THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 2019

(The House of Representatives was called to order at 10:00 o'clock a.m., Speaker Joe Aresimowicz 30th District in the Chair.)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

(Gavel) Will the House please come to order.

Will members, staff and guests please rise and direct your attention to the dais where Imam Refai Aerfin will lead us in prayer.

DEPUTY CHAPLAIN IMAM AERFIN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let us pray.

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for the diversity and mutual respect present here today in this great assembly.

Despite the challenges that we face collectively, we invoke Your mercy in overcoming adversities. This week's tragic loss of an iconic
church reminds us that God is the healer and the redeemer in times of loss. With your assistance, we will get our fiscal house in order, we will create a just society, and our diversity will be our source of strength.

To that end, we seek Your blessings and assistance. May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you. Would Representative Floren of the 149th District please come to the dais and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

REP. FLOREN (149TH):

(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):

I like the little echo effect that was going on upstairs, very nice. Welcome to the Chamber. Is there any business on the Clerk’s desk?
CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, communications from the Governor, corrected letter for Carleton J. Giles.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Refer to the Committee on Judiciary.

CLERK:

Favorable Reports House Bills and House Joint Resolutions to be tabled for the Calendar and printing.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The fine Majority Leader of the great City of Hartford, Representative Ritter, you have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we waive the reading of the House Favorable Reports and the Resolution and the Bills be tabled for the Calendar and printing.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir, so ordered.

CLERK:
And finally the Daily Calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. Are there any announcements or introductions? Announcements or introductions. Quiet crowd today. We never missed on the announcements or introductions, so last chance. Any announcements or introductions? Seeing none will the Clerk please call Calendar 388?

CLERK:

On Page 1, House Calendar 388, House Joint Resolution No. 162. RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF MATT FLEURY OF HARTFORD TO BE REAPPOINTED TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION. FAVORABLE REPORTS OF JOINT STANDING COMMITTEES ON EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE NOMINATIONS.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Another fine Representative of the great City of Hartford, Representative Vargas of the 6th. You have the floor, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to move for
concurrence with the Senate and I move acceptance of the House Committee’s Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and concurrence with Senate and adoption of the Resolution. Representative Vargas you have the floor, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Matt Fleury is being renominated to the Board of Regents of Higher Education and he has an associate degree from Berkshire Community College, a Bachelor’s in Business and Communication from Charter Oaks State College and a Master’s in Business Administration from UConn School of Business but most of all I really like this gentleman because he has done a fantastic job as Director of the Connecticut Science Center. I have had the privilege of knowing him for many years. I know that he brings a lot of the
Board of Regents and I ask my colleagues to vote in concurrence. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will you remark further on the Resolution before us? Representative Davis of the 57th District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. DAVIS (57TH:)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of Mr. Fleury’s renomination as well. It’s the renomination by Representative Klarides for him to be a member of the Board Of Regents and as the kind gentleman from Hartford mentioned he brings a lot of interesting aspects to this Board as the Director of the science center and all the things they are trying to do there to try to build up the stem field here in Connecticut. So I stand in support of him and encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Resolution before us? Will you remark further on the Resolution before us? If not,
let me try your minds. All those in favor
signifying by saying “Aye”.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed “Nay”. The Ayes have it. The
Resolution is adopted in concurrence with the
Senate. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House
Calendar 389.

CLERK:

On Page 1, House Calendar 389, House Resolution
NO. 26, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF
RENEE D. COLEMAN-MITCHELL OF BLOOMFIELD TO BE
COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC HEALTH. Favorable Report of
the House Committee On Executive And Legislative
Nominations.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to move
Acceptance of the House Committee’s Favorable Report
and Adoption of the Resolution.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution. Representative Vargas you have the floor, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our Health Department will be in very good hands when we confirm the following nominee who is Renee Coleman-Mitchell of the Town of Bloomfield. We interviewed her. Our Committee was very impressed with her background and she has among other things been the Executive Director of the Cougar Health Services at Washington State University and prior to this position Coleman-Mitchell held the position of Deputy Director of Health with the City of Hartford and was the Psych Director of Meriden’s Community Health Center, so she has extensive background in the health field, a person who has a great deal of common sense. She was very visionary in her responses to the questions
of our Committee. So I move adoption of the Report, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative. Will you remark further on the Resolution before us? Representative Davis of the 57th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support as well of Commissioner Designee Coleman-Mitchell. She certainly does have a background that will serve her well as the Commissioner of Public Health. She also served as Assistant Director of the Aids Division within the Department of Public Health so she is from within the ranks of that Department as well, so I stand in support of her nomination here today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative. Will you remark further on the Resolution before us? Will you remark further on the Resolution before us? If
not, let me try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying “Aye.”

REPRESENTATIVES:

    Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, “Nay.” The Ayes have it, the Resolution is adopted. [Gavel]. Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 390.

CLERK:

    On Page 2, House Calendar 390, House Resolution No. 27 RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF SIBONGILE MAGUBANE OF HARTFORD TO BE COMMISSIONER OF MOTOR VEHICLES. Favorable Report of the House Committee and Legislative Nominations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

    Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move Acceptance of the House Committee’s Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
The question before the Chamber is Acceptance of the Committee’s Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution. Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution is to confirm the nomination of Sibongile Magubane of Hartford to be the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles. She has extensive experience in the private sector including being the IT Portfolio Manager and Head of Financial Information Systems and Information Technology and Strategic Planning. Magubane has most recently served as a Human Resources Director for Specialty Transportation, Inc. She is a person with extensive knowledge in the computer field which is one of the issues that the Department of Motor Vehicles has had with its transitions to a new computerization system. I also want to give a shout-out to our former commissioner, Commissioner Bzdyra who did a very good job in a very tough agency, so hopefully many of the problems facing motor vehicles will be resolved with a person
with the expertise of Commissioner Magubane, so I urge my colleagues to support the Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Davis of the 57th you have the floor, sir.

REP. DAVIS (57TH:)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also stand in support of the Commissioner Designate of Motor Vehicles. She certainly brings a lot of experience that I think will serve her well from the information technology field as we know the Department of Motor Vehicles is one of the departments that most, if not all of our residents in their adulthood come in contact with, so they are kind of the face of the State of Connecticut and I am hopeful that with her skills and background in information technology that streamlining those processes and making it easier for our residents will come true and she certainly will be served well by her Deputy Commissioner, former Representative
Tony Guerrera that will also serve the Department quite well under her as well. So I stand in support and encourage all of my colleagues to do so as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Ritter from the 1st District.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I have known our new Commissioner for many years. I actually played little league with her son on the Aetna Baseball team and she will do you a tremendous, tremendous job. And Matt Fleury was earlier and I missed him, another constituent, but we are very fortunate that she is willing to go back into the public life and be the Commissioner of a difficult agency and I am very proud to know her and I know she will do a great job. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Those opposed, “Nay”. The Ayes have it. [Gavel]. The Resolution is adopted. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 391.

CLERK:

On Page 2, Calendar No. 391 HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 25 RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF BRYAN HURLBURT OF TOLLAND TO BE COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE. Favorable report of the House Committee on Executive And Legislative Nominations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Vargas you have the floor, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the House Committee’s Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Committee’s Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution. Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Resolution that would confirm the nomination of Bryan Hurlburt of Tolland to be Commissioner of Agriculture. Bryan is no stranger to this body having served with us. I remember my first session, he was sitting there in the back when he was appointed by the President of the United States to be the head of the Connecticut Farm Agency which was part of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and I remember the body giving him a standing ovation. Since then he has done many, many other things all dealing with agriculture. He brings extensive experience. He represented the 53rd House District from 2007 to 2013 but he has been the Executive Director for the Connecticut Farm Bureau Association. He is very well-versed on the needs of our farmers, very excited over the fact
that hemp will become an industry that will help our farmers. And so I’m very excited about having him be confirmed as our next Commissioner of Agriculture for the State of Connecticut and I urge all my colleagues to vote for our former colleague Bryan Hurlburt. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It’s good seeing you up there, brother.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, sir. Representative Davis from the 57th District.

REP. DAVIS (57TH:) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also stand in support of Mr. Hurlburt for the Commissioner of Agriculture. I had the pleasure of serving with him in the House of Representatives as well and he served in a district that was next to mine so we worked closely on a number of issues that were important to our area as well as when he took over the Farm Agency under the Obama Administration and also when he took over the Farm Bureau which is a very important organization within my district as well. So I worked closely with him there and I know
he will serve us well as the Department of Agriculture’s Commissioner and I strongly support his nomination and I encourage all of my colleagues to do so as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky of the 47th District you have the floor.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, agriculture in Connecticut is in turmoil with commodity prices collapsing, land use issues, tax issues. We really need an agriculture commissioner who is really strong, who understands agriculture, who understands the legislature, who understands the national issues with regard to farming and Bryan Hurlburt knows those issues. He has experience with farmers. He has experiences with farms. He has experience with the Department of Agriculture. He has experience with the Farm Bureau and with the Legislature and I encourage my colleagues to support him for this nomination.
Representative Ackert you have the floor, sir.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good to see you there.

