prices are so much cheaper than the United States, I'm not sure why. I think when I'm reading this bill, it's gonna attempt to do that, anything we could do for seniors or anybody that needs drugs to lower the cost and really keep it consistent, so I wanna thank the good Chairman and the Committee and I plan on supporting this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you. The gentleman from Coventry,
Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the good gentleman for his answers as we go forward. You know one thing that I made a mention for a few days ago was the cost of drugs and I see that through you, Mr. Speaker, that this really at this time doesn't really address cost of drugs in terms of the

marketplace. This is giving us a chance to look
some transparencies, is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, this is all
about transparency and finding out what the cost
drivers are.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, because after my
comments I made the other day, then people said Tim,
let's get going and do something about the cost of
drugs and pharmaceuticals so I look forward to the
opportunity to first of all, vote this out, see
what's driving the cost, and then doing something
about that in future years, and I thank the good
gentleman for his work. I will look for the
opportunity to do just that. You know as I

mentioned before, I believe nine of these drugs on the top 25 deal with those people with multiple sclerosis and meeting with them and talking with them and having worked with them, unfortunately too many individuals with that disease who at times cannot afford it and so they make decisions as to how much they can buy at the time or what they're not gonna pay for bills, so we have a large hurdle I believe to get over, but I look forward to this building and others to get going and make something happen. So I thank the good gentleman for his work and I look forward to passage of this legislation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Gentlewoman from East Lyme, Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker I have a couple of questions for the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

I'm just looking at testimony from the Insurance Department and they had some significant concerns. I know the original bill is very different from the amendment. Were these addressed in the bill as amended?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I believe they were and I believe we made a good faith effort to work with the commissioner and her amazing team that we have a chance to work with all the time on the Insurance Committee to get this in a place that she personally was more comfortable with and that subsequent commissioners I believe would be comfortable with.

Thank you, madam.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you. There seem to be real concerns with

regard to their interaction with the pharmacy benefit managers and that they do not directly oversee them. Again, through you, Mr. Speaker, do you think because of the changes in the language that that has been addressed to their satisfaction?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I believe that their main concern, it's been a while since I ready the testimony, a few months, but I believe the main concern was that they didn't wanna be sifting through information that they were not comfortable with. What we did is simply give them information, basic information in an aggregated form and I believe that we've satisfied their concerns.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and through you again, Mr. Speaker, there was also some concern that the department

might not have the necessary expertise on staff to perform these functions, and obviously acquiring additional staff does have a fiscal impact, so through you, Mr. Speaker, does the department now feel that was adequately addressed?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

In speaking with the department, I do believe that that is the case.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and I wanna thank the good proponent of the bill for his answers, and I'm sure everyone is sick and tired of hearing about my travails with the individual insurance market, but having seen the increase in my son's one prescription for a generic drug, when he started taking it a few years ago it was \$7 dollars, now it's \$35 dollars a month, same drug, same generic formulation, I haven't seen

inflation as a whole going up in my, you know anyone who has to buy insulin now, which you need to live if you're a diabetic, has seen an incredible increase so I would look forward to anything that would help make this process more transparent, would give people a way to know what was happening and getting to the bottom of this. We all rely on the wonders of the pharmaceutical industry. There are people alive today, you know whether it's insulin, whether it's these wonderful biologics, who would've been dead many years ago. On the other hand, sometime the financial burden, even for these basic life-saving drugs, becomes unsupportable so I want to applaud the committee for their work on this. I look forward to the outcome of this and thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma'am. Gentleman from Newington, Representative Byron.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do have a couple of questions for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and through you, I have a couple of concerns and actually, I have these through a constituent of mine who just recently e-mailed me and these questions, let me just ask the first one here. There is concern that this bill could reduce competition and cause generic drug price to increase. Is that a valid concern?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I have been thoroughly engaged with the generic drug manufacturers and I have seen perhaps a similar e-mail that you received from my own constituents, and I would say that we did satisfy at least meeting halfway with the generic drug makers to make sure that they were properly accounted for in this bill. They obviously make a different kind of product than

a brand name drug. There are different things that go into it, and their drugs may specifically increase by significant amounts, but we're talking from \$1.50 to \$1.75, that would be a big increase, so I believe that we did set an appropriate threshold here at \$60 dollars, and I believe that we did make some stride to accommodate those who are in the generic drug market to make sure that they do remain competitive.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Byron.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good Representative for that answer and working out a compromise. Will this protect generic drug savings by including a wholesale acquisition cost floor of \$100 dollars and limit the list to report to no more than three generics?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, again, we left it at \$60 dollars and we did not limit the amount of generic drugs that could be on the top ten list at three.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Byron.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Great, thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good Chairman for his answers. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you. Will you remark, I'm tired, will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests, please come to the well of the House. Members 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.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill 5384 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting	149
Necessary for Passage	75
Those Voting Yea	149
Those Voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The bill passes as amended. [Gavel]
Representative McGee from the 5th District. Sir,
for what purpose do you rise?

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

I rise for the purpose of an announcement.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed. Hang on one second,

Representative. [Gavel] Ladies and gentlemen,
Representative McGee of the 5th District is about to
make an announcement or an introduction, a little
bit of both, could we please give him our attention?

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

So I have with me someone really special, near
and dear to this place, and if you'll indulge me
just for a second, I'd like to just read a little
bit about this person and then present her with a
plaque.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Absolutely, sir. Please proceed.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Sandra D. Forte. Sandy has been with the
Office of Legislative Management for almost 30
years. She is an Executive Assistant and personal
and confidential assistant to the Executive
Director, Jim Tracy, of the Office of Legislative
Management. She assists the financial administrator
and provides administrative support to various
departments. She coordinates the transcription
process, updates the legislative guide, supervises

the OLM front office staff, overseeing and coordinating use of buildings by legislators, staff, agencies the public, legislators' purchases, stationary, you name it, she does it all. She also serves as Clerk to the Legislative Management committee, where she assists the facilities department with a variety of duties, and works on numerous complex projects. Sandy always conducts herself with class, as you can see today, dignity and professionalism. Her warm smile and kindness will definitely be missed. The Connecticut Legislative Black and Puerto Rican Caucus along with all of you in this Chamber extend our gratitude for your many, many years of State service, for making a positive difference and we all congratulate you on a job well done and a retirement well deserved. So if all of you can just give her a round of applause.

[Applause] Thirty years! [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Sandy, we truly appreciate all your contribution. I know there's actually something going on for you up on the second floor so you

probably should head up there. People are waiting to see you. Thank you so very much from all of the members of the House for everything you've done for us. We really appreciate it. Thank you. [Applause]

Representative D'Agostino of the 91st District, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

REP. D'AGONSTINO (91ST):

Just a general notation, Mr. Speaker, that I recused myself on the last vote on House Bill 5384. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. The journal will so note. We will now return to the call of the calendar. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 171?

CLERK:

On page 11, House Calendar 171, Substitute House Bill No. 5305, AN ACT CONCERNING REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS TO QUALIFY AN ENTITY TO DEVELOP A CASINO GAMING FACILITY IN THE STATE. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Public Safety and Security.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The fine Representative of the city of Bridgeport, Representative Stafstrom of the 129th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is one that we began debate late last night and I appreciate the Chamber's indulgence in staying with us last night to begin this important debate, and I also appreciate the Speaker and the majority leader allowing us to get out of here at a relative reasonable time and resume this debate today. Mr. Speaker, again, this is a bill that aims to establish the first of a two-step process, to accept

bids for a possible casino located in the State of Connecticut. Again, this is a two-step process. The bill before us merely calls for request for proposal. It does not in any way authorize the construction of additional casino gaming anywhere in the State of Connecticut. It solicits request for proposal based on various criteria. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to answering the Chamber's questions and urge support.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Ritter of the 1st District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, thank you and this morning before we gathered, a lot of folks were getting in, I know we were a little late last night and we got here a little early. The Speaker made some comments that I want to reiterate here on the floor today. We take our communication amongst each other both internally and externally very seriously. I know myself and my deputies talk to the other side probably every 5 or

10 minutes, and we do our very best to manage the flow in this Chamber so that people have an opportunity to be prepared, and at the same time to move with all deliberate speed and get to bed at a good time. It gets hard the last few days and so, to the extent that anything was called later last night and there was any miscommunication, we'll never pass the buck. The Speaker and I will always stand up here and say we can do better. So any apologies to anyone who felt that it was called very late last night. Having said that, there was never any attempt by anybody to call an amendment that was not prepared for or expected. This was all something that we had talked about and the day just kind of gets away from you at some point. All I can ask is that whatever happened last night, whatever process play out, that you vote on the merits of the bill and any misunderstandings or miscommunications you point squarely at me and the Speaker of the House and we'll take that heat. Thank you very much to the Chamber.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Verrengia of the 20th District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH):

I rise in support of this bill today. As many of you know, the Public Safety Committee, myself, have spent many hours on gaming issues over the last few years, and I can say with a great deal of certainty, one of our biggest challenges is trying to determine the value of a potential commercial casino license and in addition, trying to determine the sincerity and the willingness to other casino operators who have expressed an interest in coming and investing in Connecticut. Up until now, there is no way other than verbal communications to try to judge what they're saying and whether or not they're truly interested in investing in Connecticut. And not that I don't doubt what anyone is saying, I

believe we need a mechanism in place to put those words and to put their money where their mouth is, if you will. And I believe by going out, setting up this RFP process, again going out to the marketplace and letting the marketplace determine the value and interest of casino gaming in here in Connecticut. And the timing of this is very important because the gaming landscape here in Connecticut is changing, whether we like it or not. In many ways, it's changing because of the competition around us. As many of you know, there's a casino that's going to be opening up in just a few months in Springfield, Mass, just over the line. That casino is going to have a financial impact on our gaming industry as we know, particularly when we talk about the compacts and the value of those compacts. For example, today under our current compacts, the tribes generate approximately \$270 million dollars in revenue to the State of Connecticut, and I don't think there's one person in this Chamber that want to do something that would put that money at risk, but as leaders, we need to look past today. We need to have the

ability to say, okay this is what our gaming industry looks like today, but what's it gonna look like in the future and again, we only need to look out for a few months, and according to OFA, the financial impact to the State of Connecticut with the Springfield casino is going to bring that revenue down to approximately \$190 million dollars, OFA's figure. But what's not included in the equation is the Boston casino that's going to open up in about a year. There's no numbers relative to the financial impact of how that's going to impact the State. In talking with some gaming officials, they believe the impact to the Boston casino is gonna have a significant impact to the State of Connecticut.

The way the compacts are written now, that the tribes have to contribute a minimum of \$160 million dollars so I would argue that in short order, we are going to be at that minimum. So as other, the tribes and other casino operators are working their business model to remain competitive, we knows that the tribes competed up in Mass, they didn't prevail,

and I don't fault them for that. They're looking out for the best interests of their business model. They'd be foolish not to do that. I've heard from casino operators that have expressed an interest to come here to Connecticut, to come to Bridgeport and they tell me why it's such a great idea to do that, but keeping in mind, they're looking out for their best interests.

So I ask all of you, who's looking out for the State of Connecticut? And I say that this bill in front of us, which doesn't authorize a casino, according to the Attorney General does not run afoul of our compacts, I say it's in the best interest of Connecticut to go out to the marketplace and let' see what's in the best interest of Connecticut.

We have received correspondence from the tribes expressing their concerns and rightfully so, and in some of the correspondence, they talk about if we were to go forward with this, they could possibly put that money I had described earlier into an escrow account and they possibly can do that. But at the same time, there's possibilities here in the

State of Connecticut that we have. So there's two sides to that argument. The one thing I wouldn't want us to do is not proceed forward in fear of a threat or any inference that if we do this, we're gonna get that. If that were to occur and there was a difference of opinion, there is conflict resolution language in the existing compacts that help deal with that and can be vetted, so I certainly look forward to the debate today. I certainly understand that this is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. I certainly respect everyone's opinion, regardless of party or where you're from, but at the end of the day, I am so confident that by doing this, it is in the best interest of the State of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Soto of the 39th District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. SOTO (39TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of question for the proponent of the bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Soto, please proceed.

REP. SOTO (39TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the proponent, looking specifically at section 2, it references that the development agreement entered by the responder of the RFP and the municipality where it's gonna be located, so could you explain how we arrived at this \$8-million-dollar number?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the Representative for the question. The \$8-million-dollar number was arrived through the Public Safety Committee process based on testimony they received at the public hearing regarding what other host municipalities have commanded for facilities of this size.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Soto.

REP. SOTO (39TH):

Thank you to my colleague from Bridgeport and through you, Mr. Speaker, does that \$8 million take into account some of the unintended consequences as this bill proposes would be of at least \$500-million-dollar investment?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the Representative's question, the \$8 million dollars is merely an annual payment that is made. That payment would be over and above any property taxes that may be due to the host municipality as a result of the facility being built. There certainly would be real property taxes from the actual physical building as well as likely personal property taxes from the equipment and machines, particularly the slot machines that would be located inside the facility, so the host municipality would benefit in an amount greater than

that \$8 million dollars.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Soto.

REP. SOTO (39TH):

Thank you to my colleague from Bridgeport and through you, Mr. Speaker, another question is looking at that same section, subsection B, line 21 references a revenue sharing plan for surrounding municipalities. Currently we have a similar plan in statute, better known as the Mohegan Pequot fund which distributes to more than surrounding municipalities, so could you further define surrounding?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I take the term surrounding, it means those towns that are immediately adjacent to that municipality; however, as I began to explain last night, certainly this is

an RFP process. What is set forth here in the bill are the bare minimums that the operator of the facility would have to provide, so to the extent they went over and above that, then that certainly would make their request for proposal that much more attractive presumably once it comes back to the commission and ultimately to the legislature to take a look at.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Soto.

REP. SOTO (39TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Those are the questions I have for my colleague. I'll finish with a comment and while it's not referenced in this specific bill, I think an important piece that's missing from this conversation, which actually relates to section seven is the timeline and if the current compact with our tribal nations that would be violated if we went down this two-step process as my colleague had mentioned, the RFP went out and then at some point a casino would be authorized. So

that second step in the process, as we know, would violate that compact and so I don't agree with any part of that first step in the process, and I'll be open and very honest and say that I do think that there is value in this notion of an open and fair process, but that notion has very serious policy implications, and what's missing from this proposed legislation is a mitigation plan of what happens if that second step that has been mentioned in the process is violated. The licensing fee referenced in this proposed legislation of \$50 million dollars does not even amount to 20 percent of what is currently received in slot revenue. So my question, and it's somewhat rhetorical, is what do we do in years two and three while the structure is getting built of that second piece of the process. Then year four until operation is happening and revenue is received, so this can amount anywhere, as the good Chair of Public Safety said, anywhere from \$600 million dollars at the low end to \$1 billion dollars that we would currently receive minus the \$50 million dollars licensing fee. So we cannot run

from the fact that we do have a compact in place, and that if we moved forward with this piece of legislation, it has the potential to be violated and why would we do that? Not having a mitigating plan for this revenue that the State currently receives I believe is irresponsible. It makes the proposed legislation in front of us incomplete and ultimately very dangerous. We talked about not knowing what the future of gaming look like in the State, and I don't disagree with the Chair of Public Safety's remark there, but I would definitely disagree that this is the right way to do it. We actually heard a bill in appropriations which I also had concerns with, but it spoke to that very piece which was identifying through a plan what the future of gaming looks like. I don't know if I agree that an RFP process is a way to look at what the future of gaming in our State looks like.

I'll give another example. So we oftentimes hear in this building that we can't raise taxes on the wealthiest because they would move away. That might result in a revenue drop. So we hear from

both sides of their perspective, right we hear why it's good or why it's bad, but in the end, those are both speculative opinion. They're speculative, but what we do know without a doubt that once a new casino is approved, that we will lose money that we currently receive that is guaranteed, that is not speculative and that is nonpartisan and so yes, I'll close by saying that we do need to map out a future of gaming in our state. Yes, we should facilitate some type of open and fair process if we develop more gaming in our State, but I would argue that this proposed legislation falls very short of that mark, and for that reason, I will not be voting for it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Representative Sredzinski of the 112th District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure many will be pleased to hear that I'm not gonna reiterate that

I spoke on yesterday; however, in the time that I've had to consider this and briefly sleep on the subject, I just wanted to ask a couple of questions to the proponent of the bill, through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some of the concerns I've heard from legislators that represent Fairfield County communities, knowing that this has a potential of hitting the southwest part of the State is that there would be a traffic concern for those communities. In line 29 the bill speaks to a market analysis and the good proponent discussed the market analysis yesterday, but through you, would that market analysis include a traffic study?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I believe in order for that market analysis to be complete that yes, it would in fact have to have a traffic study.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was hopeful that that would be the case and I think it's important that we study not only the fiscal impacts, the job impacts to the community that this casino facility may be a part of, but also the surrounding communities and how they would be impacted because as we all know, last year when we discussed and debated the East Windsor facility, we took a long time to discuss the impact to not only East Windsor, but the surrounding communities as well. Another question I have, through you, is concerning the \$5-million-dollar application fee. We all know that there's one primary company that has been interested in this; however, this does not preclude multiple different

agencies, companies, tribal organizations or even individuals from submitting and RFP to the State of Connecticut, and if they do indeed submit an RFP, it must include a \$5-million-dollar application fee. Now it does say in the bill that this is refundable if there are certain agreements met; however, if they do not meet those agreement, the question I have for the proponent is, will the State of Connecticut keep that \$5-million-dollar application fee from each person?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the \$5-million-dollar application fee is that the primary purpose of course is to ensure that whoever is submitting an RFP is of the financial means and is committed to the project. If a particular bidder is not selected, of course if you recall under the bill, there is no obligation that the State actually select any bidder. It could

receive a dozen RFP responses and not select any of them. The ones that are not selected, any of them or all of them, the application fee would be refunded to the non-successful bidder.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's answer to that and if in a hypothetical scenario we had ten different agencies, individuals, businesses or tribal organizations bid on this and submit an RFP and all of them decided to not get refunded, would that be an additional \$50-million-dollar revenue to the State of Connecticut?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, I suppose in that scenario if they did not ask for the refund, then it would be a benefit to the State. I'll note

that the fiscal note on this bill does mention a potential revenue gain as a result of this RFP process let alone the second-step approval process.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and just to clarify and make sure that we're clear on the final part of this bill, we had this question asked last evening, and I wanted to make sure since we're all fresh and awake and ready for the debate of the day, would this bill before us today still need legislative authority with another vote of the Connecticut General Assembly in order to create a casino facility in the State of Connecticut?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the ranking member of Public Safety for again raising this because it is the key question of this entire debate

as I see it. No, in fact this bill does not authorize the construction of any tribal entity. To the Representative's question, yes, any action would have to come back before this General Assembly. There would be have to be a subsequent vote by the Public Safety Committee and by this General Assembly before any additional casino could be built pursuant to this RFP.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and does this bill, if passed by this House, passed by the Senate and signed by the Governor, would this bill violate the compacts of the State of Connecticut we have with the tribal organizations?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker it would not and the

Attorney General's office has been very clear on that in their letters to legislative leadership as well as in their testimony before the Public Safety Committee.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman from the 129th District for the answers to the questions. Again, I will just reiterate that I think it is a good concept, a good idea for us to take a look at what's out there. I know there are a lot of us who have concerns, a lot of us based on the geography of the State and their proximity to the existing casino facilities and I completely understand that and I think that is a valid concern. If I was a State Representative from the eastern part of the State, I too would have serious concerns with this, so in no way am I urging my colleagues to support or oppose, I just wanna make sure we have the facts and I wanna thank the Representative from

the 129th for going through the bill line by line last night with me. I thank him for his patience today as I continue, and I think it's worth a look. I think it's worth the State of Connecticut seeing what's out there for possibilities. As was mentioned last night and as was mentioned today, there are a lot of moving parts to casino gaming in the northeast, throughout Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, there are a lot of moving parts and I think there is little harm in trying to get more information so that we can make a decision as a State on what we wanna do. I appreciate the answers and I look forward to continuing the debate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Representative Skulczyck of the 45th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I'll open up with a couple of remarks and then some questions to the

proponent. I'm from southeastern Connecticut obviously. Clearly I've been very supportive of the two tribal nations throughout our time here serving. I can tell you and speak on behalf of formerly being the municipal leader in a town that much traffic goes through on their way to the Mashantucket tribal nation. We enjoy the luxury of having many businesses that have been created, many opportunities have employed residents in our community. In fact, I think when we did our last numbers, we had about 35 percent of the employed folks in my District work at the casinos. Thirty-five percent and so I can appreciate the conversation that's going on here in regard to expansion of casinos of Connecticut. Certainly when I look at the bill, we hear a lot about Bridgeport, but through you, Mr. Speaker, I'll ask a question to the proponent. Is Bridgeport mentioned anywhere in this bill?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no it is not.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you. Maybe I should consider an amendment that should go to Griswold then, but we won't do that, thank you, but kind of going a little further into that question, so we're focusing on really I think we hear a lot about a location, and I think we need to really concentrate on what's gonna happen if in fact we go forward with this process, what are the legality issues, and I've heard you've been asked the question already, but I'm gonna ask him again. And so through you, Mr. Speaker, have you the proponent reviewed all the documents from the original contract with both tribal nations?

Through you, Mr. Speaker, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Quick movement right there for you.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I have glanced briefly at some of the documents. I've also studied extensively the Attorney General's opinions on this matter. The Attorney General has weighed in on this several times over the last several years in fact going back to the original RFP process for the East Windsor facility, and has looked specifically at I think what is the key piece of the compact which is section 15A of the contract, that provides that the operation of video tribes terminate if "the existing laws or regulations of the State are amended to expressly authorize the operation of any video game of chance for any purpose by any person, organization or entity." That language is what the Attorney General has looked extensively, has cited to in saying this bill does not, in fact there is no part of this bill that "expressly authorizes the operation of any video games." In fact, lines 88-92 of the bill make it very clear that before any additional video games could be authorized, that

this legislature would have to take further action, so through this bill in and of itself, no we are not running afoul of the compact. In fact, the Attorney General has testified to that before the Public Safety Committee and in a letter since stating, "As a legal matter, however, it is my opinion that the proposed legislation would not," he underlined not, "run afoul of our existing agreements with the tribes."

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you and thank you for your response on that question. And so the video game piece which is the Attorney General's opinion which you hang and he hangs his hat on is the exact language for which you believe this bill can go forward as the proponent. I would have greater concern about the opinion. I've read the agreement. I certainly have sat through many committee hearings during this process this year and last. I think I would wanna know for

sure before we lose the revenue. Let me ask the proponent, do you know how much money we generate from both casinos in the agreement today presently?

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, it's my understanding that the two tribal entities contributed approximately \$250 million dollars to the Pequot fund last year.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyk.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Skulczyk, thank you, Madam Speaker, and yeah it's about \$250, \$270 million dollars, correct. Do you know how much, through you, Madam Speaker, the proponent, do you know how much they've given to the State of Connecticut over their life of the contract?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know the number is in the billions.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Seven billion to be exact. Seven billion dollars to the State of Connecticut and through what we know is the Pequot fund in many municipalities. In fact, I can say that the municipalities that actually surround it like I'll refer back to my own town receive very little money in return for our relationship with the casino, but I can tell you cities and larger towns and municipalities, for example presently in the last five years, Bridgeport has received \$3,750,000 dollars, East Hartford the same, Ellington the same, Enfield, Hartford, New Haven, and the list goes on. Millions and millions of dollars to supplement a lot of budgetary throughout Connecticut and so I would ask the proponent of the bill, what would happen, just

perhaps, if the casinos said if we go forward with this process and it gets voted out of this House and then the Senate and it gets signed into law, what if they stop paying the State of Connecticut? What would you, in your opinion as the proponent, suggest we do if we lose \$270 million dollars to a budget?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I don't want to speak for the Attorney General directly, but certainly it would be my understanding and my belief that that would be a direct violation of the compact by the tribal nations, and I would assume the Attorney General's office would promptly file a declaratory judgement action against the tribal entities.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you for that answer, and I'm not trying to hold you to a number, I'm just trying to talk it out if that's okay, through you, Madam Speaker. I realize there is a lot of speculation with this whole process cause I think there's some unknown and that's why we're trying to just vet it out here. I guess I would ask again to the proponent if he can share with us here, we've talked a lot about jobs last night in the late hours. We talked a lot about job creation to specific areas. I think it's difficult and maybe just your opinion to the proponent, it's difficult to know, we don't even know a location, so it's kind of hard to know if I was to build a house, I'd have to know the size of the land I'd build the house on, so you talked about numbers. What is your projection for job creation out of this and some of the other numbers that are out there?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, an excellent question and actually, it's not what my projections would be. It's whatever the casino operator who decides to participate in the RFP's numbers would be. You know as the bill is situated and as the Representative referenced, there is no geographical area that is enumerated or listed in this bill. You know obviously it's been no secret that there is one company that has expressed an interest in my hometown of Bridgeport and certainly, we would expect that they will submit an RFP for that region with an economic impact analysis as well as job figures in that area. Madam Speaker, there is nothing in this bill preventing another casino operating from deciding Torrington might be the right location and for submitting an RFP with the support, if the local community is willing to support that, with the support of the local community and what job numbers may or may not be in that particular area, but all that this bill does is set forth what the minimum number that would make this project not just viable, but attractive to the

State of Connecticut to go down the road that the good Representative has suggested.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

No pressure, Representative Stafstrom.

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and so you bring up a good point about this bill and its language and for the record, I should, I voted for this bill in committee as we do often sometimes we vote things out of committee, right, and sometimes you make the process sort of where we work together to get to the end result and I strongly oppose the ultimate bill, but you know eventually knew we'd be debating it here today. And so Madam Speaker, to the proponent again, who actually drafted this bill? I mean this bill is a pretty extensive bill which kind of speaks to a lot of different things. I don't know if there's anybody, I don't believe the proponent drafted the bill, is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

No Madam Speaker, through you, I believe the legislature commissioner's office drafted the bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Clearly understanding that. Did you work, or may I ask through you, Madam Speaker, did the proponent work on the drafting of this bill with said folks?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, certainly the Bridgeport and New Haven delegations as well as folks from surrounding towns that have expressed an interest and others including most especially the Chairman and the ranking member of the House on the Public Safety Committee were certainly involved in the concept of

this bill and ultimately, it would've been the preview of the leadership of the Public Safety Committee to instruct LCO to draft the bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you for that response. Was there a lot of inclusion with some consultants or anybody outside that maybe helped draft this particular bill?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, unfortunately I wasn't in the screening meetings of Public Safety, so I'm not entirely sure of all the details.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you again, and so we'll move on from there and certainly, you know you brought up the, the proponent brought up some significant players so to speak and obviously, MGM has been said on the House floor here, in the public hearings, the most visible, in fact the only visible actual casino looking to do a project in Connecticut, so I would ask, through you, Madam Speaker, is it the proponent's opinion that MGM is the only player in town at this point?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, through you, no. In fact, certainly we in the Bridgeport delegation have previously heard from the tribal entities that they may have an interest in the Bridgeport region. I can't speak for other regions of the State as to whether they've received interest from other operators, but I think that is, in fact, the point of this bill. Is it only MGM that has an interest

in another casino someplace in Connecticut? Would the tribal entities be interested in another casino some place in Connecticut? Are there other third party operators out there that if we were to put this out to the free market might take an interest in Connecticut, and that is in fact exactly what this bill is designed to do is to flush that out and let us know exactly who the players in this field are so that we are not dealing with just sort of the word of mouth or fliers being passed around this building, and that the public has a degree of transparency and understanding as to how this process will unfold.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and the proponent is referring to line five on the proposed bill, I can clearly see that, and it's an interesting conversation to the Indian tribal to develop as well and I think that's a piece that we really didn't

hear from too much in the committee process so it's interesting that it certainly is on here. It was on there during the process, but we didn't hear from some of the folks as loudly as we did from the MGM folks who testified, so thank you for clearing that up.

I guess I wanna just refer back to some earlier questions that were put out by one of the representatives on your side, just to the revenue loss and the possibility of revenue loss. There were points made earlier by one of the folks on your side, I think, in regard to, the Chair actually, in regard to the projected loss after the Boston casino goes online in Massachusetts, and I'd just like to know, how did we obtain those numbers or projections and could you please offer, through you, Madam Speaker, to the proponent, how we came up with those projections?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I

can't discuss the specifics, but in generalities, my understanding from what I've heard is OFA, as they normally do, tries to look at market factors and do its best estimate of where revenue may go. How OFA derives those numbers, I'm not privy to the specifics.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So OFA, and I understand that process as well, I think, and to the point you made earlier, there's a lot of fliers going around and there's a lot of information that's been flooded through this building in regard to this over the last year plus, and I kinda look at the number we've been provided and I think it almost matches some of those things that have been out there, so however they came up with them, I was just trying to clarify through you, Madam Speaker, so we can clearly understand projections cause we have to make a decision here. We have to make a decision based on what we have in front of us and what we're

seeing here is really, in a sense, projections of a deficit no matter what. If we don't build another casino, we would end up having a deficit in the money certainly that goes into the State budget and as the proponent knows probably better than I certainly, that we're already broke and we need every dime and penny we can get here in Connecticut. So let me refer to the East Windsor, how this relates to the East Windsor deal and possibly what the effect could be if this law was passed.

Through you, Madam Speaker, anything on that?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the good Representative, being a member of the Public Safety Committee probably is more privy to the details of the committee drafting process than I was. I understand that the original language of this bill as it was heard in public hearing did reference the East Windsor facility if not in name, in reference, and would have revoked some of the authority to move

forward with that project. Let me be clear. The bill that is before us today, the bill that got voted out of committee, has no mention of East Windsor in it. It does not in any way inhibit the ability of the East Windsor facility to proceed as it had been. That was expressly stripped out of the bill at the committee level process in response to some of the concerns we had heard from our colleagues from other parts of the State in effort, frankly, to try to secure support for this bill so that we could get a frank, honest look at what is out there and leave the issue limited to that.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and thank you to the proponent for clarifying that point. So the East Windsor deal can go forward. Last year's deals that went forward with the additional money, I don't wanna call it the sweetener, but I guess it was the underlying bill that went through last year, where

much more money went to the different towns and cities throughout Connecticut to even support that last year's East Windsor deal. As we know, we wrangled with that for many hours. Does the proponent know if those deals, if this possibly goes forward, if the tribal nations pull their contract with the State, that that money then is lost that was guaranteed to the State and to the budget?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, it's my understanding that the tribal entities have not paid anything based on the East Windsor Facility, as that facility has not become operational. That facility would have to become operational, I believe, before any payment from that facility would be due to either the State or to any municipality. But through you, Madam Speaker, I would go back to my point that I think it's fairly clear on the face of the compact and as the Attorney General has confirmed that this bill in

fact has really no impact on our existing relationships with the tribal nations other than to allow them to participate in the RFP should they be so willing to do so.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Okay, thank you again, Madam Speaker. You know, I'm gonna sort of maybe just change directions, just give an opinion here and then I'll have another couple of questions for the proponent, but you know, one of the great concerns we have obviously, and you've been very strong in your point as far as not having a concern under the Attorney General's opinion that we will not break the compact. I have a little bit of a different concern on that and I'm not an attorney so I don't pretend to be. I'm just a simple guy who kind of reads things and it kinda make sense. What I do see is an opinion is, I believe the tribal nations could stop paying their payment today and we could end up going

to court and we could see us in litigation the day this moves forward, and I have great concern as I mentioned earlier about what we do with that. Losing \$270 million dollars to the State of Connecticut's budget at a time when we can't afford to do that, so I would ask the proponent of the bill, I mean if we lost that money that we're getting now, guaranteed money to the tribal nation, even with the projections of the cuts from the Boston project or any of the other projects, I don't know how we make up that deficit. And even if we have to go to litigation and fight to you know get that contract back open again, and we prove that the State of Connecticut is correct, we lose revenue and to me, I don't know if I would jeopardize that. I think I would wanna thoroughly vet this out a little more. I think this is a big concern for everyone in this room. We're gonna be going over a budget probably in a week or two and having a long healthy discussion, or not in a week or two, in a few days or so, I'm tired, I'm sorry. I almost ran off the road last night to be honest with you and I'm really

tired. You know we have in front of us a bill that could change the State of Connecticut because it comes down not just to the \$270 million dollars. Southeastern Connecticut itself, let me educate people in the room, and I know State Representative Soto sort of talked upon it. Between southeastern and northeastern Connecticut, we were the last to recover in the economy in the recession here in Connecticut. Not in the State; in the country, in the country. We have a very job depressed location. These jobs, I tell people all the time, they're \$15 dollar an hour jobs that people feed their families on and I understand other parts of the State wanting them, and I'm not gonna debate whether or not Bridgeport is a location that deserves this. I wanna see Bridgeport flourish. I wanna see Hartford flourish. I wanna see every city and town flourish, but I think we're doing it in a way that jeopardizes a longstanding relationship, \$7.5 billion dollar, the home team Mohegan and Mashantucket tribal nations who've done more for Connecticut, more for Connecticut than any other business. I would

venture to say they've done the most. They put us on the map. Who watches the New York Yankees game a few years back and didn't see the Mashantucket sign behind, and I'm not a Yankee fan, but we had to watch it. [Laughter] Clearly, I'm a Red Sox fan, but [Laughter] [Applause] Thank you, clap, series coming up, but you know the bottom line is look, we could be on opposite ends of this, but I think what we need to do is, I think this should not go any further. I think this should be voted down. I think it's a worthy conversation with the players in the room, and let's face it, we know the players are going in and out of the you know the leadership and talking to leadership. I think we should push this off a year cause I won't be here [Laughter], then you can have a healthier debate then, but I'm fighting for the home team, and I'm gonna end my comments with this to the proponent. I appreciate your straightforwardness to this. I appreciate the process, but again, I'm going with the home team and fighting for my people in Southeastern Connecticut as everyone fights for theirs and I respect you for

that, and I'll be voting no. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative, all of you American League fans. Representative Santiago of the 130th.

REP. SANTIAGO (130TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, this has been a long debate. I've been working on this issue for quite a while and this bill has been recently characterized as an attack, as an attack on the home team, as an attack on the tribes and I say that this is not that. What this is to me is an opportunity for the tribes to do something that they're looking to do which is expand gaming in Connecticut, but to do it the right way, to do it the good government way, okay, the open and transparent way. In my opinion, what we did last year was not good government. It was not open and transparent and in my opinion, is one of the main reasons why the East Windsor Casino is not, there's no brick and mortar in the ground at this time. Had they done an open, transparent RFP process, put up

the best bid and been successful, I truly believe that project would be moving forward more than it is now because it would have been the right way to do this.

I also have heard concerns with regard to how we will be made whole, this process doesn't address that well this is a two-step process and this process, in order for them to be approved, you would think that they're gonna have to have a plan on how they're gonna make us whole because without that, it's very unlikely that this body will approve them knowing the consequences. Personally, if I were the tribes, I wouldn't fear this. I wouldn't fear competition. Why? Because they have the best answer when comes to anybody on how will you address this. They can say they will amend the compact so their likelihood of being one of the top candidates is there. So why are they so afraid of an open competitive fair process? I don't get it, but I think that this is not a bad bill for the State of Connecticut, and I think that if we're gonna do things the right way, the good government way, then

we're gonna support this legislation. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further? Representative Wilms, you have the floor, sir.

REP. WILMS (142ND):

Ye, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I like the analogy to the home team or the hometown cause I guess I should say what I consider to be my home team and when it comes to the issue of casino expansion and the issue of gambling, my focus is on those who have problems with gambling, whether they're chronic gambler or they're addictive gamblers, and as we know, about 5 percent of the population has this issue. And so when we look at expanding casinos or expanding gambling, you know yes, there's gonna be some positives and we hear a lot of the positives. You know there's gonna be more revenue, more jobs, more opportunities, but at the same time while that's happening, there's gonna be candidly more problems and addictive gambling issues as well and it shows up in terms of increased crime, in

bankruptcies, divorces, fiscal issues, things like that. So in my opinion, one needs to look at both and I want to make sure that my home team is part of the conversation. Certainly for many of us who may wonder well gee, I don't know really know anyone who might be a gambling addict or has an issue. One thing that I found helpful, and you can just do this, you can Google Gambler's Anonymous Connecticut and you can find out where there's GA meetings here in Connecticut in the next week, and here's the towns where there's gonna be meetings in the next week: Stamford, Enfield, Milford, Meriden, Coventry, Darien, Montville, Danbury, Seymour, Gilford, Hartford, Norwalk, Pawcatuck, Waterbury, Stratford, Middletown and Waterford and it seems to me that's a pretty representative sampling of our entire State so if we wonder, well where is this issue? Well it's not too far from home and so you know I wanna make sure that that's brought out.

One of the things that I was impressed in is that the State did engage a study of the economic and social impacts of gambling back in 2009, and

they engaged an outfit called the Spectrum Gaming Group. They're a very well-known independent research outfit and they do research and analysis for all aspects of the gambling sector, and they did a study, a very extensive study, it was addressed to Governor Rell, on the gambling in Connecticut, analyzing the economic and social impacts, and the last time that was done was in 2009, so based on my comments, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the proponent of the act a few questions if you don't mind.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. WILMS (142ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the proponent, looking through the language of the act that we're considering, I didn't see any specific language that referred to such a study, and I was wondering if the proponent could point to such language if it exists.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor,

sir.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the Representative from Norwalk for this question because I think it is an important one and it's one that frankly, my constituents have struggled with probably as much as his have or constituents of folks around the State have. To what point do we get to a saturation of gaming in the State of Connecticut, and what are the social and other consequences of that on our towns. That's why to me, I think what's really important here are line 29-30 which require a market analysis detailing the benefits of the proposed casino gaming facility. Certainly the entity who will be hiring and performing that market analysis is the bidder, so necessarily they have to be that MGM, one of the tribes, some other third party, they certainly have a bias. They are going to present sort of the rosiest picture, but they still have to put that on paper, and I think that's not the end of the conversation. Again, this is the first of a two-

step process so whatever they submit would have to come back to the legislature and it certainly would be my expectation that not only would we have a public hearing on whatever that RFP is, where any interested party could weigh in, but that before we would go any further with gaming, we would look at that spectrum report and decide to the extent that needs to be updated in order to get a fuller picture.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Speaker is back up there today.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

That's okay Representative, we're moving quick today.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

You're playing musical chairs on me today, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Wilms.

REP. WILMS (142ND):

Thank you, yes, Madam Speaker, I have to keep looking so I don't miss out on the latest shift, but

I thank the proponent for that answer and I certainly can appreciate that if let's say MGM was you know conducting this, I don't know if they would be seen as the most disinterested party in this process. So through you, Madam Speaker, if indeed perhaps now is not the most appropriate time, although perhaps there may be some analysis done, but perhaps another step needs to be done. Through you, Madam Speaker, when would be the appropriate time to engage someone like Spectrum to do that kind of unbiased analysis.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I believe that would be in January of next year when we see if there are any successful bidders under this RFP process before this legislature were to move any further with actually the second step of this, which would be authorizing the construction of any such facility.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Wilms.

REP. WILMS (142ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and one final question, through you to the proponent, would the proponent be willing to support such an unbiased study at that time?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I would. I think it would be a disservice to the constituents of whatever metro area we decide might be the right metro area, not to do such a study.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Wilms.