Good to see you as well.

I also, already the good words have been spoken by the good Chairman and some other members but, you know, having served the District right next to, at the time, Representative Hurlburt, who served us well, but then to see as he moved up the ladder to serve in the USDA under the Obama Administration and then his background in the Connecticut Farm Bureau. He’s not just in an appointed position, he hands out with framers so I know his good friends are farmers so they’ve got his ear, so it’s great that he is passionate about this, the State of Connecticut and are farmers will be served under Commissioner Hurlburt. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Thank you, sir. Representative Gresko of the 121st District you have the floor, sir.

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be very brief. I had the pleasure of serving in this building with Bryan Hurlburt over the years and I would hope that my colleagues would agree with me that he would be a fine Commission of Agriculture and I encourage them to vote in the affirmative. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will the Clerk please call EMERGENCY CERTIFIED HB 7402? The Chamber will stand-at-ease. The Assembly will be-at-ease. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call EMERGENCY CERTIFIED BILL HB 7402?

CLERK:

EMERGENCY CERTIFICATION BILL NO. 7402, AN ACT CONCERNING FUNDING FOR ASSISTANCE TO PERSONS DISPLACED BY HURRICANE MARIA, introduced by Representative Aresimowicz, Representative Ritter, Senator Looney, Senator Duff.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Walker you have the floor, Ma’am.

REP. WALKER (93RD):

Good Morning, sir. Good morning, Mr. Speaker and it is great to see you up there. Mr. Speaker I move passage of Emergency Certified Bill 7402.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The question is on passage of the Bill? Will you remark?

REP. WALKER (93RD):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker before you today is a fix into the budget, of the bipartisan budget that we passed last year. It in the budget that we passed last year we had earmarked $500,000 dollars to be appropriated by the Department of Social Services for victims and residents that were affected by Hurricane Maria. The Bill directed $90,000 dollars of the earmarked funds to the Carib Youth Leaders in Bridgeport rather than Waterbury which was in error. And then there was a correction that was done for $90,000 dollars that was to go to the Family Resource Center in Hartford which was changed to the Welcome Center at Hartford. So there were two obvious errors that were made and in order for these funds to be distributed we have to make those corrections. I move passage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The question is on passage of the Bill. Will you remark?

REP. WALKER (93RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move passage of the
Bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Lavielle of the 143rd District.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, very much. Just a quick comment. I confirm that this is not new money. This was money that was set aside in the budget from the last session and simply the names of the designees, either the names of the organization or the town were incorrectly noted in the Bill and those are being corrected in this Emergency Certified Bill, that’s all this does. It doesn’t spend anymore money. It doesn’t do anything new. It is a technical correction of the names of the designees in last year’s budget. And so I will be supporting the Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, ma’am. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not will the 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 BUTLER (72ND):

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 the tally.

The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7402

Total Number Voting 139

Necessary for Passage 70

Those voting Yea 137

Those voting Nay 2

Absent not voting 10

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
The Bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call. Representative Currey you have the floor, sir.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I move that we Suspend the Rules for the immediate consideration Calendar 401.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Is there any objection? Seeing none, so ordered. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 401.

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino you have the floor, sir.
REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and good morning.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Good morning.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

I move for Acceptance of the House Committee’s Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Question before the Chamber is acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution. Representative D’Agostino you have the floor, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is not a new contract before us today, this is what is called an accreta. It is the absorption of six tax attorneys at DRS into an existing union contract, the A&R Administrative and Residual Employees Union that has about 3,000 professionals including other accountants, attorneys that other professionals in the state workforce. It is a negotiated agreement,
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

[Gavel] Excuse me, Representative. Can those in the Chamber engaged in conversation please take them outside. We have members that can barely hear what Representative D’Agostino is sharing with us. So please take your conversations outside. Excuse me, proceed, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize that sometimes I’m a broken record on these items, so [Laughter]. But this is not a new contract as I was saying, it is the accretia of six tax attorneys into an existing collectively bargained for agreement. Again there is only six of them, there are no salary changes. In other words they don’t get any backpay. They don’t get any overtime. The negotiated agreement actually reduces their step-increase in the next two years to two percent instead of the 3.1 percent that other members of the existing bargained for agreement would receive. Again it is a
negotiated agreement. The incremental cost to the State is fiscal year 18-19 is $20,000 dollars, next year $40,000 dollars, the year after that fiscal year 21 about $81,000 dollars on a half-year basis and again, the results of this negotiated agreement rather than going to arbitration where we don’t know what the results would be are a net positive, I think, for the State because again we are getting all the benefits of the entire SEBAC Architecture which of course lead to billions of dollars of savings for the State. These folks do get a salary increase and the step-increases I mentioned in the next two fiscal years as do other members of that bargaining unit however it is not at the same level as everyone else in that unit.