REP. WILMS (142ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I thank the proponent for that answer and I appreciate his comments and I'll listen to the conversation

further. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative
Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and through
you, Madam Speaker, I have a question or two for the
proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

You stated that the Attorney General had issued
a declaratory opinion that moving forward with this
process would not violate the compact as it is
constituted. Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I don't know that I
said the Attorney General issued a formal
declaratory opinion. I think that has sort of a

term of art to it, but certainly the Attorney General did submit testimony to the Public Safety Committee on March 15, 2018, and also responded to letters from legislative leadership on certain gaming issues. I'm in possession of one letter to Speaker Aresimowicz dated April 17, 2018, and also a second letter to Speaker Aresimowicz, Minority Leader Klarides, Senate President Looney, and Senate Republican President Fasano of May 1, 2018.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker and my apologies, I misspoke. I believe the good proponent of the bill said if it were questioned, the Attorney General might issue a declaratory opinion stating that this does not violate the compact. Were the tribe to decide to that this in fact violated the compact and the Attorney General disagreed, it's simply one opinion against another, is it not?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, if I understand the proponent's question, is it whether the opinion of the tribes' themselves disagree with the Attorney General's opinion?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

If it were the opinion of the tribes' legal counsel that this in fact did violate the compact, and the Attorney General disagreed in his opinion, it would in fact be two legal opinions against each other, would it not?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, I suppose any number of lawyers could derive any number of different opinions and

certainly, being a practicing lawyer myself, I know that we are often asked to opine on certain issue for clients and to come up with an argument for that. Certainly, in this instance, I consider the most disinterested and unbiased opinion to be that of the Attorney General.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, and again, obviously I'm not an attorney, but were the tribe to receive an opinion that in fact, this did violate the compact and they were to place the funds in escrow, the end result would be the same; we wouldn't have the money and I believe the Attorney General would have no way to compel the tribes to pay the money to the State. Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. No, I don't agree with that. I believe just like any taxpayer or any other entity that owes funds to the State of Connecticut, if they do not comply with their obligations, be those, take another company who's obligated to pay corporate income taxes to the State. If you don't pay your corporate income taxes to the State, there are certain remedies to go after you. Here, it would be the same thing. This would be to me, not paying the payments just based on this RFP going forward would be a direct violation of the compact by the tribes, and would enable the State to move forward with legal proceedings to compel payment by the tribes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, and I suppose we could be having the argument about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. This is all speculative. Thank you very much. I thank the proponent for his

answers, and I know one of the prior speakers talked about the importance of sticking to the facts and I agree. It's very important to stick to the facts. Representative Skulczyck stated some very important facts. The \$270 million dollars that the tribes, Mashantucket's, Pequot's and the Mohegan's pay to the State and its municipalities every year, the \$7.5 billion that they've paid to Connecticut over the life of the compact, the million and billions of dollars that would be lost were this RFP to go ahead, be approved for an entity other than the two tribes who currently supply gaming in the State, for the three, four, five years that a casino would be built, that's a fact. That money would no longer be coming our way. We talked about how this has no ill effect on the East Windsor Casino. Let's face it, if you're going to the market seeking funding for a new venture and your funders say, oh excuse me, there's a competitor opening 20, 30, 40 miles away from you, I don't think your revenue projections are that great so it's gonna cost you more if we're even going to lend to you, and at the end of the day,

Representative Skulczyck talked about the importance of the tribes to my part of the State, but it's not just that. They're incredibly important to the entire State. They're incredibly important to the municipalities both through the money they pay through their philanthropic ventures, through their job creation, and I don't know this is something we should risk. If we're going to open an RFP process and have no intention of awarding casino rights to anyone other than the tribes, why are we performing this process? And if we are performing this process in order to award it to an entity other than the tribes, then we have in fact violated the compact, so I will listen with interest to the rest of the discussion, but I will be a no on this bill. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Hennessy.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I just want to make a few comments. I am the Chair of

the Bridgeport Delegation and I just want to commend these members for their hard work in getting us to this point and working with the New Haven delegation. I think it just proves that we're doing a good job, and I wanna thank the Chair of the Public Safety Committee for his due diligence in forwarding what he considers to be a fair and open proposal, which is an RFP with no strings attached. And I also wanna thank the ranking member of Public Safety for his support. This is a bipartisan initiative. This helps Bridgeport, but as I've always said ever since I got elected that the future of Connecticut is based on the future of Bridgeport, that Bridgeport is the economic engine for the State of Connecticut and until Bridgeport can in fact engage with all the potential that is lying waiting to be engaged, the State of Connecticut is not going to move forward. This property in Bridgeport that is under consideration for this new development, it was cleared out 30 years ago with Eminent domain, moving people and businesses out and all the work that has been done to clear the property of

contaminants and have it ready for development, all that work has gone forward over the years, and it's just waiting for development. And the location of Bridgeport with the highways, with the harbor, with an airport, trains, it's a perfect location which is the reason why MGM is considering that and is very interested in it because the proximity to New York where there are millions of people within an hour who are able to come and not only involve gaming, but so many other facilities that will be at that site. There will be numerous entertainment, retail, hotels, restaurants. This will be a wonderful destination for the entire region, but of course it's not named within the bill because it's an open RFP. If it had named anything, that would basically not be legal. I wanna commend this body for an open, level-headed debate. I think our conduct is very good and I applaud the debate, and I hope that we can support this bill and send it up to the Senate. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative

Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and before this bill was passed temporarily last evening, we had a number of questions and I'd like to pick up from where we left off last evening in discussing this bill. I believe we were discussing the section of the bill line 24-28 regarding the Regional Workforce Development Center requirement within this bill, and through you, Madam Speaker, who would pay for this Regional Workforce Development Center?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, to my good friend, Representative Davis, that would be whoever is the

successful bidder in the RFP, whoever the commercial entity or tribal nation that was selected or other individual.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and currently today, are there other Regional Workforce Development Centers within the State of Connecticut?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I'm not aware if there are or there aren't.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and through you, Madam Speaker, if there were to be one, which I believe there may be, is it the Department of Labor that

would actually operate this Regional Workforce Development Center like the other Workforce Development Centers in the State of Connecticut?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I don't believe that's specified in the bill. I think that would be up to the applicant to spell out how they envision this Regional Workforce Development Center working so that we could then vet that at that time.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the training of employees for the casino gaming facility, and we touched upon this briefly last night, what would be the vision of this? Would it be something where they would be getting and accreditation of some

type, of a license? Would they be getting some sort of certificate program created through this development center? Would they be working with a community college or other university in the State to perhaps have some kind of degree program? What would be the training of these employees and the ultimate resolution of that training?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and again, I would submit that those are all fine ideas and certainly could be included in whatever proposal comes from the applicant as part of this RFP, but I do not believe that the bill calls for any sort of one size fits all model or any specific requirements in that regard.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and in the next section or subsection, line 29-30, it talks about a market analysis to detail the benefits of proposed gaming facilities and through you, Madam Speaker, what is this market analysis? What would that entail?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, to me, a good market analysis would include not just an analysis of whether the region has sufficient work force to staff this facility, not just whether the region has the infrastructure and the population to support this facility, but also what would be the impact be on traffic, surrounding businesses, surrounding municipalities, and what the social impact would be. All of those to me would constitute a good, solid market analysis in which this legislature could eventually vet.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So it would be an all-encompassing market analysis of the general casino gaming market? You touched upon various different areas. I mean would it be limited to just the market for the development of this facility or would it include market analysis of the various different thing that you had mentioned? It's kind of unclear here exactly what type of market they're talking about.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, I would stand by my previous answer. I think that certainly it's up to the applicant to submit the market analysis that they deem is appropriate, certainly to the extent the commissioner of Economic and Community Development and the Department of Consumer Protection

commissioner decide to include additional requirements and specifics in the actual RFP that would go out pursuant to this bill, they could do so, but again, there is not a set list of criteria of what would be in that. It would be part of the RFP process for us to determine based on what comes back.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and in the next section we talk, subsection 5, lines 31-32, there is agree to make a total investment of not less than \$500 million dollars in the proposed gaming facility. What would that total investment include? Would that be purchase price for property, construction of the building, ongoing costs that would be associated with the project? What would that total investment truly mean?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, I believe it would be the initial cost of acquiring the land, of constructing the facility, of outfitting the facility. Certainly that would all have to be laid out as part of the RFP and in that RFP document. Of course, there is no cap on the amount of investment. If an operator wanted to spend more in our State and invest more in this great State, we would certainly consider that.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and in this particular case, there's no real timeline set for that investment, so could it be something where you would only invest \$50 million dollars the first year, \$100 million dollars the next, \$200 million dollars the following year, or is it something that it's truly \$500 million dollars in the actual facility being

built, you know seen more as a one-time investment rather than a \$500-million-dollar investment over ten years.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, through you, no I do not see a requirement that it be an initial investment within the first year or anything of that nature. I think it would be an investment over time similar to how we do some of our economic development, grants with private employers, but certainly, again, the sooner and the more a company is willing or a tribal entity I willing to spend on a project would help put their project to the top of the heap I would imagine.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and in the next section, lines 33-36, subsection 6, it asks that the

information documentation demonstrate their sufficient business ability. Through you, Madam Speaker, what is business ability?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, that to means that they have, it's not just business ability, but it's business ability, experience and financial stability, which I believe should be read together as a combination of factors that would show the business has the wherewithal to actually go forward with a project of his magnitude.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I can understand experience, you've built or you do these facilities, I understand financial capabilities, you could show you know the money in your accounts or your balance sheets, but business ability, would that be getting

into the details of who owns this entity? How it's structured as a board of director or a single owner? Is that what we'd be looking at for business ability?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, I believe those would go a little more to experience than to ability. You know I think ability would be the ability to successfully build a project. One could show that through a demonstrated pattern of success in other type facilities. Certainly it's no secret we've been talking about MGM who has developed projects all over the country, all over the world. The tribal nations have certainly been successful in their ventures, not just here in Connecticut, but in other states. There are other large third party operators who have a demonstrated track record of ability and success in developing casino gaming projects. Certainly any of those would meet the criteria, not

to the exclusion of anybody I haven't named, but certainly those are types of entities that come to mind as an initial matter.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and usually you might think of it as that company doing it and the way I read this, and it's unclear, it just calls for the responder to demonstrate these things and I would think in oftentimes as MGM or one of these other operators goes and builds a new facility, they might actually incorporate as a different business, a different business model, maybe have different people operating each one a little bit differently and through you, Madam Speaker, would this be looking at an overall like an MGM, for instance, as a parent company or would they be looking at the specifics of an LLC perhaps that would be created for a facility somewhere here in Connecticut?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no, I think it would be the parent company. I take the example of the East Windsor, the MMT. I don't believe that MMT, that entity ever had any experience developing anything and was incorporated solely for the purpose of that East Windsor project, but the business ability, experience and financial stability that would be looked at would be the backers of that entity, meaning the Mohegan Tribal Nations and the Foxwoods Tribal Nation.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and you know I'm glad to hear that because I think the business model or practice probably is creating a separate corporation rather than having it be limited to just, you know having the parent company be the one that get

reviewed. The next section, lines 37-38, they submit the designs for the proposed casino facility and a timeline for its construction, and through you, Madam Speaker, would this require them to have the approvals already in place from the town in which they wish to reside, or is this something where they could just say, we'd like to do these things without having any actual approval from the town, you know for anything they're actually looking to do?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, as Representative Davis and I discussed last night, certainly before anything, there would need to be a development agreement entered into between the responder and the host municipality. Some of those initial approvals or the timeline for those approvals may be set forth in the development agreement and would be repeated here through this

section of the bill as well, and the dissection of the RFP when the bill becomes and RFP, but on that point, certainly again, the stronger a case that an applicant makes, the more its application is going to shine. I don't think that this sets forth a minimum timeframe for construction, but what it does is certainly say, let us know where you think you are. The more somebody can back that up, certainly their application will be stronger.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and in this particular case, a situation where you could possibly have an entity respond to this RFP with a project that might not meet or a design that may not meet local zoning code or local zoning procedures, like you know it's a wetlands area and the casino would go there, or something along those lines, and through you, Madam Speaker, would the RFP have to include those challenges that the responder might face when it

comes to getting approvals for the various different aspects of the design in which they are trying to do?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, again, I would hate to handicap exactly what, certain towns have different approvals processes, certain towns have different boards and commissions, so I'd hate to set sort of a statewide standard because of course, there could be applications submitted for any number of municipalities, but again, the more spelled out this is in the RFP, the stronger the application is going to be.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I certainly appreciate that, but what I certainly would not

wanna see is a responder potentially to this RFP if it passed and authorized and signed by the Governor that would have some sort of grandiose design and not be able to actually accomplish what they're trying to do because of restrictions within that municipality or you know restrictions from the state perhaps if it's put near a state road or state highway, but I could imagine perhaps that when they submit these designs as part of their RFP that they would at least outline or project out that they would have to overcome these hurdles in order to achieve that.

Through you, Madam Speaker, lines 39-42 talk about an estimate of number of employees which shall not be less than 2000 persons, and through you, Madam Speaker, how did we come about with the number 2000?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I think that was through the Public Safety Committee process and the

like that that number was settled on. Again, what we're looking for is a project here that would make a substantial economic impact on the State of Connecticut and certainly 2000 additional jobs in our State would make a substantial economic impact.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I appreciate that. I would imagine a \$500 million dollar facility would at least employ, you know a total of 2000 employees, but of course, they could be able to accomplish a lot with a little, I don't know, but I appreciate that answer.

Through you, Madam Speaker, in lines 43-45, it talks about a labor neutrality agreement with organized labor. Through you, Madam Speaker, what if a responder did not want to use organized labor, either within the facility after its built or organized labor to build the facility?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, I think the bill is fairly self-explanatory that there would have to be a labor neutrality agreement and that is one of the requirements of the RFP. I would comment on that though, that it is my understanding that most gaming facilities, not just here in Connecticut, but also throughout the country do in fact rely on organized labor for much of their work force and I do not see this piece of the provision as a substantial hurdle to any bidder there may be.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and just for my own identification while considering this bill, what is a labor neutrality agreement? What does that exactly mean?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, I believe that is an agreement not to contest the organizing of the labor force in that facility.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, so it would be an agreement basically saying we will allow a union to operate and they would sign this up front. Presumably who would they sign it with? I would imagine there's various different labor unions that would be interested in operating within a gaming facility.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, through you, that would be up to

the applicant and again, I would hate to sort of handicap what an applicant can or can't include in their application, you know as we are looking for a frank and honest assessment of what may or may not be out there in the market.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I know that this topic has been discussed for a number of years, at least I think three years now in the State of Connecticut, and through you, Madam Speaker, I understand that MGM has approached Bridgeport about potentially building a facility there, and through you, Madam Speaker, have they come to any kind of written agreement with the city that would look similar to what the development agreement is here?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm not sure whether MGM has in fact entered into any agreement with the city itself. I do understand that MGM has entered into either an agreement to lease or an actual lease itself with a parcel of land located on the lower east end of Bridgeport adjacent to what is colloquially known as the Steel Point Development Project.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and how would this impact the TIF Bond agreement that we have for the Steel Point Agreement? Would this be part of that or would this be adjacent to that development parcel that has an agreement with the State of Connecticut?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, the Representative

raises a good point and I'm not clear on the exact boundaries of the TIF development agreement and the Steel Point special taxing district, but I do know that this piece of property that is being contemplated is actually across the river from the main Steel Point area. It's not on Steel Point itself, it's adjacent to it so it may be outside of the bounds of that district, but I'm not entirely clear on that.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I thank the kind gentleman for his answers and I'm just puzzled by why this legislation is even needed. It's my understanding that there is nothing in state statute prohibiting any casino gaming entity to do everything that's already outlined in here and then present it to the State of Connecticut. They could enter into a development agreement with any city that they choose to. They could come to the State

of Connecticut with a list of all of these various different things, who they employ, what kind of design of a facility they have, and they could come to us and say hey, we're looking to do this, let's go ahead with this, and what concerns me is that, and I'm using the hypothetical of the MGM and the Bridgeport, I guess perhaps it's not hypothetical, they've already started down this path, that they could've already done all of this. They've chosen not to and it's quite puzzling to me why they have not if they truly were interested in building that facility. There's nothing stopping them from doing all of these things within this RFP and coming to us and saying, we're ready to go, give us the go ahead. They didn't do that. Why didn't they do that? Why would they not say, we're ready to go, here we are, let's get going, just approve us to do this. And I don't understand why that's the case. I don't understand why any other casino operator hasn't already done that as well. I understand the Schaghticoke tribe has been trying to build a facility for years, why haven't they been able to do

this and present to us and say, here we go, this is what you're gonna get. The only one reason I can think of is that it's not truly to ever build a facility whether it be in Bridgeport or for some other facility to be built around the state, but instead to delay, delay, delay the East Windsor Facility from ever being actually completed through the approval process perhaps, through the financing process or through the actual construction later on, to push things off as much as possible and for that reason, that specific reason, I will not be supporting this RFP process here. Normally I would appreciate an open process and everything else, but we have a unique relationship with these tribes, one that required us to go forward with their proposal because of the revenue agreement we have with them and the compact. I fear that this would compromise that in the future perhaps in that second step, but there is absolutely no reason for us to need this legislation other than to delay that project. Thank you, Madam Speaker and I will not be supporting it here today.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, speaker, if I could just respond to that last point briefly, because I think the Representative does hit a concern that many folks have touched on about this legislation and really what is the need for it, and I will tell you, I think what the need is, is to figure out whether MGM is the only player out there or whether there are other players, other entities who may be interested, and to figure out what is the full landscape. You know the tribal nations have expressed interest in various parts of the state before and then have changed their mind. I think this gives us the fullest, fairest, most complete picture of anybody and everybody who's interested, and if somebody chooses not to respond to this RFP, then we know they're not interested and can move forward from there, but it gives us a full and complete list, so through you, thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Ryan.

REP. RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Obviously being from southeastern Connecticut, I'm in opposition to this bill. I go along with a lot of what my good friend and neighbor, Representative Skulczyck said. We both grew up in the same neighborhood where the Mohegan Sun is currently located. The Mohegan Sun and Foxwoods have seen an impact on their business as we've seen casinos open in both Rhode Island and in New York. They realized they had to take action to prevent this occurring a third time so their business wasn't adversely effected and that's when they came to us with a proposal about a casino, looking at opening up other casinos through the state. Initially, a few years ago, it was the thought of having three different casinos, but finally it was brought down to just one facility as the other locations were kind of rebuffed and I think one of them at that time was in Bridgeport.

As stated before, the Mohegan's and Mashantucket Pequot's have a long history in this State as citizens of our State. They developed a business model which has served us well. It has provided a lot of revenue to our state and to our community. We've seen over, I know we've heard different figures today, but I'm gonna probably use the highest figure of 7.75 billion dollars to the state and towns, like I said, and we've all benefited from that. This has resulted in employees coming from about 140 cities and the municipalities throughout the state in addition to the many small businesses that have benefited from supplying products and service to the casino. The thought of another facility in the southwestern portion of our state will have a very negative impact on the existing facilities, which have served the state, as I said, so well. It has been pointed out from completed studies a facility in southwestern Connecticut cannot generate the type of profit which would pay for the construction of a facility, that would generate the kind of income that would replace the

contributions that we've talked about to the cities and to the state that we currently enjoy. In other words, it doesn't seem according to these studies that the requirements of this bill could be fulfilled.