And again, just a quick word about process year because this is a negotiated agreement we will vote on it now. If we approve it, it goes into effect. If we were not to approve it however that is not the end of the story. By Statute it would go into arbitration and in arbitration of course as we just
heard with the prior contract that we did, we got a worse result. So this gives predictability, better results from a bargained for agreement and for those reasons I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Lavielle from the 143rd District. You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have just a very few questions because as the good Representative says we certainly are talking like broken records about these things. Just to confirm that the total cost annualized going forward once we’ve hit the second year, the biennium is about $88,000 dollars, is that correct? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker that is correct, $88,000 annualized for fiscal year 21 that is because some of the lumpsum payments don’t kick in
until the first of the year so the annualized cost is about $88K. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And so while we had no increases in, no changes in base salary before the upcoming biennium, all of these employees will be getting with the annual, with the wage increase for each year and the merit or step-increases they will be getting 5.5 percent a year over two years and that will become part of their salaries going forward. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D’AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I would not that this group did not receive any increases, only received two increase for the last 10 years, so yes in the next two years they will have the general
wage increase of 3.5, the annual increment of two percent instead of the three percent that the rest of the members of that bargaining unit receive for a total of 5.5 in fiscal year 20 and fiscal year 21. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and the rest of the question was and that then will constitute with the addition of these increments, that will then constitute their base salary. The increments will become part of their new base salary going forward. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Depending on what we do in fiscal 22, yes that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):
Thank you and I also understand that all of these employees will be, if they’ve. Yes, they will all, well future ones will not. These particular employees will be eligible for longevity payments, is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Four of the six are entitled to longevity and two were hired after we ended longevity so they are not entitled to it. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And just a question about the accrued vacation. I understand that when, that when each of these attorneys is allowed to accrue up to 70 days of vacation time that they could be paid for were they to leave State’s service on favorable terms. Would, if you have accrued 70 days, and are
not leaving State’s service can they take all of those 70 days in one year? How do they have to take those days. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the accrued, just to clarify, that was the maximum threshold that was set. I’ve been informed that none of them have hit the 70 day accrual and actually under this contract when their vacation accrual drops below that maximum as it is for all of them, they are locked into a lower number according to the existing terms of the contract that they are going into. So, if anybody had 70 they would have kept it but my understanding is that none of them have it, they are all below that. Now with respect to the actual use of vacation time, of course, that’s subject to the other parameters of the contract where you would be able to take, I think it is the 12 or 15 days depending during the year with
approval obviously of your supervisor, these are tax attorneys so they are obviously on trial, they can’t take vacation in the middle of a trial or in the middle of a case that they’ve got going on but subject to all those other parameters of approval they can take the normal vacation time. And then for example should they retire or be terminated, yes they have a vested right in that amount that they’ve accrued. I don’t have the individual amounts that each one of them has accrued but my understanding it is all below 73.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and Mr. Speaker, through you, do they have any limits on the number of sick days that they can take? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Three, Mr. Speaker. Again this contract that
they are going into follows the rest of the SEBAC Architecture that we’ve talked about previously where you accrue sick days based on your service and I think it is a day-and-a-half a month, or a day-and-a-quarter a month so they can accrue I think up to those 15 sick days a year to use again with approval, this contract, like many of the others requires the appropriate medical documentation for sick leave time and so of that time can also be used under the contract for family time to take care of a sick family member, that is consistent across the board with the rest of our contracts. There is also a sick leave bank that time that’s unused gets put into for the benefit of the whole again, consistent with all the other SEBAC contracts, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And finally, just to confirm, we’ve said it but to establish that since these individuals will become part of an existing
union that is part of the SEBAC Coalition, they will be receiving all of the pension and health benefits that came with the SEBAC contract, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct. They have to pay the increase pension contribution, the increased health care contributions, the increased co-pays, all the things that we successfully negotiated as the State as part of the last agreement these attorneys will be bound by. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don’t have any further questions for the Representative whom I thank for his answers. And just a couple of comments, I do indeed share the Representative’s feeling of knowing that I sound like a broken record
and that is unpleasant, not just because it may be boring for people, but also because it reflects the fact that we’re getting one of these contracts to review every five minutes. Now thank goodness, since last year’s bipartisan budget, we do have to vote on them. So that is good development. But we are as, Secretary Barnes said at the time in all of the various arbitration documents that accompanies some of these contracts, we were last year and we continue to be in dire financial shape. And it is one thing to say people deserve money which I am sure they do, and it is another thing to say we have that money or we don’t. And we are in a situation now where really we have nary a cent to go around and there are people who need services. There is our infrastructure that is falling apart. There is our economic development that needs to be kicked off and there is whole lot of taxes. So, what I would simply say, before anybody else says it, “Yes,” these are state employees and you better believe that they are taxpayers, they are taxpayers, t-a-x-
p-a-y-e-r, that is what they are. I do not want to hear anyone say again that there is no recognition that they are taxpayers. They are taxpayers! However they represent the people who are part of the SEBAC contract, they do a very good job. I have lots of respect for them, they deserve to earn as good a wage as anybody else but they represent two percent approximately of all the taxpayers in Connecticut. Now there is another 98 percent of the taxpayers, if they don’t get as good a wage or as good benefits, that is one thing but the fact of the matter is they have to pay for the benefits, and the raises and the increasing costs for whatever we, the Legislature, decide is going to happen to the compensation of these individuals. And so everything we approve one of these things we are forcing 98 percent of the taxpayers in the State to pay for things that two percent of the taxpayers will get but that they, the other 98 percent, will never see in their lifetime. And this is a problem of fairness. So I apologize again for the broken
record nature of these remarks but I have to make them because here we are again and we will be hear again in another six, seven, nine times this session and the total will go up and up and up while we have a budget that is full of nothing but holes. So I will not be supporting the resolution, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato of the 77th District, you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you very much. And just so I won’t sound like a broken record like Representative Lavielle stated, I just have a couple of questions for the proponent of the Bill. I know again we are in this same situation as we were a few weeks ago and I won’t ask all of the same questions since I have already done that and I think my point was made before. But I too have an issue with the what is assumed, I guess I don’t want to use the work fair, I don’t know if that is adequate because I do
appreciate the hard work that these attorneys put in. However again in comparison to private sector jobs and similar employment I don’t think the salaries reflect what a smaller firm or solo practitioner would receive. So I just have a couple of questions for the proponent of the Bill. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Can you go over the lumpsum payments, not all of them, I think they were just onetime payments, what those, the amounts of those payouts and if it is one time or is it recurring? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So it varies based on your experience level. There is no general wage increase for this fiscal year but everybody in the SEBAC Wage and Hour Agreement get the $2,000 dollar lumpsum payments unless you were at top step and then there is a fraction of that payment plus a fraction of your step. So for example, the lumpsum
payment costs the State $9,000 dollars this year for I think four of the employees and the other two it’s about $2,500 dollars and then in fiscal year 2020 it is about $5,400 dollars and that gets annualized in 2021 to about $10,000 dollars but again the lumpsum payments are a function of both, are a function of where you are in the salary range whether you are at the top, most of these folks are not at the top step within their range. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you. So even though it may be one person, just to clarify, it is possible under this agreement that an employee would receive a payout or a lumpsum payment of $10,000 dollars? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you. No, if I misspoke I apologize. That is in the aggregate. So the aggregate cost for
the lumpsum payments annualized is, I’m just doing the math in my head here, about $12,000 dollars in fiscal year 21 for the six attorneys, so about an average of $2,000 dollars which is what carries forward through what we did. So again somebody on top, I mean, incrementally your talking about maybe I think about $743 extra dollars for the person who was at top but everybody gets on average about $2,000 dollars for that lumpsum and it important again to note that in, for example, this fiscal year that is in lieu of any salary increase. I appreciate that it does go to your salary that lumpsum payment but it is not on top of a percentage increase at least in this first year. So that number I gave is in the aggregate, it averages out to about $2,000 dollars a person. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you. And I appreciate that clarification. What are the educational
requirements for these attorneys? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously you need a JD, it depends on your level. I think one person is now a Tax Attorney 1. That person can be hired a year out of law school. Tax Attorneys 2 which most of these folks are have to be three years out in practice and Tax Attorneys 3 have to be four years out in practice. Just the JD obviously you have to have some relevant professional experience doing tax law as I know this particular Representative knows, she is very familiar with the fact that this is an esoteric field, it requires some deep experience and knowledge with some very intricate statutes and experience is doing that. So obviously they are going to look for experience in that field when they do hire somebody with three years of experience in that field. It’s going to be more attractive to somebody with three years who doesn’t have that
experience. No LOM is required but it really is embedded in both the JD and of course the actual professional experience when they hire you. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

But is the, let’s say, preferred experience it is not, is it listed as required experience in the job posting? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The particular requirement for job experience is just the three years and obviously JD. The job posting of course lists a host of relevant things that somebody must be able to do including conducting litigation before the tax courts, dealing with inheritance tax cases, dealing with the recommended rulings and regulations in the tax field, etc., delinquency cases so that is
all part of the job description when you apply for it and one would assume that they use those criteria to evaluate their candidates. But the particular requirement for experience is just those three years out of law school and again obviously a member of the bar in good standing in the State of Connecticut. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

So is, and I believe you may have already answered this, is an LOM in tax required?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Is a degree in accounting required? Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, an undergraduate degree? No, I am not aware of any sort of underlying or masters or underlying accounting or other kind of degree required. That is not the case to even get into law school. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

And from your description, I understand what you’re saying, however since tax classes are not required in law school, is it possible that somebody could never had taken a tax class in law school, and then apply for this job and possibly receive it? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding of
the experience that these folks have who have all been hired is that they’ve got some background and relevant experience, either educationally or certainly in the experience front. It is possible that the State might hire somebody to be a tax attorney who’s got no background at all in that, I supposed it is possible. I would assume it is unlikely. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

And what does the first, let’s say the first step, you said Tax Attorney 1, what is their starting salary? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the starting salary is around $89-90,000 dollars but I will double check that. I’ll stick with that for now. Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you. And was there any research done do you know how this starting salary at $90,000 dollars compares to other public sector attorneys, similar public sector attorneys in other states. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I have not done any, with respect to you, other public sector attorneys again given the, and we’ve discussed this previously with respect to the Public Defenders and the AGs, you know, the various differences between certainly the breadth and scope of the work that is required on a state level where there might be county attorneys versus and the state, you obviously cover the entire state as an attorney. We talked I mean and again as we’ve seen from the arbitrations that
have occurred and arbitrator is more likely to use the private sector equivalent because rather than a Connecticut attorney going out and taking a job in Florida having been bared in Connecticut and practiced under Connecticut tax law and then suddenly wanted to practice in Florida, you are much more likely to go out and take a private sector job here in Connecticut practicing tax law and I appreciate that. And then there is a whole breadth of salary range that one can experience from the small firm doing a lot of local and personal tax work to, you know, the larger firms doing corporate tax work and I would based on just the little research I’ve done, this salary does sort of falls in the lower range of those private attorney jobs but again that is an entire breadth. But with respect to the public sector comparison I have not done one, I would submit respectfully that I don’t think it is particularly apt given the job at issue here. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you. So again, I won’t go through what I, the questions I asked with the public defenders because it would just be the same thing. But I stood up in Committee and asked, how many tax attorneys were in the room and I pose a rhetorical, a similar rhetorical question, because I sit here in a room with 150 other people and as far as my knowledge goes, I know that there are other attorneys in the room, but the only tax attorney in the room, I graduated with a LOM in Tax, and granted all my work now is not tax based because again I’m a solo practitioner. I have to take what comes in because I have bills to pay. But again I’m sitting here telling people that this is my profession and not just as an attorney, but as a tax attorney, knowing what other similar attorneys who practice in the same area make and when I posed the question to some of my colleagues, telling them that this starting offer was $90,000 dollars they nearly fell
off their chair. So again, I appreciate the work that these attorneys do, not everybody loves the tax code like I do, so it’s nice to see people with similar interests. However again I cannot support this agreement and this Bill based on these amounts not only the general increases during a time that we’re already facing over a billion dollar deficit but again some of these lumpsum payments for sacrifices as I guess some people have put it. So again I urge my colleagues to look at the bigger picture and again to heed the advice of an attorney in this area that, you know, these amounts are not what attorney make in the private sector. And again I urge my colleagues to vote no. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

    Representative Mastrofrancesco of the 80th District. You have the floor.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My apologies. I didn’t think you were going to call me next. Mr. Speaker I have a few questions to the proponent of
the Bill. Thank you, or the Resolution. If I am to understand this, these tax attorneys will be incorporated into the P-5 contracts. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

   Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

   Through you, correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

   Excuse me Representative. Representative Mastrofrancesco, you have the floor now.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