So if this proposal did go forward, if a facility was built, it could result in less business at the existing facilities with the concurrent job loss, as we've seen the impact of the opening of the facilities both in New York and Rhode Island. The conditions of the payment of our share of the slot receipts would result in the end of the payments to the municipalities of our state as the conditions of the compacts would be violated. I have to say, in my 26 years in the General Assembly, I've never seen a proposal which cannibalizes one part of the state for the sake of another part. One part of the state benefits at a devastating cost to another region of the state, whereas Representative Skulczyck said he wants to see southwestern Connecticut flourish and develop, and I wanna see that, we don't wanna see it at the expense of southeastern Connecticut. For

these reasons, I won't be supporting this bill, and I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative Ryan. Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I represent the central part of Wallingford which is not involved in either end of this geographic dispute. However, I'm one of a small number of legislators that was here at the beginning of the compact, the longstanding compact between the tribes and the State of Connecticut, and this agreement has been in place and honored for the past 25 years. In the 1980's, the legislature dealt with the tribes that were living in poverty. They regrouped, they got their permission from the federal authorities to be recognized, and they opened casinos and at that time, we struck a deal with them. They would have exclusivity and be the only operators and we, the state, would get 25 percent of their slot revenues.

I voted for that deal and both sides have honored it every year for the past 25 years. The next decade in the 1990's, there were defense layoffs in Connecticut. We lost 20,000 jobs, defense-related jobs in the state. Right at that moment the casinos opened and rehired all these people, so the 20,000 people that were dislocated suddenly had a new job with the casino and they did not lose their homes and they kept their health insurance. So if another town in Connecticut wishes to open a casino, I believe it should be within the existing tribal compact. I believe the legislature should not unilaterally break a promise that we agreed to 25 years ago. We should not allow a non-tribal casino operator to bid on a new casino. The tribes have honorably kept their agreement. For 25 years they have faithfully sent the money into the state and I believe we should also honor the compact and do the same, and for that reason, I will be opposing this bill. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative

Conley.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a few comments and I echo the comments that the good Representative Mary Mushinsky just said as well as the other Representatives from southeastern Connecticut. The casinos and the tribes have provided southeastern Connecticut with many, many jobs, and they've had ups and downs over the last 25 years, but at this point, they've hired over 11,499 workers who are currently employed at our tribal casinos, and those are real jobs that are supporting families, are supporting children through college. They're supporting folks to be able to have their home in southeastern Connecticut. In this RFP is the beginning the process which puts those jobs in southeastern Connecticut at risk, and I am all for growth in the economy across the State of Connecticut, but I am not for growth of one section of the State of Connecticut that affects negatively another section of the State of Connecticut. As we certainly want all of our communities to grow, and

we don't want any of our sister communities to suffer as opposed to that same agreement. The tribes also provide a substantial amount of money to the general fund every year. This year alone, it's about \$270 million dollars, and if the tribe decides that through the RFP that the compact is broken and they withhold some or all of this money, \$270 million dollars is a huge hole in the budget that we all know we cannot fill; \$270 million dollars to our communities is huge. We have been discussing much smaller amounts over the last few days. We have been discussing judicial salaries in just over \$5 to \$12 million dollars, and now we're talking about risking \$270 million dollars toward the general fund. In my communities of Groton and Ledyard, which are very, very close to the casino, Groton alone receives about \$1.3 million dollars, and Ledyard receives \$878,000 dollars. However, other communities, such as looking at Bridgeport, receive over \$5.9 million dollars every year and I know that in my small communities, the loss of a million dollars is very substantial. It's a huge hole that

the community could not easily fill, and I know that in Bridgeport and larger communities, they can't fill \$5 million dollars easily. It's a huge hole and I understand that our Attorney General has said that he believes that starting the RFP doesn't break any compact; however, while I respect his legal opinion, I wanna be sure that we understand that his opinion is not the decision. The decision will happen when the casino sues, and they could cite Appendix A of their compact, which states the tribe agrees that so long a no change in state law is enacted, to permit the operation of video facsimiles or any other commercial casino games by the other person, the tribe will contribute to the state the sum of 25 percent of gross operations. The tribe could clearly say that the RFP is a change in state law and the tribe can sue and they can withhold money and put it in escrow, and the Attorney General I'm sure will cite his opinion and the other Assistant Attorney Generals will do a very good job briefing the facts, but the decision maker is not me and it's not the Attorney General, it's going to be

a judge and we don't know what that judge will say, and if the tribe if they are not successful, can appeal and they can put money in an escrow account, and if the judge allows that to happen, it can be appealed for a while. It can go through many layers of the court system and through that time, \$270 million dollars can be withheld from our general fund and in my mind, that's a gamble I don't think Connecticut should do right now because we do not have an extra \$270 million dollars to gamble with. The RFP is more than a study in my opinion. The RFP is beginning to break the compact and without a plan as to what will happen with breaking the compact, I do not think that putting that kind of money and those kinds of jobs at risk is a wise thing for the State of Connecticut. That is why I oppose this bill and I ask my fellow Representatives to join me in opposing this bill. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. The fine Representative from the 95th, Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, a couple of questions for the proponent of the bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom, please prepare yourself. Please proceed.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, when I look at the proposal, this bill before us, I just have a couple of questions in regard to the intent of this whole process. As I look at lines 1-6, I've been hearing that this is a proposal specifically for one entity, but I don't see an exclusivity within this proposal, so in lines 1-6, my question is who can bid on this project? Can the tribes bid on this project if we move forward with this proposal?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, yes.

In fact, line 5 of the bill specifically says that Indian tribes are permitted to bid.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

So there is no language within this bill that would preclude the tribes from bidding if they do choose to?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, they could bid.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, if this bill is passed by the House, passed by the Senate and signed by the Governor and the tribes put in a very attractive bid, can they move forward with building

a new casino in any part of the State of
Connecticut?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, through you, no, they could not.
They would have to receive approval from this
legislature just like any other bidder would.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, so if I understand
the response correctly, they would have to come back
to the legislature and collectively all of us would
have to vote again to move a new casino forward?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

That's correct, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank the gentleman for those answers. Can you outline, are there any benefit to the host municipality and the surrounding municipalities if this was to move forward?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, in fact the bill calls for at least an \$8-million-dollar direct payment to the host municipality in addition to whatever property taxes they may collect. The bill calls for revenue sharing agreement with the municipalities surrounding the municipality. The bill calls for a Workforce Development Center to be built and of course, there are substantial jobs and folks who would live in the host municipality and surrounding municipalities and frankly, municipalities throughout the state who would

benefit both in terms of residents and local shopping from the disposal income.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, many of the concerns have been that if this bill does move forward that a boxed casino will be built. Thank you, would the gentleman know what would be the minimal investment for this particular project?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Lines 31-32 call for a minimum \$500-million-dollar investment.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and how many, is

there a minimum number of employees that the proposed casino will have to hire?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you, yes, lines 39-40 call for not less than 2000 employees.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Is there any reference about labor neutrality in this proposal?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Madam Speaker, line 43-45.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Would this proposal also, if it moves forward,

provide for small contractors to bid on projects?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Madam Speaker, through you, lines 46-49 call for the use of small contractors and minority business enterprises.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Is there anything in this proposal that would be an out clause for the General Assembly not to act on this bid if it does come back to us?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

In fact, Madam Speaker, as I understand the term out-clause, there are several out-clauses. There is nothing in this agreement that would

require the construction of an additional casino gaming facility in the State of Connecticut. Of course, it may be that no one bids as part of this RFP process. It could be that the Commissioner of Consumer Protection and DCD decide that none of the bids they receive meet the criteria. They could decide not to forward any bids to the General Assembly and then of course, the General Assembly could decide not to act upon any bids it received. It would have to come back to this General Assembly for a subsequent vote.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you and Madam Speaker, is there anything in this bill that provides exclusivity to any one entity to bid or build a new casino if this bill moves forward?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

No, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, so in sense, this is an open bid process where we that believe in open commerce, we that believe in the American way where people can bid on different projects can bid on this particular proposal. So my understanding is that there's no exclusivity and anyone can actually bid on this proposal.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Madam Speaker and in fact, the point of that is to allow, again for frank, honest and open debate and discussion on all of the State's options with moving forward on a casino gaming facility in the State.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

And through you, Madam Speaker, does this bill in any way stop the enactment of public act 17-89, the MMCT venture?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Absolutely not, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answers and the reason I asked those specific questions because I wanna be clear in the transcript is what we're trying to accomplish is to gather more information. We're gonna do a market analysis. We are going to really find out if a new casino in the State of Connecticut is the right move for the State. I think what we're trying to do is gather the data as any business individual would do before

they decide to open a new business within a strategic barrier. It is to do an analysis, gather the data, and see if this would be a great fit their business, and I think that's what we're doing with this proposal. The State of Connecticut is saying should we build new casinos? We don't know the answer to that, but you know what? We're going to find out by establishing an open bid process. Not an exclusive process, but an open bid process that anyone can bid. There has been questions about does this break the compact. A casino has not been built. There's nothing to break. We haven't even broken ground. What this does just moves the process forward and let's take a minute. Let's really take one moment and many in this Chamber are business owners. Imagine, just imagine that you see a good business opportunity and you have the ability to put in a bid to apply for that project because you have 100 employees that work for you and you want to expand, and you're looking at this proposal because it makes sense. It's a good business decision for your company, but when you're about to

put that bid, they tell you, you know what? You cannot bid on this project because this is an exclusive project, an exclusive bid for a specific business. That's not fair. That's not open commerce. We don't want monopolies. We criticize monopolies, but yet what this proposal is attempting to do is just gather information. We can come back next year and say, you know what? The market analysis just doesn't make any sense and we don't wanna move forward, but at least we have the data. We cannot say that today. We cannot assume that this breaks the compact. Then imagine how many laws we would be breaking based on assumptions. We need the process to be played out. We need to gather the data and then we will have the information to make a decision. Madam Speaker, I stand strongly in support of this bill before us cause this is the right thing to do today. Today is the right thing to do. It may not be the right thing tomorrow when we have all the information and market analysis, but today it is. We'll be sending a message to every business owner, every individual in the State of

Connecticut that we as a legislature believe in a competitive process, we believe in an open process, and we are against monopolies. That's the message that we're sending by doing this bill, so I encourage all my colleagues to support the bill before us. Madam Speaker, thank you so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Riley.

REP. RILEY (46TH):

At first I'd like to align my remarks with those from southeastern Connecticut that have spoken before me. I do not want to reiterate what they have said, but I will say that I'm not willing to make a \$270-million-dollar bet. We talked about revenue day in and day out and we will in the next three or four days continue to talk about revenue. This is revenue that we have, and I'm not willing to make a mistake and lose that money. I believe we are possibly jeopardizing that money. We have a good faith relationship with the two tribes that we have in southeastern Connecticut, and they are good

to the State of Connecticut, they have been for 25 years or more. You've heard the figures, you've heard the numbers, the amount of money that they have given to this state is amazing. I understand that the residents of Bridgeport are trying and will to work in a positive manner and fashion to have a casino possibly built or even thought about being built there. I understand that this is a touchy subject for members of this Chamber on both sides. I just cannot at this time support this piece of legislature, and I thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative de la Cruz.

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and through you, one question for the opponent, proponent, not opponent, I'm sorry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom, please prepare yourself. Representative de la Cruz, please proceed.

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Representative, through you, is there is a guarantee, once the casino is operational, say they don't make the money that they think they're gonna make, is there a guarantee, or if they went out of business in the future, is there a guarantee that they'll continue to make a payment?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom?

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, through you, there's no guarantee that a casino is ever even built pursuant to the bill before us.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative de la Cruz.

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Thank you and just some comments now, I'm all set with questions. I wanna talk about the RFP process. Now I'm a sheet metal worker. I don't know if you looked at those handrails up above you and someone had asked me to quote them, which

Mohegan Sun or Foxwoods may do if they were going to potentially build a casino in Bridgeport, I would have to spend maybe a week on developing a quote for those handrails. They would then take that quote and mix it up with a bunch of other quote from different contractors from around the state. That's time, it's money. We're asking a company that's been around in our state for 25 years to now do an RFP for a process that would actually violate an agreement that they signed with the State of Connecticut 25 years ago, so when I keep hearing that it's just an RFP, that's all we're asking, just for them to throw a price out, throw something up against the window, see if it sticks. There's cost associated with an RFP. It's very, very expensive and I think in this room, maybe we don't even talk about that, I haven't heard one speaker mention it, but I can assure you it's not something that, even MGM or Foxwoods goes into lightheartedly because if you potentially win that bid, now you have this project on your hands and you're not sure what the dollar amount are so I wouldn't take that lightly.

Twenty-five years ago roughly, the State of Connecticut married the Indian tribes. We basically are in a marriage right now and when everybody just seems to think that they have no ground to stand on if this RFP goes through and they have a compact with another casino, just imaging you asking your spouse after 25 years to search for a new girlfriend or boyfriend. Do you think they're gonna give you the full two years to do that? The result of this divorce by the way, if we do have a divorce, is we lose the kids, the house, the car and everything. There is no middle ground here. If we break the compact, we lose \$270 million dollars the next day. That's a fact and that's the kind of money that we're talking about here and again, as my Representative Conley had mentioned earlier, we were talking about \$12 million dollars the other day and spoke about it for probably five hours, so \$270 million dollars is a real number and we can't take that chance. And as for my friends on the other side of the state, I feel like I'm standing with them right now cause we talk about Eastern

Connecticut and say we're sticking together, this issue is not an Eastern Connecticut issue. The Pequot fund divvies \$70 million dollars to a bunch of communities that have been affected, but overall \$270 million dollars go to the general fund budget, so if you're in a town that didn't make the list, I hope you don't feel like you have no skin in the game because we all have skin in the game in this. If there's \$270 million dollars going to the general fund, we're all part of this.

And now the competition part. I'm not sure if you guys are familiar with gambling. My family is very familiar with it. I spoke about this to a few folks.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

[Gavel] If we could please quiet our conversation or take them outside and be respectful of this debate, that would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, I should've started off with a joke, but what I was talking about was

the competition and imagine competitively if for some reason a casino in Bridgeport wins the bid, and now they're the lone casino and the compact is broken. We've just given two casinos a \$250-million-dollar budget to try to put that other one casino out of business and to me, they wouldn't be true to their tribe. They wouldn't be true to their business model hadn't they tried to do that. They had the ability to change the odds on tables. They can crank machines up to a point where they're winning faster. There's a bunch of different ways that can attract gamblers and gamblers will drive right by a casino for another hour and a half to another casino if the odds on a craps table are one point higher or black jack or the machines are working better. Our casinos have been here for 25 years. They have information on folks who already gamble so if a Bridgeport casino opens up and there's a gentleman that lives four miles from that new casino, and they know that every Friday and Saturday he comes down and gambles \$200 dollars, they already have that information about that

gentleman. If he stops coming once the casino opens, they just send him a voucher to come gamble for free until we can put that other casino out of business, and the reason I asked if there was a guarantee on the money is because I would fully expect two casinos in our state to handily put that one casino out of business because they're not paying taxes. Because they'll be able to fully execute every earned dollar to try to put that other one out of business and this is my opinion. I'm not telling you what they would or should do, but I can tell if it was my casino and I was paying zero taxes, I would make sure that I put them out of business and once the doors are closed, there's no guarantee on money, we're done with money from any casino and oh by the way, when we're coming up with these numbers, we're talking about replacing \$270 million dollars. What I remind folks is, if you didn't see the growth of a casino like I've been able to do, in 1992 when they first opened the doors and I was a young person and saw a town of Ledyard with no police department, with just two state

troopers. They have a full police department now with a chief. East Lyme has a full police department with a chief. Montville, when the casino had first opened, had hired three individual Chinese teachers because they speak different dialects. They have Haitian teachers. The cost in our area went up and we are very appreciative for the folks that did show up at our doors. We love the people that are working at the casino, but it did come with a cost, so if we're looking at just replacing the \$270 million dollars, that's not enough cause the new casino on the other side of the state that opens up will be competing for the very same workers, the workers who will bring to schools that need to be educated. Many times they come and speak a separate language to accommodate the different tables that we have in the casino. There's a whole section for Chinese gaming which drove our Chinese population in schools which added more money to our budget, so we can't just look at the \$270-million-dollar replacement, and once that \$270 million dollars went away, Eastern Connecticut still has all those bills,

bills that we've incurred for the betterment of the state, for the betterment of our community, yes, we're very proud of what we have, but they're bills nonetheless. How do we get money to pay for those teachers if the compact money is gone? How will they get new money on the other side if we're all splitting \$270 million dollars with the impact of three new casinos? Now southeastern Connecticut has transitioned. You used to get on the road at 3 o'clock at night on 395 and you could be the only person on the road after 6 o'clock at night. That's completely changed. The police presence is more and I mentioned the schools already and where we are with that, but again, I think the pawns in this game, and I feel bad about it when you walk out in the hallways and folks are really rooting for their hometown and trying to get the casino in, I think it's very disingenuous of the other side. I believe that it's a ploy to try to slow up the casino in Windsor, cause really where is there skin in the game? As one representative said earlier, why wouldn't they just come with an offer? Why wouldn't

they just say, here we are, cause that makes sense and when we say we're putting this big RFP out because we don't know how many, we're not putting an RFP out to change the boiler in our house. I'm not gonna get ten plumbers, it's not Angie's List. There's two or three or four players in the United States of America and internationally that are gonna be interested and if any of them were interested, they would've been here already with money in hand. Ladies and gentleman, I'm obviously not gonna support this. I do wanna thank my good friend that did bring the bill because I understand again, if it was from my side and I was in Bridgeport, I could see where you would have that attitude where you want it in your city, where you wanna make sure you have the best for your city, but from my point of view and from my experience with the casinos, the \$270 million dollars that we're even talking about possibly raising is not enough, so I respectfully disagree and hopefully everyone can vote no on this. A vote for no on this issue is a yes to a 25-year relationship we've had with a company that's

supported our state for many, many years so thank you, Madam Speaker and thank you everyone for listening.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative of the 116th, please proceed, sir.