   Thank you, I apologize. And Through you, Mr. Speaker. With the exception of the negotiated items that we received in Appropriations Committee would the tax attorneys be, get the same benefits that’s in that existing contract of every other item? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

   Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, there are differences as I mentioned before. There is the difference with respect to the lower step increase, the difference with respect to the cap on vacation accrual time, the general benefits with respect to sick leave as I discussed with Representative Lavielle accruing that, that all does fall under the contract language. Because A&R is, I think one of the largest groups about 3,000 there are other provisions in this contract that would not apply to these attorneys. For example there is some provisions that deal with if you use your car for work, if you are given a state car, you have to garage a car, other issues with respect to meals and breaks and like that that don’t apply to them because of the work that they do, but by-in-large those general provisions accrual of sick leave, personal time, things like that, again with those other exceptions that we discussed are governed by the P-5 Contract. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And in the current contract the P-5 Contract, Article 24, Section 1, under Compensation of the existing contract, it states that there is no pay raises in 2016-17, 17-18 and 18-19 and this current agreement that the tax attorneys are getting are getting a raise in 2018-19. Through you, Mr. Speaker, does that mean they have a different arrangement?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, that is, so the SEBAC Architecture just when we sort of peel back all the layers of the onion here, everybody, including attorneys do not receive a general wage increase. Now for fiscal, this fiscal year everyone in the SEBAC Wage and Hour Contracts including these new attorneys folded into this P-5 Contract will receive that $2,000 dollar lump sum payment that we
discussed with Representative Pavalock-D’Amato so they are no different with respect to any of the other SEBAC employees covered by the Wage and Hour SEBAC agreements. No general wage increase but they do get the lumpsum payment or a fraction of that based on their level of staff as I discussed with Representative Pavalock-D’Amato. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One more question here. Would the tax attorneys, through you, Mr. Speaker, would the tax attorneys also be eligible for and I am referring to Section 5, Article 18, under Vacations. According to the existing contract vacations can be, “employees can be paid up front for their vacation pay.” Would the tax attorneys be eligible for that benefit as well? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.
REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. There are obviously various strictures with respect to that, that payment it’s not like you get to just get it in advance and then, you know, never work on the backend, but generally yes, those provisions with respect to how you can use and be approved for vacation time, again subject to the accrual cap that we discussed previously those would apply to these attorneys. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know we, in Appropriations, when we get these contracts, just quick comment, this is what we get. There is no detail on here, we don’t know what the previous arrangements were with these tax attorneys so it makes it very difficult to wean through this contract. And through you, Mr. Speaker to Representative D’Agostino, I am assuming that the
vacation is the same as previous contracts, 15 vacation days, 12 holidays, three personal days, and 15 sick days for a total of 45 days off per year which would be nine weeks. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is the total amount somebody can accrue, again obviously I guess I feel compelled to say this because it has come up several times, I am unaware of anyone who takes 45 days off a year, I’m sure it happens, but we have not been inundated with information on a State level of people taking, you know, 45 days here, 45 days there. The last several contracts we’ve done including this one, where you have particularly attorneys involved in cases, management, the State of Connecticut always has the right to control that with the exception of course the holiday pay which everybody gets, people in the private sector get
Christmas and Thanksgiving off for the most part depending on your job, so the holidays are holidays and I think that is something that anybody, no matter where you work public or private you appreciate that. Yes they can accrue up to 15 vacation days, 15 sick days, and take three personal days in addition to the 12 holidays but again that is all subject to prior approval, the sick leave time obviously is very regulated by the State of Connecticut. You have to have, it is very extensive in here in this P-5 Contract, medical approval, proof of that, etc. Your vacation time needs to be approved in advance, particularly when you are involved in case work and I don’t mean to diminish what the rest of our State employees do, but all of that is subject to the management’s rights and approval in a bargained for mechanism. It is a long way of answering a question. Yes, 45 days, total you can accrue including the holidays. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.
REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you and through you, Mr. Speaker. To the Representative, can you tell me what the percent of cost sharing is on the medical? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So again this is again governed by the SEBAC Agreement and this is the separate SEBAC Agreement with respect to the retirement and healthcare benefits, my understanding, I had it written down here, I believe they pay 16 percent as part of the cost share. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just a couple of quick comments, I want to thank the Representative for answering my questions. I appreciate the
detail. You know, these contracts are very lavish to me. I am certain that these tax attorneys work very hard as everybody else does but until these contracts begin to come up to mirror what the private sector is doing, the State of Connecticut is going to have many problems. Forty-five days a year off, nine weeks, and I know they keep saying that we can accumulate these days is a bit much for me with all the other perks that they have. So I am going to be voting against this contract today and I hope at some point in the future the State of Connecticut can look at these contracts like the private sector does and to get them in line because it is really unfair to the taxpayers. Through you, Mr. Speaker and thank you Representative for answering my questions. I appreciate it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative de la Cruz from the 41st District. You have the floor.

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No questions, you can
I had a couple of comments. First a couple of New Year’s resolutions this past year, one was to either lose weight and join a gym or the other was to buy bigger clothes. I bought bigger clothes. My other resolution I let myself down a couple of weeks ago. It was to not bite my tongue in this room, sometimes we get, we’re tired or we have to run back to work and somethings were said on the floor about the last contract we voted on that really, on the way home I said, you know, I owed it to the people I represent, I owe it to the people in this room to let ‘em know how I feel and what I think about these contracts.

We keep talkin about how we cannot afford this, how it is unaffordable, Connecticut cannot afford it. How many people here when it comes to a lawyer or tax attorney and you’re in big trouble, how many of us in this room are looking for the cheapest attorney? The guy that’s, you know, a “My Cousin Vinney” type of attorney that really doesn’t that really doesn’t have much experience you’re looking
at maybe 30 years on prison, you’re gonna get the
guy that the cheapest. And actually I did nine
municipal years and nine municipal budgets before I
got up here and the actual Republican Party on my
Facebook has really been killing me, the Republicans
saying I voted for a rise that was 11 percent over
two years and the funny thing is I serve with a lot
of those folks on those local boards and they know
how it works. The union comes in, they negotiate
with attorneys and I guarantee you the union came in
and said, well Massachusetts people are making this
and New York people are making this, what is fair,
what’s not fair, where should they be, what’s their
pay level. All those things are disused in these
meetings and we always talk about people leaving
Connecticut, how they can just pickup and go. This
also another sector of folks who can pickup and go.
I did the math last year and it was $140,000 dollars
per attorney, that is what the math came out it. If
you divide that by 2,000 work hours in a year, the
pay came out to about $72 bucks a hours. Hey, I’m a
union sheet metal worker, that sounds really good to me, but I don’t have $150,000 in student loads and I didn’t go to school for eight years to get to that point. So I understand that they are gonna want to make a little more than we make. And if you’ve hired an attorney recently, and I have for a couple of different things at work, the goin rate is between $300 dollars and there was one attorney in New York that was $700 dollars a hour. And I don’t want to say we’re getting a discount or deal, I get where the folks are comin from though. If you hear the rhetoric that State employees are just paid too much, this is ridiculous, why are they so much further than the public sector? I can tell you this about the public sector cause I’ve been a member for a very long time, the public unions the bus was moving, slowly, a little bit at a time, one percent, two percent and then over 30 years because the private sector bus stopped and hasn’t moved for 30 years. So and now what we’re seeing in our folks that are upset and even me, I have neighbors, they
look at someone that has benefits that are State workers and they say, why should that guy have that. To me it’s a story of I’m going down to get a pick-up truck at my local dealer and Representative Johnson, I find out bought the same exact pick-up truck with the same exact options. You know there was nothing different about it. It was the same exact truck. And we come to work with each other and we talk about the truck, we look outside and she informs me that she paid $4,000 less for her truck than I paid for mine and maybe she negotiated better, maybe she said something, I don’t know, but she got that truck for $4,000 dollars cheaper and like me, now running to the dealership saying, I want you to charge Representative Johnson $4,000 dollars more instead of me going to the dealer, saying I want to pay $4,000 dollar less. I want to fight. I want to fight for what I get and we see today as 31,000 Stop & Shop workers in our State and in the surrounding states are fighting right now for everything they believe in because you know why,
they finally said enough is enough. They said that we can’t take any more and I’ve seen some people say, well that’s their job and you know what, they should a got a better education or they should do something different if they want to make more money. I can tell you when I first got into the workforce, I graduated high school in 1989, went directly to prison, for a short, short time and I didn’t do it so in case anyone was wondering, [Laughter] but when I got out I walked into a non-union job, they gave me 40 hours a week, the starting pay was $6.50 an hour and they said that after four years, you’ll make $13 dollars an hour, you have 11 paid holidays and one week paid vacation. I told that same story to a young kid in my constituency that is 25 years old, 25 years old with about $60,000 dollars in college debt and he looked at me and said, “I would take that job today. If I knew I was going to make $13 dollars in four years, I would take that job today in today’s economy.” So today when we’re talking about these employees who got these raises
over all this time, I think of all these young faces that I see up in this crowd, the people we’re fightin for right now are those folks. When they get a job four years from now, we are already down and we explained this at a meeting last night, folks are all upset about the unions and about how big and bad they are, we’re talking Tier 1 and Tier 2. Most folks in our State don’t realize that there is a Tier 4A and I predict the way we’ve been beating up on State employees the last few years, we are going to have a Tier 5, Walmart tier, where they work for 55 years for the State of Connecticut and never retire. And maybe that’s gonna make Connecticut great and competitive. What makes me upset is that every time we bring up other states, cause everyone says everyone’s leaving, leaving, and I get it.