REP. DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I just have a few general comments about this bill. This is a very passionate debate on all sides and I certainly respect all of my colleagues and where they stand, and I believe that it's a great debate for us to have because it talks about a very important asset of the State of Connecticut, so you know, I've been involved now for two years on this debate because I sit on Public Safety, and when I first walked in here to the Chamber this morning, I said to myself, you know we really don't know as the State of Connecticut what a gaming license is worth. But you know what? We do know what a gaming license is worth so let's talk about it. In 2007, we were receiving \$430 million dollars from the tribes. So

in 2007, a license on gaming in the State of Connecticut was worth \$430 million dollars to the State. Fast forward to 2017, that number has gone to \$270 million dollars. So when we talk about \$270 million dollars to the State, we are absolutely receiving that revenue from the tribes, but let's look at the fact that we went from \$430 million dollars to \$270 million dollars. Let's also talk about some of the bills last year that relate to this bill. I certainly was supportive of the bill last year that concerned about East Windsor because we are concerned about jobs all over the State of Connecticut, but let's talk about where that stands now in relation to this bill. This bill does not affect the compact. It does not affect East Windsor; however, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the federal government have not signed off on East Windsor so my concern as a legislator is, what we do if they do not sign off on East Windsor? If the federal government and the Bureau of Indian Affairs never approves East Windsor, then our problem that we attempted to solve last year as far as jobs, as

far as declining revenue, our problem remains the same. The only thing that changes is we lose another year where we have no idea what other proposal for the State of Connecticut may be out there. We do not know where we stand on gaming. We do not know what the true value of that license is, and another gaming bill that would've also helped us to understand where we stand that failed in Appropriations this year, failed due to a fiscal note that even OFA couldn't determine the accuracy of because the data on gaming and on a study is sold that we were looking at data from a decade ago. We have an asset in the State of Connecticut. The gaming license, the opportunity to do gaming in Connecticut is a license from the State of Connecticut and there are many unanswered questions absolutely. We're all concerned about our communities, our constituents, jobs throughout the state, absolutely. But let's be clear, if this proposal fails to pass, we have no idea what we're going to do about the declining revenue in the Pequot fund. We have no idea what we're gonna do

about jobs, even in the eastern part of the state. If the federal government never signs off on East Windsor, we are back to square one and when is it going to be viable for us to consider what our options are as a state? When the revenue goes from 270 to 100 to \$50 million dollars? When is it worth it for the state? We have been great partners with the tribes. The tribes have been great partners with us. There is no dispute in that. We provide the tribes with \$12 million dollars a year for the ability to run Keno as an example and at this stage of the game, what does it hurt for the State of Connecticut to say, we need to have the information in our back pocket on what exact proposals could be out there, and what exactly is a license to operate in Connecticut worth. We may see the tribes come back to the State of Connecticut after this RFP and say we wanna participate or we wanna sit down with you and talk about mutually amending the compact, maybe they give us revenue on table games, which we don't get right now. Maybe they up their contribution from 25 percent on slots, maybe they

don't. Maybe the proposals come back and we say, we've got a great deal with the tribes. Let's leave everything alone. But we don't know and standing here today, we have more questions than we have answers and unless we pass a proposal like this, we are never going to know and the revenue is going to continue to decline and one more point, Madam Speaker that I would point out is the tribes, certainly the Mohegan, did compete in Massachusetts. They did compete for a license in Springfield and they have every right to and if I was in their shoes, I would've too because it's a smart business decision and we need to ensure that we're making the smart business decisions for the State of Connecticut. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

It's been an interesting debate, Madam Speaker. I've enjoyed listening to it, a lot of passion by both sides. I have a couple of question to the

proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom? Please proceed,
Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

I apologize in advance, I've been in and out of
the Chamber working on different matters so if it's
been asked and answered, apology is already offered.
The compact that we have now with the tribes, how
long does that go through?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, I'm not aware of a
termination date of the contract.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

I'm a little surprised by that, so there's no
idea when the compact terminates?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

I'm not aware, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

I think maybe that's something we should know because there's been a lot of dialogue about violating the compact and if the compact terminate in two years, then perhaps this should be put on hold for two years. If it terminates in two months, that's even more reason to hold off, so maybe we can get that answer before the dialogue ends here tonight. I think it's an important aspect and frankly I'm surprised we don't know. Is there anything in the bill that would allow this process to go forward without coming back to the legislature and I know that question has been asked and answered, but my question goes to is there language in here that if the legislature fails to act, fails

to do something, fails to vote, does it become automatically approved?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

No, it does not become automatically approved, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

So then it would have to come back here for a vote, correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, I hope we can get the

answer to the first question as the night goes on.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom has the answer to your question, sir.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I just wanna clarify before was I don't believe there is an end date to the compact. I believe it continues in perpetuity barring some other negotiation of it or some other clause being invoked. It certainly does not terminate in the next two months or even two years without further action by the state.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Camillo. Representative Rosario.

REP. ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand in strong support of this bill because I believe, I truly believe that this bill will help set the course of the future of gaming in the State of Connecticut and will for once, put us on the offensive and not the defensive. Now I understand that the tribes have

been very generous and they've been a great partner to the State of Connecticut for the last 25 years, and that's all great, we appreciate it, thank you very much. However, I'm afraid of the next 25 years. Ladies and gentleman, the Pequot fund has been shrinking each and every year and if we don't wanna take a \$25 million dollar bet this year, and if we don't do something about it, next year it's gonna be a \$270-million-dollar bet, \$190 million dollar bet and lower and lower and lower as we move along into the future. Competition is coming. The competition is coming and as far as the State of Connecticut is concerned, I've been hearing an outcry about corporations coming into the state needing subsidies, corporate taxpayer dollars, corporate welfare to provide jobs in the State of Connecticut with very little return on investment, and at MGM we have a Fortune 300 company willing to invest \$675 million dollars into one of the most distressed areas in the country, not the state, the country! And when someone comes along with an offer like that, I think we should listen, and as far as

the tribes are concerned, we're not anti-tribe. We welcome the tribes. We have an open-door policy in Bridgeport for the tribes and in 1995, under an RFP process, the tribes along with three other gaming companies bid on a casino in Bridgeport and guess who won? The tribes. They have a proven track record of bidding and putting a good proposal forward in Bridgeport and what this bill does is it calls MGM's bluff. If you're really serious about coming to Bridgeport, put your cards on the table, and tribes, if you really wanna be a partner in Connecticut, you have to think about the entire State of Connecticut, not just portions of the State of Connecticut because we need to move our state forward together. Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Boyd.

REP. BOYD (50TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be brief. For two years now I've been on the Public Safety Committee and sat through hours and hours of

testimony, last year regarding East Windsor, this year regarding this proposal. There's a few points I'd like to make. One, I was showing great preference to the bill that we had before us to do a comprehensive study on gambling in the state because we have serious discussions about the lottery, about sports betting, about casinos, and we need to really take a holistic approach. I am gravely concerned that this discussion is one that's compiled upon the Native American tribes and the casinos they operate having a reduced amount of business and a reduced amount of money that's coming into the Pequot Fund, which has been alluded to and is a fact. Since the casinos opened in the early 90's, they were literally the only game in town. I grew up in Plainfield which had a dog track that was very active and really was the closest thing other than the Jai Lai in the state. About two years into the casinos opening and their models going, that went away, and now in 2018, there are more casinos in the northeast than there were in the early 90's so adding another one or the prospect of another one is

only going to keep moving around the perspective business. Now it's quite possible the business model the tribes have is not sustainable and they're gonna have to close or reduce their thing. They are now diversifying their business into water parks and other things. I feel as though if we add another casino in the State of Connecticut, and I had the very same concern when East Windsor was on the table, is that we're just taking the block of people who visit these casinos and sending them to different destinations. With Rhode Island and Massachusetts having them, I don't think that we wanna build the economy of the State of Connecticut off just gaming, and one of the things that has not come up here, of which the hours and hours of testimony has happened, is the societal effects of gambling, and we had numerous people come before the Public Safety Committee and talk to us about their addictions, and again, our purview here is not necessarily that, but it's something that we need to consider. You know, to my friends in Bridgeport, you are our largest city in the state and we need to

support you guys. We need to have jobs for people there. One of the things that I've learned coming from my rural towns up here is that our cities need jobs and I'm sure if Senator Gomes were here, he'd be saying jobs, jobs, jobs and we need to do that as a state because it's our largest cities and if our cities are not stronger, our state is not strong. But I struggle with the fact that casinos are designed to take people's money. The whole business model is on people losing with a few winners. And there's a whole bunch of effects that are business, societal, public safety, addiction, bankruptcy, crime and even suicide costs that come with this. Madam Speaker, I don't think we need any more casinos in Connecticut. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. The fine Representative of the 38th, madam McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to this bill and if I may make a few comments and a very brief couple of quick questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you. First I'd like to say that I tend to disagree with the assessment that has been made here this evening that this proposal is innocuous. I believe that if we do go out, it is a two-pronged process, but if we do go out with an RFP and the second portion is actually continued, that it would be in violation of the compact and then we would risk losing the \$270 million dollars that the two tribes have contributed and the \$7.5 billion dollars we wanna remember that they have contributed over the last 25 years, but also that this legislative body did pass a bill last session that allowed the casino to combine their plans and to go forward with East Windsor, and I would just like to go on the record to point out that in southeastern Connecticut, the two tribes employ 12,000 employees and I have thousands in my District that rely on these good-paying jobs to continue to protect their families and to make a good living so we do in fact

risk that if this proposal were to go to fruition with an RFP that was chosen, but I do have a question to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you. First, and I know you may have answered this yesterday, so I do apologize, but I did go through the testimony that was supplied, and can you remark if the Consumer of Economic Community and Economic Development has agreed to that they are able and capable of going out for an RFP process?

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, I answered yesterday, I have not had that conversation directly with them. If testimony was submitted during the Public Safety Committee process, then the testimony is what it is.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you for that answer, but in reading the testimony, the commissioner clearly states that they do not have that expertise and the gaming industry does not fall within their purview. Secondly, if I may Madam Speaker, continue with a new question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you. I would just like to hear, I don't see any provision in the current legislation that indicates what would occur if for instance the RFP went out and a developer, an individual or a business was chosen to go forward, is there any provision? How do we have any safety measure that if the developer, and I've seen this consistently throughout the state, goes forward and they fail and this evening, we keep hearing about how these two casinos are struggling for survival at this time, so how would that leave the state if we were to lose

the money that we're gaining currently, we've broken the compact so now we don't have the funding from the two casinos, and the new casino fails? Thank you.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I guess I would quibble a little bit with the premise of the question at the beginning. As I've stated numerous times here today, I have not seen any legal support for the position that by allowing an RFP we would be in violation of the compact. It's my understanding and the testimony from the Attorney General's office has been fairly clear. I believe that the tribes would continue to be obligated to make their payments unless and until at least the point at which the legislature were to come back in and authorize the construction of another facility.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and through you, while I disagree with that appraisal because to send out the RFP alone may not be in violation of the compact, but if we go to the next step, we are in violation and therefore, we do risk losing the funding that the tribes contribute right now, so I'm just curious as to why we would go through that process.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, to the extent this RFP is successful and there are bidders and one or more bids are submitted to the legislature next year, I'm sure we would have a robust debate at the committee level and ultimately here on the floor about that exact point. You know, like I said, I think that that would all need to be spelled out in the RFP in an honest, open and transparent manner, and we could

evaluate that at that given time.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. My comment to that would be that this in some effect is truly another casino expansion piece of legislation because if we break the compact with the tribes, and they continue as you pointed out earlier, the East Windsor project could continue, so we would have three casinos and then if we accept a proposal out to RFP, we could potentially have four casinos in the State of Connecticut, and in such a small state, I don't think we want to saturate our state with so many casinos. Thank you.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

I didn't catch a question to that, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was just making the comment that do you see this as the potential to being an expansion of casinos in the State of Connecticut?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Madam Speaker and of course the RFP calls for an economic analysis of whether, in fact another casino could be supported in another region of the state, that would be part of the RFP that's submitted.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I will just end on saying again that I think the two tribes have been here in the state for over 350 years. We've built up, in the last 25 years, mutual trust with them.

They've been good partners, as mentioned earlier, doing plenty of philanthropic activities and in discussion with them, I too am concerned about the societal impacts and gambling in the state, and they have promised to continue to support those initiatives, to work with us on mental health initiatives and substance and abuse treatment, so I am concerned about those areas as some of my colleagues have said, but overall to me, this is job protection for my southeastern Connecticut, so I will oppose the legislation in front of us tonight. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Baker.

REP. BAKER (124TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm gonna be brief. I had some points that I wanted to be make, but I'm gonna be brief in respect to everybody's time here. When I first found out about this RFP process, I realized on the proposal, part of it was gonna be in my district and I had a lot of concerns on what my

colleagues on both sides of the aisle of this project. This particular project, I could walk to this project before half of us could get to the LOB building. I had concerns about the traffic study, the impact on my community and how it was gonna affect. I thought about Atlantic City from the perspective of what the casino has done to the outside of it. I was very concerned in those terms, but one of the things I had to realize as the dynamics and the publicity rose up and it was like a wave that started to come through Bridgeport, and one of the thing I was able to realize and stuff and the impact that was having and people were starting to come to Bridgeport, ask questions, look around and look at the brownfields and the depressed areas in Bridgeport, and all of a sudden, Bridgeport became this goldmine to people. I started to see active in the real estate. People started to buy properties, people from New York. People were coming down from Massachusetts man, and I said, wow! We could ride this wave out. We could truly ride this wave out and bring Bridgeport back, and as I

talked to many of the people here in Chamber, and a lot of you have ties in Bridgeport, many of you were born and raised there, and many people would talk about how Bridgeport was the industrial city of Connecticut. At one time, you get a job and walk off the job, you'd walk down the street, you'd get another job, you had three or four jobs. All that has changed. We weren't prepared for that at all. This is an opportunity for us to get back and move. As I sit in this Chamber and I make decisions about things that go on here in the State of Connecticut, yes I do, I have ownership. Two weeks ago after the session, I got in my car and I drove to the Mohegan Sun. I had dinner there. I don't gamble, but I had dinner there and I took the opportunity to put back into that community, so I know what it's like for you have to jobs there and I was trying to be supportive of that. I go to many places here in the State of Connecticut and try to be supportive of the growth in the State of Connecticut. We cannot be so paralyzed by fear, cause many of us here have or own business and we understand when somebody wants to

open up a business across the street from us, we're biting our fingernails trying to figure out what are we gonna do? What kind of impact cause we need to get our stuff together. We realize the competitor has just come across the street and we gotta do something to keep our customers. That's what we need to do here in Connecticut. The world is watching us. The world is watching us. They wanna see just how friendly we are. This proposal gives the opportunity to review, to just review, how we can be able to move Connecticut forward so we need to be able to look and do those things, so I ask that you just take the opportunity to look at this proposal and we can sit down and we can have that conversation because all of this room have ownership on how we turn Connecticut and continue forward. Thank you, each and every one of you for sharing your concerns, and I look forward to sitting down and talking to you so we dialogue how we can make Connecticut a great city as it was before. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative
France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I had a number of questions, but the substance of those questions have been asked and answered and so I'll just summarize with some points. Now we've heard some phrases, open and transparent, free market, good government, open bid process and those are nice phrases to hear, and it's interesting cause I have a debate with a good friend of mine regarding these very points and if this was 1776, we could have that conversation, but I will tell you in the intervening 240 plus years, we have corrupted that process so that we are not a free market in many cases because we have made laws. We are not pure as we were 240 plus years ago, both at the state and federal level and so, you have to deal with where you are and in this particular industry, in this particular state, 26 years ago, we made a decision as a legislature to enter into an agreement with two tribes to give exclusive rights to gaming in this state. So in

effect, we ended the free market in that industry and gave exclusive rights to a single entity, or two tribes. So to talk about nice phrases that sound what everybody wants, we have to deal with where we are. So in that case, when we look at how we arrived in this position today, in the last three, four years, due to the impending opening of a casino in Massachusetts, the tribes approached the legislature and they said, you know we have done nothing to stem the competition that has happened in our surrounding states. As has been pointed out by others, you know for the first decade that the two casinos were here, they essentially were alone and exclusive throughout the area of New England. The closest casinos were really Atlantic City for that time, but that all changed in the early 2000's. New York, Rhode Island, Massachusetts. There have been casinos that have opened that have taken part of that revenue away, and unlike many other industries, casino revenue and casino gambling is very much like a fixed pie in a sense that in a region, you have a fixed amount of revenue that is drawn from the

population of gamblers. It's not like manufacturing where you can create a demand for a product and entice people to buy more. Essentially, it is a fixed pie. There is some growth when a new facility opens up because there's excitement there and you draw people from the region, but by and large, the reason we're seeing reductions in revenue, as was pointed in a previous comment from a peak of around \$400 million dollars a little over a decade ago to now around \$270 million dollars is not really the value of the license, cause the license is not a fixed price. The license is generally given as a percentage of gaming revenue and given that, that's what the license was of value, to use that vernacular, but essentially the reason that the revenue is dropping is because of competition, just like every other industry. As the last speaker just mentioned, if a business opens in your field across the street, you're concerned about how you're going to continue and remain viable so when the tribes came to the legislature and asked for an opportunity, we entered into effectively a

legislative contract. In 2015, the original proposal was for up to three locations and at the time, the tribes were talking about initially north of Hartford, between Hartford and the border to stem off the latest competition from the casino in Springfield. The second priority was in the Danbury area and the third priority was the southwestern part of the state and you might ask, you know, a previous speaker also talked about you know 20 plus years ago they offered a bid on a casino in Bridgeport. Well the market was very different then. Once again, in 1995, there were two casinos in Eastern Connecticut and Atlantic City, so building a casino in Bridgeport, given the market, would make sense then, but today, the market is very different. You have three substantial casinos in the greater New York area. You have three casinos going in in Massachusetts, you have gambling in Rhode Island. The market is very different today than it was then. So what did we tell the tribes? We said come together, form a business entity, work together, and then seek out a town to host a casino

and they did that. The plan was to come back in the 2016 session, they were not able to complete that process until the 2017 session and they came back to us, and East Windsor was the town that they were able to receive an offer and receive acceptance of putting a casino in that town, and they came back to us and we codified in statute and approved them to move forward. Now some have raised the issue of the BIA approving East Windsor. Well technically, BIA does not approve East Windsor; they approve the change in the compact and if you look at their process, their process is they have 45 days to review a change to reject, not to approve. At the end of that 45 days, much like we see in our own contracts that go on the House Calendar, in 30 days they are deemed approved, the compact is deemed approved. The technicality that has not happened is the publishing of that decision in the federal register and the tribes currently have a course case to try and have that happen, but that is the technicality that has not happened, so it is not accurate to claim that the BIA approves the East

Windsor location; it's really the change in the compact. But I go back to what we've done over the last three years in approving the location in East Windsor. We've entered into effectively a contract. By legislation that contract is binding. And so here we are, less than a year later, after we have entered into a contract with a business in our state, who as many have pointed out have been good partners for 26 years and what are doing? We are effectively changing the market place. The proponent of the bill and others have talked about that the RFP has no effect on East Windsor and while yes, the removed the original section of the bill that would've taken East Windsor out of the opportunity, the reality is that the RFP does change the market place and you might ask why? Because as they're going for financing to enter into the construction of this facility in East Windsor, the banks look at that revenue projection, and the revenue projection was based on one new casino opening up in Springfield in their region. Well now the banks are looking at the deal and going, now

there's a potential that the legislature of the State of Connecticut within a year may authorize another casino, and that creates a substantially increased risk to a hundreds of millions of dollars-loan for construction. It is very possible that there would not be a bank that would offer that loan based on just issuing an RFP because it brings uncertainty to the market place. And banks, when they issue loans, they don't like uncertainty. So I would argue that the RFP does have a potential effect and a real effect on the existing agreement that we have made with the two tribes to open a casino in the East Windsor area.

I'll wrap up. I think that what we see here as many have put out a great relationship for a long time and it's not just the \$270 million dollars they currently give and the peak of around \$400 million dollars a little over a decade ago. It is their involvement in the communities in southeastern Connecticut. As some have eluded to, when the casinos opened up, it was a time where the Sea Wolf program was canceled and EB went from an employment

level of about 26,000 employees to 8,000 employees and absent the casinos with substantial hiring in southeastern Connecticut, you would've had a significant depression in that localized area of our state, I predict. Now we obviously didn't have a predictability of we were planning to have casinos open up, but it is interesting that the timing was such that it did allow southeastern Connecticut to not have as big an economic impact with losing 18,000 jobs in Electric Boat. What we're seeing now is a resurgence there, but it's been 20+ years since that time and as many have eluded to, the tribes have been great partners, not just to the State of Connecticut, but locally. If you look at the distribution of the suppliers and the service providers to those casinos, they spread well across the State of Connecticut. Fully two-thirds of the State of Connecticut is directly involved in that business, and there are businesses in our local in southeastern Connecticut that are directly dependent on those casinos. I remember one such business in Groton, Paul's TV, came to our southeastern

Connecticut delegation a little over a year ago and talked about the impact they have, that the casinos have by buying their TV's and appliances through that business and what the gentleman expressed to us was it was essentially worth two employees to him, and if the casinos stopped the business with him and those two employees went away, it was unlikely that he would be able to stay in business. Within six months, Paul's TV closed so clearly the equation changed in some fashion, but clearly that is the impact and the economic benefit that the casinos bring to a region of southeastern Connecticut as well as across the state. So I would argue that gambling, ironically gambling with \$270 million dollars on red and rolling the dice. I don't think that's a good bet for the State of Connecticut and I would urge my colleagues to turn down this RFP and we want to go forward with what would be a legitimate way to assess the market, do a feasibility study. Get an expert, because I would argue as was eluded to before, DECD has already stated they don't have the expertise to assess an

RFP, and I will argue that the Department of Consumer Protection, that's not their purview. They issue regulations, they ensure that the market is fair for consumers so they do not have the expertise to assess an RFP. So I would argue who's gonna do that. So if we truly wanna know what the market will bear, there are experts out there that can do it, and I would argue that neither DECD who have stated in testimony they do not have the expertise, nor the Department of Consumer Protection, who issues regular and ensures fair consumer protection, neither of those have the expertise so I would urge rejection of this bill and if we want to proceed forward, then proceed forward with a feasibility study by a consultant that has the expertise to truly give us the information we need. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. The fine Representative from the 151st.