A lot of the State workers that we have did retire and they do go to Florida and they say, well we paid so much little, the taxes are so low. If you retire as a police officer here in Connecticut and you go to Florida, the guy that is protecting
your house in Florida he could work 90 years and never retire. The way we move our country forward to me is to make sure everyone is paid at a decent level. As a State worker the gold standard and how do they get there, I believe they probably are in Connecticut for a guy that’s working on the side of a road making $28 bucks an hour, plowing at night, does that happen in a non-union situation or not working for the State. It probably doesn’t. But if you’re making the laws in this building and you are starting to look at the total effect, if we paid a State worker $10 dollars an hour, they would leave the building after work, and get they paycheck from the State, but then they would enter the Human Services Building in your town or they would have to go to the Federal Government and get their earned income tax credit. So I am not going to bite my tongue every time, I don’t want to sound like a broken record I guess. We keep hearing that broken record part and it is easy to be on the side of we can’t afford it. I’m in the sheet metal business.
I give people quotes all of the time that they cannot afford, but their roof is leaking or their boiler is broken. Sometimes you have to afford certain things. If we lose these workers we’re talking about and I remember, we’re not just talking about numbers now, these are actual workers that at the end of the day will say, “Oh they didn’t want to give me a raise.” We all have other jobs, right. We go back to our employer and when they tell us no raise, and you know the company did good or bad or whatever they did and that is sometimes not your business, cause it’s not their fault that we didn’t pay our bills 50 years ago. They have the opportunity to take another job and that is my perspective on it, on everything I vote on up here and the reason I’m actually coming out is because the amount of abuse I got on Facebook because I voted for the last contract two weeks ago, they failed to mention an 11 percent raise, they forget that folks went like seven years without a raise and all they are doing is paying catch-up and that is
where we stand now. Comin from a union sheet metal worker in Connecticut that now barely is making it because our insurance went up and all these other things went up, I get it and our union is gonna go in there an negotiate with owners of the companies and we’ll probably get a one or two percent raise, we’re just treading water and when everybody keeps referring to the private sectors and how great they’ve done and how they keep costs down, remember if there is a private sector person that used to work at even Sears. Sears used to pay health insurance to people. They are gone now. So now the new private sector Walmart, when people work there, they don’t have insurance. Guess why the State workers looks so expensive now, because our insurance is almost $30,000 a person because we have private sector places that don’t and haven’t moved forward. So now it’s time we move forward.

I am obviously gonna vote for this Bill and I’m gonna keep voting for all these Bills as they come up because I’m gonna trust that they were negotiated
in good faith on both sides which anyone that has municipal experience knows all that to be true. We have police officers in my town right now that my nephew is a police officer, he did like many kids do, he followed in his father’s footsteps. He became a police officer. These people have been working just three years. He just missed it. “Oh, I don’t have a defined retirement. I mean, I don’t have a pension, I don’t have this. I don’t make as much as this guy makes. I have to work ten years longer than this guy did.” The problem that no one is seeing in here is all these young kids that are comin up, if we were gonna do to them what we’re doin to ‘em, and we all know what we’re doing to ‘em, we should have never taught ‘em math in high school because they’re using a calculator and realizing that they’re in trouble. So I hope all the young kids up there are listening because I’m telling you pay attention to this stuff cause the previous generation wasn’t really looking out for ya. It’s time we all get together and let’s move this Bill forward and get
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky of the 47th District.

You have the floor, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So we’re gonna give highly paid lawyers another raise and bonuses. But we don’t have enough tax money. We don’t have enough money in this State to pay them. So what do we have to do? We are already the second highest taxed State in the Nation. Think about that for a second. There are 50 states in this country and we are the second highest taxed State in the Nation. We still don’t have enough money to pay for the bonuses and the raises that we as a legislature plan to give out to State employees. So what do we need to do? We need to raise taxes. And we need to raise taxes big time so we can leapfrog over number one and become the highest taxed State in the Nation. So what kind of taxes have we proposed? Well, we’ve got proposals to impose highway tolls
because we don’t have enough money to fix our roads and bridges. So we’re gonna take more money out of the pockets of the people of this State for tolls. There is a proposal for statewide property tax. There is a proposal to replace the local car tax with a statewide car tax. We’ve got a proposal for a millionaires tax. There is a brilliant proposal to add a tax to gasoline, home heating fuel, diesel fuel, jet fuel, kerosene, propane, and natural gas because we don’t have enough money in this State so we need to take more money out of the pockets of the people of this State. There is a proposal to put another tax on electricity. There is a proposal to tax legal services because when people are down and out and are really desperately in need of an attorney who is gonna charge $100 dollars an hour or $200 dollars an hour, they really need to put more money into the coffers of the State of Connecticut. That is a great way for us to get money is to really hit people when they’re down. We’ve got a proposal to tax accounting services because when we need to
get an accountant to do our taxes, of course, we want to have to pay the State of that. There’s proposals to add a tax to veterinary services so when your animal is sick the State is going to take a piece of that money. Sugary drinks, there’s a great one. We are gonna tax sugary drinks because we need more money to pay for more bonuses and raises for highly paid State attorneys. Plastic bags, five cents a plastic bad. How many plastic bags do you use in a month? Well, five cents apiece because the State needs more money to pay for more raises. Grocery bags. Groceries, textbooks, nonprescription drugs, alcoholic beverages, beverage containers, the bottles because we don’t charge enough tax on the booze that’s in the bottle, we now have to put a tax on the bottle itself. Haircuts because everybody needs a haircut at some point, right? Great way to suck some more money out of the people of this State. Why do we need the money, because we’re giving it away to people that make $100 grand a year. Dry cleaners. Real estate,
great another tax on real estate. Boat storage because the boating industry is doing so well in this State, why don’t we throw in another tax on it. Interior design. Newspapers and magazines. Waste collection. Parking. Renovations and repairs, so you want to fix up your house to sell it because you’re desperate to get out of this State, well it’s gonna cost you more because the State needs a piece of that. Trade in for cars. You’re trying to upgrade your car or you’re trying to just trade in your car, new tax on that. That is great proposal. Helmets, oh there’s a good one, let’s put a tax on helmets. That’ll encourage people to ride motorcycles safely. Car seats because kids’ safety is so important that we need to tax it. Summer camps, sports programs, swim lessons, and here’s the kicker, we’re gonna now license cats and domestic animals. I can see it now, going into the town clerk and saying I need a license for my gerbil, please, for my goldfish, here’s the little tag to put around its neck. Come on! So we just heard the
State employees, these tax attorneys, start, their starting salary is $90,000 dollars a year, right out of school, $90 grand a year. But what’s the median income of the people in this State? Well right now it’s about $74,000 dollars a year. That is the median income, that’s for people who’ve been working for years, and years, and years $74,000 the median income. And where has that median income gone in the last few years, well what was it in 2005, 14 years ago what was the median income in this State, $78,000 dollars. So in the last 14 years the median income in this State has dropped over five percent. We’re talking about the people in your districts who work for a living. They’ve lost five percent over the last 14 years.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

"Representative can we still stay on the topic on the board for the germaneness. Thank you." 