REP. CAMILLO (151ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a quick

question, point of clarity, legislative intent to the good Chairman, the good proponent from Bridgeport.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, sir, he is prepared.

REP. CAMILLO (151ST):

Thank you. When we say RFP, I know in our town when we put out request for proposals, it usually means that the project or the service to be awarded are eminent, and then a winning bid is selected and then you're off to the races. Is that the case here? I think you've explained this before, I just wanna make sure for a point of clarity.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. For clarity, no, that's not the case here. There is absolutely no obligation that after we get these proposals back in that one is ultimately selected.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151ST):

I wanna thank the good friend from Bridgeport for the answer and thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Orange.

REP. ORANGE (48TH):

Hello, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good evening, madam. Please proceed.

REP. ORANGE (48TH):

It's nice to see you there and certainly, this debate, I'm so happy that it was PT'd last night and we're doing it at 5:30 p.m. instead of 5:30 a.m. I think we're all a lot kinder at 5:30 p.m. than we are at 5:30 a.m., at least I am. I stand here opposed to this bill, and I stand here and I've listened to the conversation in this Chamber and the passion that we all share is to represent our districts and our people. But we are debating

opening and RFP process to add casinos in our state. Although we don't really know who's coming, MGM has been around so we're assuming that they're looking at Bridgeport because that is what we've been told. Someone in their comments this afternoon said put the RFP out there and call their bluff. Well sitting on the Public Safety Committee and during the public hearing process, I asked MGM when they were testifying that should East Windsor not be built, would you still be interested in Bridgeport and the answer to me was no. So I just wanna state that, be careful what you wish for because sometimes it just doesn't happen, and also going back to the casinos, they are exclusive under the current compact and the compact does not terminate. I know that question was asked and I just wanna reiterate that it does not terminate. It's just like a treaty so with that being said, Mr. Speaker, how are ya? With that being said, I'm going to just say that I am opposed and I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Representative Dubitsky of the 47th District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I don't think it will come as a surprise to anybody here that I am a constitutional conservative. I believe that the decisions of the people should be made by the people and not by the government. I think voluntary transactions among individuals and among companies are the best way to foster a society with millions of people working and making decisions based on their interests creates the most prosperous, safest, fairest, most equal and most free society on the face of this earth, and because of that I believe in open markets. I think markets should be open to allow people and companies with the best chance of succeeding to compete. That brings the best products and services to consumer, fosters innovation, increases choice, and brings down prices. I have always wanted to see

competition in this state for casinos. I want the free market to decide who, where, when and how big casinos should be, and they should be built based on what the people want, and what they're willing to pay for because companies will provide what people want if people come up with their money, and it will make room for new ideas when businesses fail. In a situation like that, we would have the state establishing basic guidelines, basic regulations, taking its cut off the top via taxes and otherwise keeping his hands off the market. That's the way it should work, but that's not the way it is in Connecticut.

In Connecticut, with regard to casinos, the state is both the regulator of the market and a participator in the market. Long before I ever got to the legislature, the state contracted to give the tribes a monopoly on gambling in the state. The state promised the tribes that they would be the only players in the state, that if the tribes gave the state 25 percent of the slot, the state would make sure that they were the only player. The state

wouldn't let anybody else into the market regardless of free market principles and regardless of free market demand, and the tribes built an enormous business on that monopoly. They built two of the largest casinos in the world and they kick off a lot of money to the state. They held up their end of the deal. They've been very good partners and good neighbors in this state and so far, we have kept our end of the deal. But now two different things are at play. The state is broke and needs even more money, and MGM is cutting into the action with a new casino right across the border. So market forces are now bumping up against the government imposed monopoly. Tribes have an interest in maintaining that monopoly cause they built their business on that state's promise and the state wants to maintain the revenue or even increase it. So as a lateral move, the state made a side deal with the tribe to let them build a third casino intended to intercept the customers that were heading north into Springfield, but MGM's not gonna just sit there and let that happen, so they tried to outflank the

tribes and the state and they promised the state that they were gonna maintain or even exceed those revenues if they could build their own casino. And they convinced the state, or they tried to convince the state and tried to convince us that we're getting a bad deal with the tribes, that we're not getting enough money out of the tribes. So they're trying to entice us with this glorious payday. They're trying to entice us to break our compact with the tribes, to dump the tribes that have been good partner to us. MGM is trying to entice us to stop receiving that 25 percent and to open up the market to free enterprise. Or is it? That is the question. Why is MGM trying to ask us to open up our markets now? We're told that there's this great opportunity to build an enormous casino in Bridgeport, to build this massive new casino and it's gonna be great. Will it be big enough to replace the 25 percent that we're gonna lose from the tribes? And they're asking us to allow them to do that in Bridgeport. So the question before us is, is that gonna happen? Is that even likely?

Well frankly, I smell a rat. In order to replace the 25 percent that the tribes are giving us, the Bridgeport casino needs to be massive. It needs to replace the revenue being kicked off by two of the biggest casinos in the world. It needs to be from any estimates the single most profitable casino on the planet to replace that money and without being that big and kicking off that much revenue, the numbers simply don't work. They don't work for the tribes, they don't work for the casino, and they will not work for the state.

Now MGM says there's an opportunity in Bridgeport for a casino that will be the most profitable casino on the planet, and if that were true, where are all the other casino companies? Where's Harrah's? Where's Caesar's? Where's Wynn? Where's Golden Resorts? Where's the Hard Rock? Where Sands? Where's Resorts International? If this were really an opportunity for the biggest casino in the world, the most profitable casino in the world, wouldn't we see all the big casino operators asking us to open up the market to them?

But there's nobody there. You go outside this Chamber behind the ropes and you don't see lobbyists from all those different casino operators. All you see is MGM. And MGM is asking us to break the compact and give up the money because it's got an interest, it's got a multi-billion-dollar interest in making sure that it's casino in Springfield does well. It's got an interest in making sure that the casino in Windsor never gets built. It's got an interest in delaying, in making sure that nothing happens until its Springfield casino is up and running, and it's already got its clientele and people coming up.

So unless Bridgeport is the biggest casino opportunity in the world, the numbers don't work and nobody other than MGM seems to have any interest whatsoever. So despite my deep desire to see market competition in the casino industry in Connecticut, and despite the hard work of the bill's proponents and despite the passion of the demonstrators that were holding signs outside, and despite the lobbying of the people in the green shirts out here, and

despite MGM's glossy high profile, high dollar campaign, I think we have to resign ourselves to one simple fact. Nobody is planning to build a casino in Bridgeport. Nobody. The numbers simply don't work. Not for the casino, not for MGM, not for the state. This bill would simply delay the tribes East Windsor casino and the state will wind up losing millions of dollars. I wish it were not true. But since the facts, in my view at least, are indisputable, I will be opposing this bill. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Representative Rovero of the 51st District. Sir, please proceed. Don't touch it, hang on. You are now good to go, Representative.

REP. ROVERO (51ST):

I realize you don't wanna hear me, but, I'll try to be brief, Mr. Speaker. I have been on Public Safety for about eight years, and I think if anyone checks my record, I have voted against almost

everything that came up in regard to gambling. But a couple of things I have to make clear. One is I heard someone come up and say that the casinos net income is going down and down and down and after a few years it will probably be down to \$40 million dollars. Well to clear the record up, I think there's something in that compact that says the minimum they will have to pay us, no matter what, is \$170 million dollars. So let's remember no matter how low their income goes, they're gonna have to pay the State of Connecticut \$170 million dollars.

While on Public Safety, another thing I said and I'm gonna say it again, when we think the economy in the State of Connecticut is gonna be saved with gambling and marijuana, I think we're in trouble. Folks, gambling and marijuana is not gonna bring the State of Connecticut out of our present troubles. Thank you and have a good day, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much. Will you remark further? If not, staff and guests to the well of the House. Members 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.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Have all the members voted?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Have all the members voted? If all the members have 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 announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5305.

Total Number of Voting	150
Necessary for Passage	76
Those Voting Yea	77
Those Voting Nay	73
Those absent and not voting	0

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill passes as amended. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar 165?

CLERK:

On page 38, Calendar 165, Substitute House Bill 5169, AN ACT IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE OFFICE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Public Health.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The esteemed Chairman of the Education Committee, Representative Fleischmann from the 18th, great to see you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, great to see you and your excellent

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

[Gavel] I understand we're all either excited or unhappy about the last bill, but please. Representative Fleischmann has the floor; I wish you'd give him the respect. Thank you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and may I pay special

respect to your excellent Red Sox polo shirt. Mr. Speaker, the bill that is now before us does reflect recommendations that were presented to the Education Committee at the beginning of this session from the Office of Early Childhood, and they are primarily meant to help us better serve children who are homeless who we want to make sure are getting early childhood services, but who are falling between the cracks. In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 4605. I ask the Clerk please call the amendment and I be given permission to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 4605, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 4605, offered by Representative Fleischmann, Representative Lavielle, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

So Representative Fleischmann, I believe you did want to move passage before we got to the

amendment, right?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. If I didn't, I so move now and then moved acceptance and passage, I would certainly appreciate having this amendment considered.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Excellent. The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. We've called the amendment. Representative, please proceed.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment before us essentially strike section 1, 2 and 7 of the underlying bill. Those were the sections that had a fiscal impact so the language that remains does not involve cost, but still would facilitate the notion of homeless children and youths being able to get served by these early childhood centers even if they haven't necessarily gotten their immunizations yet

with clarification that in such instances, the canters will maintain records of such children for two years. I move adoption and I hope the entire Chamber will join me in supporting this good amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of the House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Lavielle, you have the floor, madam.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

My pleasure, good evening.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I rise in support of the amendment and as the good Chair of the committee remarked, it does get rid of the fiscal note that the underlying bill without it and I would just add that in regard to the section that covers the admission of homeless children to childcare centers for 90 days if they haven't been vaccinated is consistent with and

codifies federal regulations in the matter. So again, it's a good amendment and I urge everyone to support it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats, and 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 MORIN (28TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If all the members have 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 Bill 5169 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting	148
Necessary for Passage	75
Those Voting Yea	148
Those Voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	2

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill is amended as passed. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 189?

CLERK:

On page 13, Calendar 189, Substitute House Bill

5447, AN ACT IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AUDITORS OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS CONCERNING PRIVATE PROVIDERS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

For the second time in a row, Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

For the second time in a row, through you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This measure is before us because the office of the state auditors undertook an extensive and really impressive investigation into what is happening today between local education authorities and private providers of

special education and frankly, some of their findings were a bit hair curling. Perhaps the most concerning of all their findings was that many, many Districts, when setting up relationships with private providers of special education, do not have contracts. Instead, they provide the individualized education plans for the children who they want served, and then pay untold sums to the providers with no formal contract in place, so the Education Committee unanimously voted out this measure before us that simply says, when setting up an arrangement with a private special ed provider, there shall be a contract. It was pointed out at the time we were voting in committee and in subsequent discussions that, while very clear and bare bones, the bill perhaps could use a little more detail, so in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of amendment LCO 5050. I ask the Clerk please call the amendment and I be given permission to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 5050, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 5050,
offered by Representative Fleischmann,
Representative Cook, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the amendment before us has the same spirit as the underlying bill, but with some more clarity. So for instance, while the underlying bill said there shall be a contract, this amendment says that that contract shall include some information on how tuition or cost for service is provided under the agreement or contract are to be calculated. That's something that you or I would expect to see in any contract, and it's spelled out here. In addition, some other basic elements of the contract are mentioned in this

amendment so as to ensure that whenever we have a child in a public school who's getting services from a private sector special ed provider, we know exactly what kind of services they're getting and exactly what system of charges are being made, and also what sort of outcomes we'll be getting over the long term. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Lavielle of the 143rd District. The floor is yours.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, once again for the second time in a row. I stand in support of this amendment, very strong support actually. We were all on the Education Committee very struck by the fact that the state auditor really had a lot of difficulty under the current system evaluating whether the tax dollars of folks in all the school districts were being used for what they were intended to be used for. There was no bar set to

actually determine whether the services provided corresponded to the cost and to the original plan, and it was a bit difficult to get our arms around that issue beside saying there had to be a contract, and there were a lot of iterations, but ultimately, in lines 164-167 and in other places in this amendment, the fact that the contract had to do this very simple thing of explaining how under that particular contract, tuition and costs for services provided under the contract would be calculated. Those parameters have to be set in each case. So in effect, this is not the state mandating how they should be calculated. It's leaving that decision up to each individual school district working together with the providers of its choice. So this is actually a bill that will help our auditors determine that dollars spent by our residents are benefiting from proper stewardship and proper accountability, and that's really what we seek above all to ensure in this Chamber. So I urge very strong support of this amendment. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. [Gavel] The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats? I apologize, you beat me to the, Representative Byron from the 27th District, I certainly don't wanna.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just have one quick question for the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that if this bill passes, it would cause severe cuts to a school called Ben Havens Programs, which could potentially translate into staffing cuts?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no, not to my knowledge. The bill before us simply requires that there be a contract where currently there is none, so I assume that that provider or any that can take its current relationship with the school district and turn it into a contract should be able to continue to do its work.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Byron.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the good Chairman's answer. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Once again, will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be 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 MORIN (28TH):

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 Bill 5447 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting	148
Necessary for Passage	75

Those Voting Yea	147
Those Voting Nay	1
Those absent and not voting	2

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill is amended as passed. [Gavel] Back to the Calendar. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 304?

CLERK:

On page 19, Calendar 304, House Bill No. 5273, AN ACT CONCERNING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ISSUES AFFECTING THE STATE. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Commerce.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Speaking of Commerce, the great Chairwoman of the Commerce Committee, Representative Simmons, you have the floor, madam.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, good evening Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good evening [Gavel] and we'll ask people to just keep it to a dull roar so we can hear you. Thank you.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Simmons.
Representative Stafstrom. Question is on passage of the bill. Representative Stafstrom. Apparently last night we did call House Amendment A, and now Representative Stafstrom will proceed.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ye, I believe we left off we were discussing House Amendment A, I would like to withdraw that amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

House Amendment A is now withdrawn.
Representative Simmons, will you proceed?

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment, LCO 5262. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 5262, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule B?

CLERK:

LCO No. 5262, designated House Amendment Schedule B and offered by Representatives Yaccarino, Simmons, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a bipartisan, friendly, pro-business amendment that aims to improve our state's marketing efforts in order to better attract businesses, residents and economic growth to our state. We have so many positive attributes in Connecticut that we should be proud of. We rank second in quality of life and life span. We rank fourth in research and development. We rank fifth in innovation. We rank seventh in the

number of S&P Fortune 500 companies, and we are consistently ranked one of the safest and healthiest states to live in, and despite some of the negative business news that we hear, we also have incredible success stories that we should be proud of in Connecticut. We're still home to the largest

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

[Gavel] Please, I'm having a hard time hearing Representative Simmons and I think we all owe her that respect. Thank you.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're still home to the largest submarine maker and helicopter maker in the world, which are expected to combine and create thousands of jobs over the next decade. We've had major global companies who've recently announced they're moving their North American headquarters to Connecticut ranging from the Maybourne Group to Henkel to Charter Communications to Nestle Waters. We have a growing bioscience, healthcare, IT and advance manufacturing sector in Connecticut, and we've also passed a number of pro-business bills

over the past couple of years, and we need to do a much better job of telling our story in Connecticut and better marketing the positives of our state, and so the purpose of this bill is to implement recommendations that were made by the public private marketing working group that the Commerce Committee created last year, and I wanna briefly thank the leaders of the group, my good ranking member, Representative Yaccarino as well as Senator France, Senator Hartley, Representative Reyes, and I also wanna thank Representative Fishbein and Representative Yaccarino as well as Representative Camillo for their creative and thoughtful recommendations for inclusion into this bill and we'll talk further about the bill because essentially, the amendment become the bill, but I move adoption Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of the House Amendment Schedule B. Will you remark on the amendment? The fine ranking member of the Commerce Committee, Representative Yaccarino, the

floor is yours, sir.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to see you up there, you do a great job. I'd just to speak in favor of the amendment. I'll be very brief, but I'd like to thank the good Chairwoman of Commerce, it's a pleasure working with her, but really, representative Fishbein and Representative Camillo. Representative Camillo was ranking on Commerce a couple of years ago and he had a recommendation that we have a competition and that's embedded in this amendment, for middle school children to participate to change our revolutionary to whatever they feel necessary. It will come out, I believe it's October 2019 with the results. It's a challenge to the middle school students. It's good to get them engaged, so that's just a small part of this. I'm in favor of the amendment, but I wanted to thank them first and I'd like to speak on the bill after. So, thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Yaccarino. Will you

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. [Gavel] The ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'll just summarize some of the highlights of the recommendations, and gain, this consisted of a series of meetings from the public, private marketing working group as well as the leaders of the Commerce Committee. We met several times and heard expertise from the private sector on how we can improve our marketing efforts, and some of the highlights of those recommendations include better utilizing Connecticut's 3.5 million residents to promote why they love Connecticut

through an I Love Connecticut photo competition, requiring the Department of Economic and Community Development to better communicate with the business community on the positive business resources that we've added to our state as well as positive success stories, and utilizing the business community to get the word out about these success stories through their business networks. Another idea by my colleague Representative Fishbein was to create a Made in Connecticut Day to capitalize on the logo that we created last session. The good ranking member Representative Yaccarino, Representative Fishbein, Representative Reyes and I also think that it's time to update our still revolutionary campaign with something more modern and to engage students in a competition for updating this logo, and then finally, another highlight of the recommendations was creating a Connecticut Comeback campaign where we could engage former Connecticut residents who grew up in our state, that are between the ages of 30 and 45, that may have moved to one of our neighboring states, and really target that

population to move back to Connecticut with updates on things we've done to improve our state as well as stories and nostalgia to encourage residents to move back. A number of states have utilized this approach including Tennessee. So those are some of the highlights. There's a bunch of other recommendations that are in the bill and we're really exciting about moving these ideas forward because we have to do a better job marketing Connecticut and telling our story so that we can attract businesses and residents to our wonderful state. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Simmons. Will you remark further? Representative Yaccarino of the 87th.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Again, thank you, Mr. Speaker. A couple of questions for the good proponent of the legislation, and then I'll make comments.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, Representative.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I apologize. The statewide tourism dollars, I wanna make sure that they're not mixed into the money spent on this legislation?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, you're correct, Representative, this wouldn't impact tourism dollars.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you for that answer and thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know I spoke last night very passionately about manufacturing and technology and I'll stand by that. Like the good Chair said, we have some good companies here, and right in New Haven colony you have Sema4 Mount Sinai, Yale University, Southern, I could go on and on and on.