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker. We are giving raises of five percent over two years to
people who make $90,000 dollars to start when at the same time, over the last 14 years, the people of this State have lost that same amount for a median income of $74,000 dollars. That is what this proposal is right now. That’s what is before us. And where does this money come from? Where does the money that we are about to spend come from? It comes from people who are working. It comes from the time and people spend at their jobs. So when we’re talking about giving more raises to highly paid attorneys and more bonuses, and more time off I would ask you to go to the people of your district and tell them that they are going to spend more time away from their families. That they are going to spend more time away from their vacation and they are going to have to spend more of their working hours at their job, making more money to give to this State so we can give that money that they’ve worked for to people who make a lot more money than they do, have a lot better benefits than they do and have a lot more time off than they do. Thank you,
Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Case of the 63rd District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning. Just a few questions and some comments because some conversations happened after the last contract that we passed out of here. So Through you, Mr. Speaker. I know we’ve talked about it, but the time off accrued that is still at 45 days, nine weeks, is that not correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Through you. Within this contract is there any cap on the sick time that
can be accrued. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again that is governed by the P-5 Contract particulars. If you give me a second to flip to it but yeah, you accrue the 1-1/4 days per year and then additional time can go into the sick bank and then while you can accrue it, you can only take a certain amount with you, I believe it is a quarter. For example, if you, unfortunately is someone were to die, for example, their beneficiary would only get I believe I quarter of that time, so there are caps on the actual amount that you can monetize from any accrued sick time. Through you. I should, I just want to note real quick just to correct myself on the record, the starting salary is about $77,000 dollars closer to that median income. I misspoke earlier. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That sick time is a little different than what was explained in Appropriations. From what I just heard from the good Gentleman is that you can use sick time for bereavement time? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, and that is across the board with the SEBAC contracts that some of that time can be used for those purposes again with prior agreement. It is not additional time, you can use some of that time for those purposes. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Can you use sick time for vacation that has been accrued? Through
you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you. No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So if somebody wanted to use time that was accrued which we were told in our hearing that it can go on indefinitely, the amount you accrue, but when you payout at the end if you have monies leftover it is only paid out at a quarter. But what are the instances that sick time that’s accrued can be used other than being sick. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you. So there is a whole provision in the P-5 and this is again consistent with a number
of our wage and hour provision that the State has negotiated. With respect to sick leave time, obviously you need to be sick. You need to use them, the medical, you have to have a medical reason for that. An acceptable medical certificate, etc. You can use some of it for again, we’ve talked about how we embedded in these contracts across the board some of those family care purposes, again subject to prior approval of management. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It was explained in our Committee meeting that sick time is accrued as sort of the employee’s paid family leave so people do accrue and it was, for me, it was hard to hear when a state agency told us that it is better to accrue than to use. So I was curious and I will look into it for more information that is coming to us is how much of that sick time is used on sick time and when someone is actually sick. Through
you, Mr. Speaker can they use a personal day?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, no. You’re sick, you’re sick, your personal time is your personal time. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And once again we heard differently in the hearing but I will move on. I’m done with questions right now, Representative D’Agostino so thank you very much for your answers.

Here we are again, and we are looking at six employees we are here today to vote on, in one bargaining unit. The last time we heard the bargaining unit it was 148 so now we are at 152 people that have joined the bargaining unit, the SEBAC Agreement. Granted this agreement is only roughly $88,000 dollars, the total we have done in
two contracts is roughly $3.5 million dollars of accrued added to our budget and we have one more coming to us, that was just passed out of Appropriations the other day that will bring us well over the $4 million dollar mark accrued. I don’t know where we get the money. We were just up Autism Day, last week we just had DMHAS and a bunch of other agencies up here who haven’t had increases. Yet in the summarization in Appropriations these employees that are getting this are averaging $93,000 to $128,00 dollars. Yet we can’t give a dollar to people who are the most vulnerable. We are on the cusp of 2,500 people striking to where our own family members are going to have a tough time being taken care of in the nursing homes because of reimbursement and wages that we pay DSS.

To me we have to look at priorities on where we put our dollars, $4 million dollars annually accrued in three contracts for roughly 194 employees, there is 40,000 State employees, this is only 194. When are we going to prioritize and take care of our most
vulnerable? We have 2,000 people on a waiting list to get a place to live that have an intellectual developmental disability. Prioritize. I understand people do great work in the State of Connecticut but when you hear the words 45 days they can accrue to take off, nobody in the private sector gets 45 days where they can accrue to take off. Nobody in the private sector can accrue sick days unlimited and then use it for other reasons other than sickness. We need to take this long and hard and remember May first we vote for this contract and if it goes through, we got 2,500 employees gonna be going on strike who take care of our loved ones in our nursing homes but we can’t prioritize our dollars to go to the right place. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Betts from the 78th District.

You have the floor, sit.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Good morning and thank you very much, sir. A couple of question to the proponent and comment if I
may? Through you, sir. Could the good gentleman tell me if the money that has been allocated to pay for these contracts, has the money already existed in the budget or is this new money for a budget that is yet to be approved. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that question was asked. Look answering that question goes to some of these other comments as well. I would really urge everybody to not look at these contracts in a vacuum, right. They are all part of an arrangement that we agreed to a couple of years ago with all of our State employees that saved the State billions of dollars, that let us close our budget gap two years ago. At the expense of what that would have cost in tax increases or whatever else and cuts that we didn’t have to do because our State employees gave back and have saved us $24 billion dollars over the long haul in increased
pension contributions, increased health care contributions. New employees after July 1, 2017 are on a 401K plan, basically a private sector plan and they have no job security. That was all part of this deal. So these raises that are now coming due, in the third and forth years of the contract, are on top of the hard zeros we negotiated in the previous years that we got the benefit from. That is collective bargaining. This is not a handout. This is not a free for all. This is something that we bargained for. This is the second part of it that they are entitled to, but we got a massive benefit from all of that on the first part and because of that, because we were budgeted for that, because we knew it was coming this money is in the reserve for salary account. This is not new money. That is what collective bargaining gives you, predictability, stability, savings, that is what we’ve got from this deal and so this is not a handout. This is not just, we’re deciding to give these people raises. This is all bargained for.
Please don’t look at these contracts when they come through individually in a vacuum, they are part of a larger deal that has saved this State billions. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

    Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

    Thank you and I am very glad the Representative brought this up. For the record, we say we, approved the SEBAC Agreement. I did not approve it nor will I approve any more moving forward because the problem we have is not the employees, the problem we have is with the process. So through you, Mr. Speaker. Who pays or where does the State of Connecticut get money to pay for these contracts? Is it not all taxpayers in Connecticut including the State employees? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

    Representative D’Agostino, excuse me.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

    Through you Mr. Speaker. Sure. I mean
obviously the general fund, all the different revenue items from the general fund eventually help all the costs of the State including the actual people who help run the State. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you for that answer. I wonder if the good Representative would tell me if the people who are paying, obviously the people who are paying for this do they share in any of the benefits that have been negotiated here. In other words, are they not in fact paying for benefits that they are not receiving nor will they receive? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think if I understand the question, the answer to that is yes. So for example, these particular employees in this
unit have agreed to a lower step increase than the other members of their bargaining units. So, you know, whatever their aggregate add in to the State coffers is, they are getting less than other members of the bargaining unit. Again, by agreement, that is a negotiated deal term. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you. Actually the Representative or maybe I wasn’t clear enough, the people who are paying for this we all agree are taxpayers. They in my mind are not getting any of the benefits that have been negotiated in these contracts. They are not getting the 45 days off, etc. the other things that have been identified in negotiated in these specific contracts. Is it not accurate and fair to say the people are paying for others to receive something that they are not personally going to be getting? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST): Through you. No, no. That is not accurate. I mean I guess it depends on what we’re talking about. Is the taxpayer in the State of Connecticut getting 45 days off by virtue of this agreement? No. Do the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut get $1.5 billion dollars in savings in 17 and 18? Did they get a renewed contract that saves us $24 billion dollars over 20 years? Did they get the benefit of that so we didn’t have to raise taxes or cut services the last budget cycle? Absolutely. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you. Thank you for your answers. Now I will make a few comments including the one Representative de la Cruz mentioned. I was not planning on talking on this but I am not gonna bite my tongue either. I can tell you the people who I represent in Bristol and Plymouth, I could assure
you, I can guarantee you, they are very upset with what we are doing. They have said over and over again and not only about how overtaxed they are, I know many of them who don’t have any insurance, do not even have jobs and are just working hard to go paycheck to paycheck. They don’t feel they have been heard. I will standup every single time that the occasion warrants to standup for the them because, not only do I represent them, I agree with them. It is the system that is the problem. We are going contracts and it comes before us, can anybody think of a time when somebody has said, “No” to a contract. How often does that occur in response to what the people in our districts say?

We sit here and we negotiate contracts, did we in the private sector, or do people outside the public sector, you talk about the big savings, which I would like to know where the big savings go, I wonder if. Well I’m not gonna get into that, but I will just simply tell you a fact. People in the private sector when the companies did not have
money, I repeat, they did not get guaranteed jobs. They did not get guaranteed jobs! If people think that’s fair to the people who are paying taxes, I totally disagree. They need to be represented. I don’t think taxpayers have been represented in the nine years I’ve been up here when it comes to collective bargaining and thinking out and looking out for their interests. All they’re told is like what we’re told. Here’s a contract. This is what was negotiated, approve it. And by the way, it is going to be new money going into a new budget and it is moving forward and by the way a lot of this stuff goes on the pensions. If people really believe here that the only people here that should benefit from what is going on or contributed to the State is the public sector, then I disagree. We have a system that is hurting everybody, everybody. So I take great exception to people who say, oh well, look at the tremendous savings that are being realized which are numbers and papers and yet ask the people who will have to pay for it who are not benefiting from
it. Ask them if they share that same feeling, same benefit. I will be voting against this and all future contracts until we address what they say, they are supposed to be our bosses, reform the system and make it fairer for everybody. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dathan of the 142nd District.

You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am first going to recognize my two children who are watching Democracy in action here and I am really pleased to show them that we are looking at all these contracts and looking at how much they are costing our State, what we need to do to make sure that we get our State on a fiscal responsibility. I appreciate the discussion.

I also wanted to note about all of the recognition of how much these people would be making in the private sector. I am a CPA, 25 plus years’
experience and many of these attorneys have a lot more experience than I do within the tax laws and they also have more education than I do. We are paying them private sector benefits. They are not receiving long-term pension plans that are what you would get in the older people that have been part of the State for a longtime. They are getting more along the lines with the private sector pension plans and 401K plans, but yet they are receiving a lot less salary than they would be receiving in the private sector. Again these are highly specialized individuals with long career service and lots of education. But I think one thing that we’re forgetting here is that these attorneys spend most of their time making sure that businesses and individuals are paying their fair share of taxes. These individuals are working for the State to make sure that the wealthy are paying their fair share and that everybody is doing their fair share for Connecticut. We need to make sure that people don’t underpay their taxes which is going to cost the rest
of us State taxpayers much more money. They bring in far much more money to the State than we pay them. People are forgetting that. Without them honest taxpayers would be forced to pay more, where dishonest people could get away with less tax.

I just want to finalize saying that we end up spending much more if we had to privatize and hire firms to do this at $300 to $500 dollars an hour and we need to be thinking that these are actually employees that are value add like all State employees but they are actually bringing in a lot of money to our State. So thank you very much and I will be supporting this Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Cheeseman from the 37th District. You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I just have a few comments. There has been give and take and a lot of debate on this issue and I’ll just refer to the constituents with whom I spoke last
week at an office hours in Salem and their comment to a man and woman was what are you people in Hartford doing. They didn’t differentiate across party lines. They didn’t care whether or not I was a man or a woman. They saw me as someone who regardless of the votes I take on the floor, they view us as working against them. Where did the time come when the average citizen of Connecticut look at what’s happening in their State capital and feel those people aren’t on my side. As I get up and go to work, as I look at my children, as I look at my aged father, their parents dealing with all those issues that they see something like this going on with salaries that they can never hope for. With benefits that would only happen in their wildest dreams. With guaranteed job security for four years in return for wage freezes. They would give their eyeteeth for that and I need to be there voice here. We can argue the benefits we gain from every single State employee but at the end of the day, surely we have to think about the benefits we have to offer to
our citizens, every man, woman and child. And as long as we continue to do things that create further debt, create a further perception that there was one rule for people who work for the State and another rule for the people who work in the private sector, we’re not gonna have the kind of State that works for everybody here and that is what I want to work for. So, I acknowledge the hard work of these attorneys, I acknowledge the hard work of everyone here but I cannot in good consciences support this Bill while my constituents, people in my town, continue to have the feeling that we are not working for them. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative O’Dea from the 125th District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. O’DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick comment, no questions for the proponent. I appreciate his responses to date and I can’t say I disagree with them from a factual standpoint, I
appreciate his perspective. What I just wanted to bring out to my good friend from the 41st, I wasn’t planning on speaking either and he had said he going to try to bite his lip. My lip is continuing to bleed at this point-in-time I’ve been biting it so much, so I just want to briefly state that the State workers, the misconception, I think that a lot of people have is simply because we are opposed to the contract we are opposed to State workers. That is not the point of why I am going to be voting, “No.” As stated by Clint Eastwood playing William Money in the movie “Unforgiven”, when the sheriff was on the ground, Gene Hackman, said, “I don’t deserve this” and Clint Eastwood playing William Money, said, “Deserves got nothing to do with it.” And at this point-in-time, I just want to say it’s not that the state workers don’t deserve this raise, that is not the point I am making. The point I want to make, on behalf of my constituents is that we can’t afford the raises and I know my good friend from the 41st was going through an analogy, I just want to point
out that, you know, I work two jobs. My wife works two jobs so that I can work two jobs. And these times they are tough as they say. At the end of the day we just can’t afford to continue to increase our costs because as I said previously on the floor, my district in 2014 paid $225 million dollars in income taxes to the State of Connecticut. We are only 18,000 residents. New Canaan paid $225 million dollars in taxes to the State of Connecticut, 18,000 people. In 2017 that number went down to $190 million dollars. My constituents are leaving and we can’t afford, if we increase the taxes on my constituents they are going to continue moving. Those who can afford to move will be moving and be taking their money with them. So while I believe I am not going to convince anybody to change their vote at this point-in-time. I just want to make note of this, going forward, raising taxes is not an option because our revenue will go down. When we decrease the boating tax revenue went up as pointed out by Mr. Dubitsky, or Representative Dubitsky.
Revenue went up when we decreased the taxes. If we decreased taxes, I’m telling you revenues will go up. So with that, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for your time and attention. We all deserve better. Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora from the 86th District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon and I also had no planned on speaking. But I think it was said that a “yes” vote is an easy vote and I have to disagree with that. I think the “no” vote is a much more difficult one because obviously it does, these votes do impact our State workers and it is very difficult to say that somebody should not be getting an increase or somebody should not be getting an expanded benefit but, you know, the reality is in the State of Connecticut and I think it was talked about today, you know, our economy is essentially stagnant. And yes, the private sector hasn’t seen
increases much more than just in four or five years. I think there are some industries that are going well into the 10 years. One of the business tours I went I on, I remember I was talking to the business owner who employs about 150 people and was discussing in the context of a minimum wage increase, the impact he is having in trying to run his business to make ends meet and I wouldn’t disclose the business but in our area, people would be shocked because it is knows as a viable good company. But when you talk to the owners, they would say otherwise. I looked at him and said, let me ask you when everything turned, was it around 08? And he said absolutely. We never came back from 2008 and I feel like in the last biennium, budget that we started to turn the corner. I think as Representative O’Dea pointed out, we’re seeing an increase in revenues when we decreased taxes in the boating industry. And it is a little bit ironic when Representative Dubitsky was told to kind of get to the point because that is the point. He spoke to
the very manner in which the State of Connecticut needs to fund these contracts and that is through taxation. And the fact of the matter is we’ve reached the point where our taxes have made us stagnant, have constricted us and so I think it is a lot harder to standup here and oppose our State workers and then we are going to be turning around within seven weeks from now attempting to vote on a budget and we have a battle already in this building on which taxes to raise and whether or not to raise taxes. So, I think it is a bit disingenuous to be able to standup and say we need to do this, we need to be able to support these State workers when on the backend there is no manner at all in which we could pay for it under our current projections. And so I stand in opposition to this contract. It is not in opposition to our State workers, but rather we cannot continue to make our decisions in a vacuum which I think is where this discussion has gone today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Minority Leader Klarides from the 114th District. You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH);

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to say whether I was planning on talking or not because I’m talking now. And I agree with the comment my colleagues have made so I will not be repetitive in regards to those. I know though that Representative Case was upstairs with me at Autism Day and we all, no matter which side of the aisle we’re on, we hear from people, parents who have young children that are developmentally disabled. We also hear a lot of parents who have older children who are developmentally disabled and their struggles on how those children who are now adults are going to live the rest of their lives. We also hear from the elderly. We hear from preschoolers, we hear from schools. We hear from a lot of people cause that’s our job to figure out and listen to what people need and what they want. But unfortunately from what you heard we have a very serious budget problem. We
have a $3.5 billion deficit we’re facing and I’m glad that Representative from Hamden brought the issue up of the negotiation and the contract two years ago and how wonderful it was, and what an amazing job and how much savings we got. My head almost exploded when I heard that because as the Representative from Bristol mentioned it wasn’t we who supported that, and as you’ve heard time-after-time not because we don’t like our employees but because we simply can’t afford it. Simply can’t afford it! Just like the same decisions you make in your home day in and day out and in these difficult budget times, it is our job as government leaders to prioritize and figure out who needs our help the most and those are the people that are the most vulnerable. And it is not the people we are addressing today, it is not the people we addressed two weeks ago, it will not be the people that we address next week. And that is the whole problem. He is correct. This problem didn’t occur today. Two years ago when we had a golden opportunity, no
matter how much money was saved, we all know it was nowhere near the structural change that needed to be made in fringe benefits, etc. Nowhere near. We wouldn’t have to make the decision on whether those people upstairs can figure out how their disabled children are taken care of. How their disabled adults will ever be able to take care of themselves when their parents are gone. Those are decisions that we shouldn’t have to make, but those are the decisions that we’ve been put in the corner to have to make. It shouldn’t be contracts for lawyers with 15 percent and more wage increases, versus disabled, versus elderly, versus children, versus taking money out of your pocket everyday but those are the choices that you have forced us to make.

We have gotten our priorities straight. You all have to do the same. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Majority Leader Ritter from the 1st District.