We have Sikorsky's, we have UTC, we have UConn, Quinnipiac university in Hamden and North Haven has an amazing science lab, bioscience lab, so when you look at commerce, you look at jobs and these are the companies that drive our economy, and I mentioned Massachusetts last night and they do a great job, but we have lower real estate prices here so companies can come in and start their businesses here but they need certain things changed. This marketing plan, when we did listen to the folks, there's certain things we need to do better as a state and I believe in this state so strongly. I believe in competition. You always put your best team on the field and we have some of the best teams in Sikorsky, UTC, and forgive me if I forget anybody. Yale University, Quinnipiac and all these other great universities, UConn, so this is a small piece, but it's all about marketing. I'm sure our Representative Buckbee is better at marketing than I am, and he'll be speaking on this, but it's something that we need to do. If you look at DCD and Lindy Gold, I don't know if anybody knows Lindy,

she promotes Connecticut like nobody else and we need to do that, so I stand in strong support of this. I think it's vitally important, and it's marketing, and it's jobs, and it's hope for Connecticut and for families and I think it's import, so I think that's all I have to say. I'm hoping we get some more of our stuff. This is mall, but small things become big things. They become good things as long as you work together, so thank the good Chairwoman, thank the committee, Fishbein and Freddie and everybody else and Reyes, but thank you so much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Yaccarino. Will you remark further? Representative Fishbein from the 90th District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I just briefly wanna thank my good Chairwoman of Commerce and my ranking member. It's been great to work together with them on this and you know, I think it's about time that this building celebrated all of the great

manufacturing and the products that we make in this state and have a Made in Connecticut Day. I don't know why we didn't think of it earlier, so I think it's a good thing. And engaging our children. You know children come up with the greatest ideas and you know for marketing, and I think it would be great cause the Still Revolutionary logo I think we all agree is a bit stale and you know we talked about perhaps doing that on an annual basis, and I think that would be for the betterment of our state overall in bringing I guess pride in our Connecticut heritage to a higher level. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Fishbein. Will you remark further? The fine gentleman from New Milford, Representative Buckbee, the floor is yours.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of comments on this if you don't mind?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

Thank you. We've talked about the great business and we did that with New Milford Day. We brought up Kimberly Clarke and we have so many wonderful manufacturers that people aren't aware of. I had so many people here that had no idea that Kleenex were made right in New Milford, that we have this whole thing. It's very important to share the success stories as Representative Fishbein just mentioned, as our leaders of this committee have brought up. It was a great discussion. I think this is a great thing for us to get the word out. Putting the kids in there is a no brainer. We have great kids in this state as well, but I think the biggest thing is we really truly need to get the word out about the great businesses already here. We must support the businesses already in this state before we worry about who else is gonna come in, and that's a very important way to do things. Thank you so much for bringing this up. I wholeheartedly support and co-sponsor this bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Buckbee. Will you remark further? Representative Ackert of the 8th District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I wanna thank the work that was on this legislation. I think one thing that we take pride in is some innovation here in Connecticut, and I wanna throw this out there as a suggestion. I heard a discussion of a name and a volunteer opportunity to ask the children or the students of the State of Connecticut to give us some ideas. You know the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection has a Facebook and they have the whole fishing display on there and everyday people load up their Facebook account with all the photos of what's going on. Now I kinda think that we don't need to, cause I get concerned whenever we say, within available appropriations, how often have we said within available appropriations, so I hope we find some money for that, but you know what? I've been watching these folks with these drone and photographers. I could tell you there's a lot of

people that would sit there and say, with the pride of the State of Connecticut, let me show you what's going on in my town, here's the photos. Here's my business plan coming through and it wouldn't cost us a dime. It just takes someone to put a website together, start promoting it, so we have the innovation. I think we have the volunteers, we have the group, and if that doesn't work, let's find the money for this. So I'm in strong support of this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Ackert.

Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, through you, Mr. Speaker, I wanna thank the good Representative Ackert for his excellent suggestion and I wanna actually echo the suggestion from Representative Fishbein. We actually included between lines 10-12 a social media photo competition highlighting the strengths and beauty of our state which could include an I heart Connecticut Facebook campaign, so I think we're all

in agreement on that and we will take the good suggestion. We'll take a look at what DEP has already put as well, so I thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Simmons. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be 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 MORIN (28TH):

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. Will the

Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5283 as amended by House B.

Total Number of Voting	148
Necessary for Passage	75
Those Voting Yea	148
Those Voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	2

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill is amended as passed. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introduction? Ah, the fine Representative from West Hartford, Derek Slap, you have the floor.

REP. SLAP (19TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's a very special guest I'd like everyone to welcome to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

[Gavel] Representative Slap has some guests that he'd like to introduce, please. May we give them the proper respect?

REP. SLAP (19TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Christine Cooney has

worked with DDS now for 16 years and with the State for more than 20. Many of you know her and have really come to appreciate her professionalism and your public service. She's going to be leaving the State service very soon. She's brought her family to the Chamber and I want to introduce Kaley and Ryan. They are both Duffy Dragons and live in West Hartford, and also, Pat, her husband. They actually live on the same street that I do and they're great public servants and I hope we can give them a nice welcome and thank you for Christine's public service. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Well Christine, thank you very much for your service to State, the people of the State of Connecticut and to your family, welcome to the Chamber. Thank you for allowing your wife to serve our great State. Back to the Calendar. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 323?

CLERK:

On page 21, Calendar 323, Substitute House Bill No. 5517, AN ACT CONCERNING EXECUTIVE BRANCH DATA

MANAGEMENT AND PROCESSES. Favorable Report of the
Joint Standing Committee on Government
Administration and Election.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Fox of the 148th District, good
evening, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed.

REP. FOX (148TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in
possession of an amendment, LCO No. 5230. I ask the
amendment be called and that I be granted leave of
the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 5230, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

LCO No. 5230, designated House Amendment Schedule A and offered by Representatives Fox and Devlin.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

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

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill allows state agencies the ability to share data internally and across the Executive Branch. It's a starting point in codifying executive order No. 39, which designated a Chief Data Officer at OPM to oversee improvements in data management practices across the Executive Branch. Executive order No. 39 also establishes a

Connecticut open data portal and this bill codifies the open data portal. The bill codifies the Chief Data Officer's role and charges the Chief Data Officer with implementing a state data plan to be updated every two years. The hope is that each successive plan will aim at a greater data standardization of data practices across state agencies. Mr. Speaker, the bill establishes a legislative appointed data board to advise the Chief Data Officer, review its work and work to continue to improve state data practices. Section 6 of the amendment provides each town that possesses or contracts services for the creation or maintenance of a digital parcel file shall transmit this file to the Regional Council of Governments of which it is a member. It does not require a town to submit any data that is not already a matter of public record, nor does it prescribe the format in which the data parcel is submitted. This process will also allow our towns to access this data from neighboring communities. Mr. Speaker, finally, section 7 of the bill codifies the office of State Ethics, which had

developed a mechanism through formal and informal advisory opinions for avoiding potential violations of the code by requiring that a plan be in place to ensure that a family member may not take any actions that would result in the financial benefit for a relative. Move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Fine ranking member of the 134th District, Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good evening to you.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

So I rise in support of this amendment. As the good Representative said, this is just another move that further helps establish consistency across our agencies and as we modernize both collection and use of data for better decision making, it's a good move forward to improve the ongoing efficiencies of our

agency, so I stand in support and encourage all of our colleagues in the Chamber to do so as well.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Devlin. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it.

[Gavel] The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? 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 MORIN (28TH):

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. Representative Porter, for what purpose do you rise? Take a breath.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

I rise to be noted in the affirmative please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

So noted.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESEMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5517 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting	148
Necessary for Passage	75
Those Voting Yea	148
Those Voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	2

SPEAKER ARESEMOWICZ (30TH):

The bill is amended as passed. [Gavel]

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 230?

CLERK:

On page 16, House Calendar 230, House Bill No. 5274, AN ACT CONCERNING THE TERMS OF THE STATE POET LAUREATE AND THE STATE TROUBADOUR. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Commerce.

SPEAKER ARESEMOWICZ (30TH):

[Gavel] Please keep it down. Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a simple bill that aligns the terms of the State Poet Laureate and the State Troubadour to three years, and Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO 5071. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 5071, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House A, LCO 5071, offered by Representative Simmons, Representative McCarty, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

Representative Simmons you may proceed with
summarization.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a friendly
amendment that adds to the statute the name for a
female State Troubadour, which I wanna give credit
to my --

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

[Gavel] I'm sorry, Representative Simmons for
like the 15th time. Some of the Representatives are
having a difficult time hearing the good
Representative speak, so please, if you have to have
conversations, I would ask you to take them outside
the Chambers. Thank you very much. Sorry,
Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a
friendly amendment that slightly amends the state
statute to note that the name for a female State
Troubadour is a Trobairitz and I would like to give
credit to my good friend and colleague,
Representative McCarty, who pointed this out, who

has studied this issue and is an expert on it. I'd like to defer to her to speak further to this and thank her for bringing this to our attention because our current State Troubadour is in fact, a female. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Well I did not know that until you brought it up, so thank you, Representative. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative McCarty of the 38th District, the floor is yours, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First I would just like to compliment the leadership of the Commerce Committee for allowing me to speak about something that's so very important to me. These women were very accomplished poets, composers and musicians during the Middle Age in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and they composed in the Provencal lyric alongside the male troubadours, and I thought it was very fitting as we discuss various issues today, that our female trobairitz were talking about some

of the same issues that we discuss today, and the word trobairitz was found in a thirteenth century manuscript called Flamenca and they were known during the Middle Ages and vidas. These were aristocratic women as I said that were very accomplished and the wrote in the [inaudible - 05:57:08] form and they actually wrote with debates with their male counterparts so they really were the first pioneers in launching the whole entire Western secular literature. Prior to this time, as you know the manuscript were of sacred nature so these are vernacular poets writing in the lyrical Provencal and the name was naturalized this century, so it's a word that's accepted in English and it's pronounced trobairitz, and I would be delighted after having spent 30-40 years of my life studying every place that these women wrote and lived, and it would be an honor to give them back their fitting place, not only from the Middle Ages, but their recognition today. So thank you very much to the Commerce Committee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative McCarty. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. [Gavel] The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Well I can't top that. If not, will all staff 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 MORIN (28TH):

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. Will the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5274 as amended by House A.

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill is amended as passed. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Abercrombie of the 83rd District. For what purpose do you rise?

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please continue ma'am.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, Representative Zupkus, who was just there a moment ago, --

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

[Gavel] Please, the Representative has the floor and I'd like her to be heard. Thank you.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

You really don't want me to use my outdoor voice folks, okay? On behalf of my colleague, we would just like to take this opportunity to thank everyone in this building, in this room to the staff, the nonpartisan staff for your generous, generous contributions. We have raised \$2,762 dollars. [Applause] And we couldn't do it without you guys and we really, really do appreciate it. The Home for the Brave is such a wonderful organization that helps veteran women and their children and it's still not too late to contribute if you haven't. We're not going to the bank till tomorrow to get the check, so \$3000 would be a nice round, oh thank you! Do I see any more? I've got a

10, do I have another 10? No, sorry. [Laughter]

Sorry, I forgot where I was for a moment.

[Laughter] Seriously, thank you to everyone we really do appreciate it and they're gonna come on Monday or Tuesday so we can present them with a check. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you Representative Abercrombie and Representative Zupkus, et all. Representative Staneski, for what purpose do you rise madam?

REP. STANESKI (119TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll have to fix my microphone. I just rise, I wanna thank Representative Abercrombie and Representative Zupkus for this, but I do have to ask a question. I did see one of our members dressed down earlier, and I'm hoping he paid the \$5 dollars, but I think now that he's dressed up, he should be contributing another 10, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Hey that might be hard to argue with Representative Staneski. Further announcements or

introductions? Representative Gibson of the 15th District, for what purpose do you rise?

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good evening to you.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

I rise in purpose of an announcement. I would like to thank all of the colleagues yesterday who participated in the diaper drive. It was a huge success. We collected over 100 diapers and more importantly, we collected over \$450 dollars. Thank you very much for a good cause. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

I agree Representative Gibson. Thank you very much for bringing that to the Chamber. Any further announcements or introductions? Seeing none we'll go back to the calendar. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 465?

CLERK:

On page 34, House Calendar 465, Senate Bill 429, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PASSPORT TO THE PARKS.

Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on
Environment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

From the fine Environment Committee,
Representative Demicco.

REP. D'AMICO (21ST):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. D'AMICO (21ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a
fairly straightforward bill. It clears up an
ambiguity that occurred in legislation that we
passed last year. It clarifies that the Passport to
the Parks is a separate, non-lapsing account rather
than an appropriated account, and that's the gist of
the bill. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment

and it is LCO 3695, and I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment, and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 3695, which has been previously designated Senate Schedule A?

CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 3695, offered by Senator Kennedy, Senator Minor.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. D'AMICO (21ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the amendment does a couple of things. It strikes section 2 of the bill and it again, clarifies with regards to receipts and expenditures of the Passport to the Parks, and it states that all receipts from the operation of state parks shall be deposited in

the Passport to the Parks account, and that expenditures incurred by the department shall be paid with monies from the Passport to the Park's account, and it eliminates the word appropriated so as to clarify the intent of last year's statute, and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of Senator Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark further on the amendment? From the 107th District, my good friend, Representative Harding, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good evening to you, please proceed.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Mr. Speaker, I just wanna speak quickly on the amendment if I may. I support the amendment. It has a valuable technical change which is necessary and also removes language which involves some changes that were necessary to admissions, etc. I

look forward to speaking further on the underlying bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Harding.

Representative Ziobron from the 34th District, no? Never mind. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it.

[Gavel] The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Well, sure. Mr. Speaker I think all of us would agree that we value our state park here in the State of Connecticut. They really are gems of natural resources and places where people from the

State of Connecticut love to recreate and vacation and this Passport to the Parks account that we created last year will be invaluable in allowing us to operate and maintain those beautiful state parks in the way that they should be, so I thank my colleagues for doing this last year and I would appreciate their clarifying the statute which is what this bill intends to do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Demicco. Will you remark further? Representative Harding of the 107th?

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker, I just wanna speak about the underlying bill. I support it wholeheartedly. These parks are beautiful. It's a place you can canoe, kayak, go on the trails, etc and this bill allows for the administration to make sure that those expenditures go towards the purposes they were intended to. I wanna thank my good colleague, Representative

Ziobron who has been a huge champion of the Passport to Parks Program. I look forward to her comments on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Speaking of Representative Ziobron from the 34th District, the floor is yours, madam.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a wonderful example of how working together, we can do what's best for the state because it certainly was a team effort, both in the house and in the Senate. A lot of very frank conversations, a lot of good work by previous people who worked under previous recommendations to the PRI Committee and so many others, and I'm so proud that we were able to accomplish this together. With the Passport to Parks Program just this year, for the first time in years, we had campgrounds opened that were closed. For instance, Devil's Hopyard was opened for the first day of fishing. We have maintainers being hired across the state to maintain our trail system. We have new lifeguards who are being secured for our

beaches and other lakes and other areas, and I really hope that this will be a sustainable, long-lasting program that will last long after we're no longer in this building anymore because it was the right thing to do for the State of Connecticut.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be 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 MORIN (28TH):

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:

Senate Bill 429 as amended by Senate A in concurrence with the Senate.

Total Number of Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those Voting Yea	146
Those Voting Nay	1
Those absent and not voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill passes as amended in concurrence with the Senate. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 196?

CLERK:

On page 38, Calendar 196, House Bill 5498, AN ACT MAKING CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS INELIGIBLE FOR PUBLIC FUNDS AND LICENSURE OR ACCREDITATION. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Higher Education and Employment Advancement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The fine chairman of the banking committee,
Representative Lesser.

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Speaker. It's
good to see someone from the beautiful town of
Wethersfield up there. Mr. Speaker, I move
acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report
and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk
is in possession of an amendment, LCO No. 5224. I
ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and I
be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 5224, which will
be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 5224,
offered by Representative Lesser, Representative
Staneski, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this amendment
is a strike all amendment. It replaces the
underlying bill and it reflects a collaborative
effort between the Banking Committee and the Higher
Education Committee in an attempt to get better data
for the Office of Higher Education about claims made
against private occupational schools. It requires
that those schools submit reports on the number of
claims, the nature of claims, and the status of
claims to the Office of Higher Education if the
office requires students as a condition of
enrollment to waive their access to make claims in a

court of law and make other restrictions. It allows, but does not require the office to deny state funding or certificates of authorization if they don't do so, and if it determines that those complaints violate public policy. Mr. Speaker, I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? From the 62nd District, Representative Simanski, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SIMANSKI (62ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The good Chairman did a good job of explaining exactly what this amendment does. It's a strike all so it really becomes the bill and I agree with everything he said, but I think it's important to explain the history of how we got to where we are now. Originally this bill came to the Banking Committee, since it's an educational matter, we were all scratching our heads like, why is it here? But when you look at the original bill which is extremely draconian in

measure, it applied to any person, school, board, association, limited liability company or corporation that in any way sought to limit a student's rights. As it turned out, it came out of the Banking Committee on a party line vote, it went to Higher Ed, and it came out on a party line vote, and we never really got to understand why we needed this. There were never any complaints, never testimony about who was aggrieved, why we needed the original bill. The amendment, which is good, and I signed onto it along with Representative Staneski, does get to the heart of the matter. It addresses those private occupational schools, and these are the schools we've heard about where they offer to get a degree, they offer to get a job as a barber, a truck driver or whatever, and then they sort of renege on their promise, so this amendment, which becomes the bill, does get to the heart of the matter, that it seeks before the commissioner will grant a certificate of authorization or a renewal, to look at claims made against the institution, to look at the nature of those claims, to really

understand whether or not the institution does
deserve accreditation, so as the amendment stands,
this is a good bill and it ought to pass. Thank
you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Simanski. Will you
remark further? Will you remark further on the
amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds.
All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it.
[Gavel] The amendment is adopted. Will you remark
further on the bill as amended? Representative
Ackert of the 8th District. You have the floor,
sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I believe I have
the genesis of the bill as it has been amended here,
and I thank the good Chair for his deliberation of
it. Recently, we had a school closure, and again

we've been trying to do our best to protect these public school students and private school students essentially, so this does not in a contract essentially with that school, you essentially don't waive your rights for a suit. Is that correct, to get what you have signed up for?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lesser.

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this bill I think kicks in if, as a condition of enrollment, that school, and it has to be a private occupational school, seeks to limit the rights of students to pursue claims against the school and in that case, it would require data reporting to the Office of Higher Education. It does not mandate anything except the reporting of claims to the Office of Higher Education.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative

Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I didn't get to hear all of it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Okay then, [Gavel] Well you know I get the feeling it might be a Friday night or something, not that anyone would have anything better to be doing, but would you please again, I know we're all excited to be here Friday night, but please keep the conversations down. I'm gonna ask you again to please keep the conversations down, so do you need the question answered again Representative?

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

If he would, if the good gentleman would.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Oh I'm sure he will. Representative Lesser?

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, you know I think the intent of the bill is it only kicks in if a school has included certain clauses in their contracts with students as a condition of enrollment that limit

their rights to pursue claims against the school and if it does so, then it requires that the school then report claims to the Office of Higher Education and allows the Office of Higher Education to intervene in certain egregious circumstances. Whether or not it affects the particular case that the good Representative is referring to, I think would depend on whether or not that is a private occupational school.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and if the good Chair would indulge, just a claim, could he give an example of a claim that would be in this?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lesser.

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Absolutely, I think that's an excellent question. Through you to the gentleman, I think you

know a student could pursue a claim, let's say for example they were defrauded in their education. I think that would be an example of a potential claim.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Lesser.

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

And I didn't hear the gentleman, I'm sorry, if I could and I don't mean to belabor it, I just didn't hear what the example was, and I think it was the mike, holding the mike up.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lesser, would you please answer again?

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Yes, sorry, I think the example that I cited earlier to the good gentleman through you is an example of fraud. So if a person enrolled in a private occupational school for the purpose of getting a particular certificate and then they don't actually get the certificate that they paid good

money for, this would be an example of the kind of complaint that they would lodge, presumably with the Office of Higher Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Lesser.

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and that ends my questions and I thank the good Chair for his answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will you remark further? Ah, Representative Haddad of the 54th District.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just rise in support of the bill as amended. I think the fine Chairman of the Bank Committee has done an excellent job at identifying an issue that could very problematic for a number of students who are attending post occupational schools in the State of Connecticut. We are entering an era where there are ever fewer student, and the competition for those

students among post-secondary schools and higher education institutions will increase. I fear that bad practices will creep into the market and I think that this does good service to students by preventing the practice of limiting options of students to pursue grievances against the institutions that they are paying a lot of money to attend, and so I compliment the Chair of the Banks Committee for identifying a solution to this problem and urge my colleagues to support the bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Haddad. Will you remark further? Representative Mushinsky of the 85th District. You have the floor, madam.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do wish to compliment the Banks Committee and Representative Lesser and the support of Representative Haddad as well for listening to the students who have put their final life savings into training for a new career and then they are unsuccessful in passing the

exam. In fact, in some cases in my District, the entire class told me they failed the exam which simply means the school is not doing their job. They should not be taking these peoples' tuition and they're really a fraudulent school so if we can help our constituents spend their post high school money to get themselves trained for a new career, that's what we should do. If someone taking their money, their last \$2000 dollars and not allowing them to have a new career, that's what this bill is for, so I hope you will stand with me and my constituents who've experienced this problem, give them access to get their fund back and support this amendment. And I thank the Bank Committee for listening to these constituents and responding to them.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Mushinsky. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be 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 MORIN (28TH):

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 Bill 5498 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those Voting Yea	118
Those Voting Nay	29
Those absent and not voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill is amended as passed. [Gavel] Will
the Clerk please call Calendar No. 411?

CLERK:

On page 30, House Calendar 411, Substitute Senate Bill No. 309, AN ACT ALIGNING THE OFFICE OF THE LONG TERM CARE OMBUDSMAN WITH THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Aging.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Fine Chairman of the Aging Committee, from Middletown 2 times in a row, Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good evening, sir.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill in conjunction with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill in conjunction with the Senate. Representative Serra, you have the floor.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill codifies various provisions of the federal state long-term care ombudsman program. The US Department of Health and Human Service promulgated this rule with the expectation that it would promote consistency among the states in the interpretation and implementation of the Older American Act provision requiring ombudsman programs. The rule became effective July 1, 2016 and we have been advised that failure to achieve compliance with the new rule will place the office of the elderly funding stream at risk. The administration of the community living has been approved with Connecticut's plan for compliance, which in part assumes enactment of conformity statutory changes during the 2018 legislative session. Passage will ensure Connecticut continues to receive its full share of federal title 7 Elder Rights Protection and Title 3 grants for State and Community program funding. These grants support the activities of the long-term care program and the State's unit on Aging

in the amounts of \$360,000 dollars and \$14.5 million dollars. With that, Mr. Speaker, I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report, we did that, and passage of the bill. Will you remark further? Representative Byron, my fine neighbor from Newington. You have the floor, sir.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and my good neighbor from Wethersfield.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

It's great to see you too.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

It's always nice to see you. Yes, this bill includes long-term care residents under the State's Ombudsman office for resident advocates. The bill allows a resident advocate to be removed due to noncompliance with regulations. The bill also puts the statutes in line with federal requirements and requires the office to come up with policies and regulations regarding informed consent. The bill

changes the agency hand from DSS to the Department of Rehabilitation Services. Mr. Speaker, I do have a question for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir. Representative Serra, please prepare yourself.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the good Chairman of the Aging Committee, is there a fiscal note with this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no, there is not a fiscal note.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Byron.

REP. BYRON (27TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good Chairman for that answer. Can he answer why there's not fiscal note?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a great bill,
has my full support.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Byron. Will you
remark further on the bill? Will you remark further
on the bill? Representative McCarty of the 38th
District. You have the floor, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I would
like to comment favorably upon this bill. The long-
term care ombudsman is a very important office and
as we know through the office, over 20,000 long-term
care facility residents are protected under this
program, but if I may, just a very quick question to
the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Of course, please proceed.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you. Through you, can you tell us currently, I know the volunteer resident advocates do such tremendous work protecting our nursing home residents, can you tell me how they are selected and how many we have currently?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Serra.

REP. SERRA (33RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I do not have that number or how that procedure is affected.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and then just finally, I do hope that as we move forward that we give the long-term care ombudsman program the services they need so that we can continue to build up all of these programs that really do protect our seniors with their safety and health issues and helping to resolve the complaints, and I'd like to thank the leadership of the Aging Committee for their work. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative McCarty. Will you remark further on the bill? From the 141st District, Representative Wood, you have the floor, madam. Never mind. Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further on this bill? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be 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 MORIN (28TH):

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. Will the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Bill 309 in concurrence with the Senate.

Total Number of Voting	148
Necessary for Passage	75
Those Voting Yea	148
Those Voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	2

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate.

[Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 388?

CLERK:

On page 41, Calendar 388, Substitute House Bill No. 5472, AN ACT CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATION OF SHORTHAND REPORTERS AND CONCERNING A STUDY OF VIDEO COURT APPEARANCES BY DEFENDANTS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The fine vice-Chair of the Judiciary Committee, Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, good to see you up there, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

[Gavel] All right, I know it's the whole Friday night thing. We don't wanna have the Sargent of Arms have to come in and quiet you down do we?

[Laughter] Representative Stafstrom, please continue.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Getting a little rowdy, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill does two things as the title specifies. The first thing that it does in the first six sections of the bill is provide a requirement that shorthand reporters or court reporters, those nice folks who record depositions for civil lawsuits, are to be registered with the Department of Consumer

Protection, receive certification, and register through the Department of Consumer Protection as they had in years past.

Section 7 of the bill provides for a study of video court appearances. In that vein, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO No. 5194. I ask that the amendment be called and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 5194, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 5194, offered by Representative Godfrey.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a strike all of section 7 of the bill, not the entire

bill, just section 7, and what it does is it revise those folks who will be required to perform a study of the applicability of having video court appearances by defendants in certain pre-trial criminal matters. This has been an issue that has been raised several times in the past. It is thought that this could, if done properly, save money for the state ultimately, but certainly there is significant thought and consequences that need to be considered before we ultimately decide whether to allow video court appearances. This would be the first step towards that process. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Rebimbas, you have the floor, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment before us and I want to thank the good Representative for bringing the amendment. One of the things I do wanna know, and

certainly I concur with the good vice-Chairman that this potentially could be cost savings for the State of Connecticut. It's something that's done in other states, so it's certainly something worth into and studying. And I certainly didn't want a change in amendment, but the only thing I would wanna make sure that the individuals that are designated here that are gonna be studying will also include at least in their conversations input from victims and victim advocates who represent families because the impact of not having an individual brought into court also impacts on a victim's rights in that regard to be able to actually see the individual, question the individual personally. That sometimes does get lost in translation of video, so again, I rise in support of the amendment. It's certainly a good one and then I'll reserve my comments for the underlying bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Rebimbas. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? From the 41st District, Representative de la Cruz.

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this amendment. This is something that is near and dear us. As we find out, making laws is a result of things that happen to folks, and this is something that happened to us, and we think it is money savings. We don't have to have folks driving down for every trial or every appearance. I thank the good Chairman for vetting it out. I know they didn't love it in the beginning, so this is a study that will be worth it, I believe because we will potentially save money in the end, and some of the victims that have to go to court day after day, hopefully we can minimize those days. So I thank you for the amendment and it's a good bill. It oughta pass.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative de la Cruz. From the 53rd District, Representative Belsito, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BELSITO (53RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Oh my God, another

study, 14,559. Really, at this point in time on this particular study, we don't need a study. All we need is to touch base with the states that are using this system already and found out the procedure and how good it's working. Why would we have to study it when it's already being performed? It's time for us to start looking at these in a different light. Since this is being performed, it might be saving money and it might not. We don't need a study on that, we just need basically a phone call. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Belsito. My friend, Representative Godfrey from the 110th District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanna associate my remarks with Representative Rebimbas, she's absolutely right. This is a study we need to conduct because we can save money if we do it right, but how right is right is an open question, and certainly victims and the victim's advocate need to

be a part of the discussion, and I trust that the individuals that we are putting on the study committee will do exactly that. So I support this amendment wholeheartedly and ask my colleagues to join me in voting yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Godfrey. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it.
[Gavel] The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I initially said, the first six sections of the bill really relate to the requirement for shorthand

reporters or court reporters to be registered with the Department of Consumer Protection. They previously had been required to do so. We removed that requirement a couple of years ago. It is my belief that that was an ill-advised decision and is not in the benefit of litigants in our courts or the practice of law in the State of Connecticut, and that we should go back to having our shorthand reporters registered, and I would urge support for the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further? Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the bill as amended and certainly would encourage everyone to do so for the good reasons that the good vice-Chairman had indicated. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further? Representative Godfrey.

REP. GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Rebimbas and just, if you may recall at the very end of last year's session we passed this in the last few days. It passed the House unanimously and unfortunately, got lost in the other place, but I encourage you all vote for it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Godfrey. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [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 MORIN (28TH):

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 Bill 5472 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those Voting Yea	130
Those Voting Nay	17
Those absent and not voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill is amended, passed. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar 314?

CLERK:

On page 20, House Calendar 314, Substitute House Bill No. 5426, AN ACT CONCERNING ELECTION DAY REGISTRATION LOCATIONS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good evening, sir. Please proceed.

REP. FOX (148TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, sir. Mr. Speaker, under current law
the registrars of voter must designate a location
within each municipality for completing and
processing election day registration applications.
This bill allows the town clerk to designate a
location if the registrars fail to agree on a
location. There is no fiscal impact. Unanimous
support in committee. I want to thank the ranking
member, Representative Devlin for once again

bringing common sense legislation to our Chamber.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will you remark further on the bill?

Representative Devlin of the 134th District, you have the floor, madam.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good evening to you.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

This is a great bill and I am so thankful to the good Representative for bringing it out tonight. As he so clearly indicated, simply what this does is provide a provision in statute so that if registrars of voters cannot agree on where they should hold election day registration, the town clerk, who is already involved in election proceedings can make that decision. It is a simple fix. It's a great bill. It oughta pass. I encourage all of our colleagues in the Chamber to support it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Devlin. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be 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 MORIN (28TH):

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 Bill 5426.

Total Number of Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74

Those Voting Yea	147
Those Voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill passes. [Gavel] The Chamber will stand at ease. The Chamber will come back to order. The Chamber will come back order. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 74?

CLERK:

On page 36, House Calendar 74, Substitute House Bill No. 5208, AN ACT CONCERNING MAMMOGRAMS, BREAST ULTRASOUNDS AND MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING OF BREASTS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sean Scanlon, it looks to me like there's a problem with your mic. Could we possibly use Representative de la Cruz's mike? Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good evening.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

It's a pleasure to be using Representative de la Cruz's microphone right now.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Does that mean you'll be speaking a lot more?

[Laughter]

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Mr. Speaker, without comment, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good evening again. This is a bill that came through our committee at the behest of the majority leader, Representative Klarides. It deals with mammogram and there is an amendment before us, and the Clerk has amendment LCO 4900. I would ask the Clerk to please call

amendment, and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 4900, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 4900, offered by Representative Klarides, Representative Scanlon, and Representative Sampson.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker and once again, the credit for this belongs to our minority leader, Representative Klarides, who brought this bill to our attention this year on the committee, and this bill is very simple. It builds on work we've done in the past sessions to make sure that all women in

Connecticut have access to mammograms. This bill simply adds federally recognized data codes that are used for insurance purposes in order to make sure that it's encompassing everybody who is seeking to have access to a mammogram, and it's a good bill, oughta pass, and I move adoption, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of the House Amendment, Schedule A. Will you remark further on the amendment? From the 80th district, Representative Sampson.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good evening, sir.

REP. SAMPSON (80TH):

I concur with the words of the Chairman of the Insurance Committee. This is a fine amendment. It will become the bill so I will just make my comments right here and not speak again. I encourage my colleagues to speak in favor. This is simply a correction of a very fine piece of legislation that

we passed in an earlier year to keep Connecticut on the forefront of technology and in medicine and in detecting breast cancer. It's a good bill. It oughta pass. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Sampson, and before I have to bang the gavel and ask you to be quiet please, the distinguished minority leader, Representative Klarides of the 114th District is gonna have the floor and I'd ask that you give her your attention. Thank you. Representative Klarides.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as the good Chairman mentioned in 2016, I was proud to sponsor legislation that mandated insurance companies to cover 3D mammograms called tomosynthesis. The reason for this was because as technology developed, 3D mammogram became much more advanced and the ability to detect breast cancer and save lives became the norm in regard to 3D mammograms, but since the implementation, we found

that the billing codes were off. They were not consistent with the way they needed to be, so this does in fact simply update those codes. I would like to thank the good Chairman and our ranking member of the Insurance Committee for all the work that they've done to help move this through, and once again, this is one of those issues that we can all agree, no matter which party we are, that we move this forward to save lives. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Klarides. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it.
[Gavel] The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Godfrey of the 110th District, you have the floor,

sir.

REP. GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you Representative Klarides for this clarification. As you know, I don't know if everybody knows,

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Pardon me, I'm trying to get a clear line in front of Representative Godfrey. He is trying to address us. Thank you very much.

REP. GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, because as you know, there is a very large manufacturing plant in Danbury, Connecticut not too far from my house that is the cutting edge on this technology, and because it is able to detect breast cancer especially much earlier than older technologies, it has saved huge numbers of lives and has certainly contributed to the economy of Western Connecticut, so thank you on this, and I rise in support.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?
Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If

not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be 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 MORIN (28TH):

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. Will the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5208 as amended by House A.

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel]
Representative O'Dea, for what purpose do you rise
sir?

REPRESENTATIVE O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise for an
announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE O'DEA (125TH):

Just real quick before our last bill, I wanna
congratulate Ben McGorty on his 27th wedding
anniversary. [Applause] And seeing as this is our
last bill, I'm predicting he'll have a 28th. Thank
you very much, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter]

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative McGorty, Happy Anniversary. Boy
that shows great dedication. I hope we can help you
cause you may need it. [Laughter] Representative
Lamar, for what purpose do you rise sir? Oh you
don't rise. Representative Ritter?

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative O'Dea announced that we're on the final bill which is true. Tomorrow we're gonna come in at 11:30. We will start with one bill and then we have a Memorial Service, I believe. Representative Rebimbas has helped organize that as well, so we would ask members to try to be here as close to 11:30 as possible to get that bill done and be respectful that has a memorial service of a former colleague of ours. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Ritter.
Representative Betts, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

REP. BETTS (78TH):

For a historical announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Well now I'm very excited to hear that. Please proceed, sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

It's going to involve money. I'm going to give \$2 dollars to Leslie because this represents only

two people knew that I did not wear my name tag.

[Moaning] [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

And that's exactly why I didn't recognize you because I had no idea who you were. [Laughter]
Thank you, Representative Betts. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 321?

CLERK:

On page 21, Calendar 321, Substitute House Bill No. 5470, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROVISION OF TIMELY NOTICE OF CHILD PLACEMENT INFORMATION FROM THE Department OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES TO THE ATTORNEY OR GUARDIAN AD LITEM REPRESENTING THE CHILD IN A CHILD PROTECTION MATTER. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

My classmate and the esteemed Chair of the Judiciary Committee Representative Tong.

REP. TONG (147TH):

My classmate, Mr. Speaker, great to see you. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. TONG (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill simply provides that in cases of child protection in the juvenile court when there is an issue of child abuse, that the Department of Children and Families, when it makes its determination as to the placement of the child must notify an attorney for the minor child or a guardian ad litem if one has been appointed for the child. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment LCO No. 5289. I ask that the Clerk please call the amendment, and that I be given leave of the Chamber to provide a summary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 5298, which will be designated House Amendment A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 5289, offered by Representative Tong.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. TONG (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This merely makes it clear that when the commissioner has to remove a child immediately from a home because of the imminent risk of physical harm, that the commissioner can do so without having to adhere to the notice provisions in this bill. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Rebimbas, you have the floor, madam. [Gavel] I know everyone's excited to leave but please, I'd like to be able to hear the Representative.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment before us and I actually did have a dialogue earlier with the good Chairman regarding the amendment, and it does make sense. Again, the underlying bill that we're gonna be getting to has good notice requirements that we went the Department of Children and Families to provide. This just clarifies in the most emergent situations, risk of harm to the child, that's when those notices would not be practical, so I do support the amendment before us, and I'll reserve my comments for the underlying bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it.

[Gavel] The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests 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.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Have all the members voted? I know, I know, don't run, I'm not gonna turn it on. Just trying to move you a little bit. 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 announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5470 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting	145
Necessary for Passage	73

Those Voting Yea	145
Those Voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	5

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The bill passes as amended. [Gavel] My good friend, Representative Hilda Santiago, for what purposes do you rise madam?

REP. SANTIAGO (84TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise for journal notation.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Ladies and gentleman, Hilda Santiago is trying to do the announcements for journal notations. Can we keep it down so the record can hear what she's saying? Go ahead, Representative.

REP. SANTIAGO (84TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The one's listed below are business outside the District: D'Agostino, Perone, Stallworth and Currey. Business outside the Chamber: Slap, Morris, Reed and Berger. That's it for tonight, Mr. Speaker, and have a good night.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. I believe it's the Representative from the 78th District, but without the nametag, I'm not sure who it is, but sir, you have the floor.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Since you've recognized me, Mr. Speaker, that's gonna cost me another dollar, but because I went and forgot to wear my badge, I was wearing it and I had to take it off, put it in my car, and as sure as my name is Whit Betts, I left the keys in the car and I'm not sure if I have any gas left in the tank cause the police had to come up here and say, your car is running for over 5-1/2 hours, [Laughter] so that's a painful thing. I may be needing to borrow somebody's gas, but anyway, it's been a fun day, I have just one announcement for the journal.

Representative Bolinsky missed some votes due to illness. Thank you very much, sir.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

And we wish him the best. I hope he's feeling better. Representative Albis, I feel as though we're ending the night, oh Representative Rojas.

Oh. So, Representative Albis we are ending the night in how we began the day. For what purposes do you rise, sir?

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Mr. Speaker, I move that we immediately transmit all bills pursuant to House rule 11F.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Concurrent with House rules, all bills acted upon today are transmitted.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to make an announcement.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Mr. Speaker, the Yankees are currently leading 5-0 in the 6th inning. Aaron Judge has hit a homerun. So has Gary Sanchez. We're playing very well. [Laughter] I have an Indians fan sitting next to me, unfortunately.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Gavel] Representative Albis, I'm about to rule

you out of order, sir.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

All right, I'll behave, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

So I'll see everybody here at 11:30 a.m.
tomorrow and there will be no further business on
the Clerk's desk. I move we adjourn subject to the
Call of the Chair.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on
adjournment subject to the Call of the Chair.
Without objection, so ordered. [Gavel]

(On motion of Representative Albis of the 99th
District, the House adjourned at 8:48 o'clock p.m.,
to meet again at the Call of the Chair).

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 384 pages is a complete and accurate transcription of a digital sound recording of the House Proceedings on Wednesday, May 4, 2018.

I further certify that the digital sound recording was transcribed by the word processing department employees of Alpha Transcription, under my direction.

Alpha Transcription
3244 Ridge View Ct 104
Lake Ridge VA 22192