You have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes when these debates happen, you hear things and you say, we’re never gonna find a way to get on the same page or agree. But I am actually comforted by what I heard here today cause to summarize what I heard was that there are workers getting increases and Representative D’Agostino mentioned through the collective bargaining process, they are getting a pay increase, that is true and it was part of a giveback in the whole SEBAC Agreement that helped us balance the previous Biennium budget. So what I am hearing is other workers in the State deserve a raise. Other workers in the State deserve leave to take care of their loved ones, to take care of sicknesses and illnesses. I am hearing that we should make sure that all workers are uplifted. Right now there are thousands of Connecticut workers at Stop & Shop striking for just that right to make more money, to have a good healthcare plan for their families, we can all join them in that strike.

We are going to have a vote sometime between
now and June forth to give every worker who earns the minimum wage a higher wage to uplift them and their families so that people who work 40 hours don’t live in poverty. So I agree with everything that has been said. Let’s find a way to make sure that all Connecticut families make more money, have humane polices to take care of them and their families just like the people in this Chamber do. That seems like a good idea to me. So, I’m all onboard and I look forward to the next five weeks and the last thing I would say, is I heard we should put more money into the budget for certain programs, I couldn’t agree more. Bipartisan conversations, lets do it. What do we want to fund? What are those programs? It is April 17th, we have seven weeks left, let’s do it. So you name the programs, we will all work on. I’m sure the Appropriations Committee continues to work through their process but these are not things that we disagree with. So at some point in the next six weeks we will have a change to uplift families and based on everything
I’m hearing today, that should be a bipartisan vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you very much. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the Resolution before us? If not, will the staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Will the Members please take their 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 BUTLER (72ND):

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 Resolution No. 23

Total Number Voting 146
Necessary for Adoption 74
Those voting Yea 84
Those voting Nay 62
Absent not voting 3

Deputy Speaker Butler (72nd):

The Resolution is adopted. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Buckbee from the 67th District. You have the floor, sir.


Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of introduction. As some of you know today is New Milford Day. A day that Representative Smith and myself are very proud to present downstairs in the North Lobby where you will find a wonderful collection of what New Milford is from Kimberly-Clark and their amazing Kleenex to Kimberly Farms and their amazing ice cream which I would challenge
any of you to find a better ice cream anywhere.

Also in there are a few people to introduce here, all right, [goat bleating] I’ll get to you next. This is Jedi. Jedi is a one-week-old baby goat here thanks to our friends at Goatboy Soaps. You want to say anything? No, okay. [Laughter] Jedi is a young representation and only a week old, a young representation of what New Milford is built on [Jedi bleats], there you go based on agriculture. So the young Jedi is a young Padawan right now but wants to learn from some of our wonderful guest behind us as well.

I am happy to introduce our Judge of Probate Marty Landgrebe. Our Chief of Police Spencer Cerruto, our Mayor Pete Bass and from our Town Council Katy Francis. I would like you all to please give them our usual accord and welcome. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you and please enjoy your day here visiting with us. Representative Baker. You have
the floor, sir.

REP. BAKER (124TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to see you up there. I am here for the purpose of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed.

REP. BAKER (124TH):

Mr. Speaker I wanted to welcome the Bridgeport Lighthouse Volunteers. They are in the balcony. They’ve come here on a tour of the Capital and Legislative Building and, you know, I must say that they are, have really drilled me on what we do here as legislators and I have to tell you that this is going to be our new wave of legislators here in the City of Bridgeport where I serve. So can we all just give a round of applause for them and look at the new faces and thank them for coming out here.

[Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Baker. Welcome, I
hope you enjoy your time here at the State Capitol. Chamber will come back to order. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 64.

CLERK:

On Page 6, House Calendar 64, House Bill 7112, AN ACT INCREASING THE AMOUNT A TOWN MAY DEPOSIT INTO A NONLAPSING ACCOUNT FOR UNEXPENDED EDUCATION FUNDS, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The fine Chair of the Education Committee, Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of
Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative Sanchez, you have the floor.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Mr. Speaker, beginning with fiscal 2020 this Bill increase the minimum amount of unspent education funds that a town may deposit in a nonlapsing fund from one percent to two percent of the town’s budgeted appropriation for Education for the prior fiscal year. Existing law unchanged by this Bill permits this deposit by the town Board of Finance, Board of Selectmen in a town with no Board of Finance or other appropriated authority for this school district. The Bill also requires that the deposited funds be spent upon the Board of Education’s authorization and only for educational purposes. This Bill came out of our Committee with unanimous support and I urge its passage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark
further? Representative McCarty of the 38th District.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

For a few points of clarification and comments later on the Bill to the proponent if I may? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, Madam. Prepare yourself.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you very much. Again for clarification, would you please confirm that this is already a current Law, the one percent of unexpended funds can be retained by Boards of Education with the approval of the Selectmen and the Board of Finance.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez. Hold on Representative technical difficulties.
REP. SANCHEZ (25TH): There we go. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, current you can use one percent, this Bill would just move that one percent to two percent.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Yes, thank you for that clarification. And then to just move on, you know many of our districts have multiple towns and if you could please comment how this Bill would effect say a district that was regionalized.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It would be the same process. Whatever they’re doing now, it would continue to be moving forward. There is not going to be any changes if they’re in a region or not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And then just a few
more quick questions, if I may? Can you, or would you be able to give an example to the Assembly of how these unexpected funds might be used? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So if a local Board of Ed has an issue maybe in a classroom, a loss of equipment or some maintenance issues, they would be able to go into this fund and make those repairs or purchase the equipment that is needed. This would only be for educational purposes. So they can do that presently and again as I stated before, it is just moving that one percent to two percent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I think you made an important comment that this Bill will strengthen that these funds, these unexpected funds can only be
used for educational purposes so I appreciate that clarification. And then just one more quick question if I may? Through you, Mr. Speaker would be is this Bill a mandate for one? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is not a mandate. They may choose to do this.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I would just like to say that I am in very strong support of this Bill. I think it will encourage very good fiscal planning on the parts of Boards of Education so that they don’t need to go back to their Board of Finance midyear to ask for funds that maybe necessary for unexpected educational purposes. I would like to remind my colleagues that this Bill came out of
Education unanimously. There is no fiscal note attached to the Bill and I think it is a good Bill supported by many of our educational organizations such as CAB, CAPS and the CEAs so I would encourage my colleagues to support this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

    Thank you, Representative McCarty. Will you remark further? From the 47th District, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

    Of course, please proceed.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

    Thank you. Under the current law the amount that can go into these nonlapsing funds is one percent, correct? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

    Representative Sanchez.
REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you and under this proposal it would be increased to two percent. Is that correct? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you and currently the funds that are deposited in that account are, the amount of the money that goes into the account is determined by the town, either the Selectmen or the Board of Finance, is that correct? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Under this proposal is there any change as to who determines how much goes into the account? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now currently the, currently who makes the decision as to what expenses are paid with this, with the money in the account currently? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The district and the local Board of Ed.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that Board of Finance actually decides currently where the money goes if it is in this nonlapsing account, not the Board of Ed. Am I mistaken in that? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I should have said the Board of Finance, instead of District, but you’re correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now under the proposal under Item 3, it appears that this changes that now the Board of Finance will no longer have any say in where this money goes and it will now be the expenditures will be decided by the Board of Education instead of the Board of Finance. Is that true? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that both the Board of Finance and the Board of Education would make those decisions but the money has to be spent on educational purposes only.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’ll direct the good proponent to Lines 14 and 15 and it appears to me that it says, each such expenditure shall be
authorized by the local Board of Education for such town and that is a complete change from the current law which has the Board of Finance that is the authority making the decision on those expenditures. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In addition, currently the money that is deposited in these accounts is not counted towards the minimum budge requirement, is that correct? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, the State’s MBR Law requires towns to budget at least the same
amount for education cost from the previous year. So this Bill is just increasing the amount that can be put into this particular account, from the one percent to the two percent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I didn’t make my question clear. Right now under current law the excess money that the Board of Education does not spend can be deposited by the Board of Finance into this nonlapsing account and can be directed by the Board of Education to things such as equipment purchases, or lawn maintenance or things like that that would not be considered educational expenditures that would not add to the current, to the minimum budget requirement for that year. Am I correct in that? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. Current law does not, does not give, does not authorize the expense at this point. It doesn’t specify that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is exactly my point. Current law does not specify so towns are using this money for maintenance of school buildings, for purchase of school equipment and things like that, that are not educational, considered educational expenses and that do not add to the minimum budget requirement. Under this Proposal I would point to Lines 13 and 14, it appears to be that this now mandates that all money coming out of these, coming out of these accounts, must only go to educational purposes and not to noneducational purposes thereby all of the money in these nonlapsing accounts will by statute be required to be added to the minimum budget requirement. Am I correct in that? Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Presently the dollars that are, that go into this account can be used for any type of purposes. The law will specify that whatever dollars that are in that account must be spent only for educational purposes and anything with a school building, anything with equipment, but it will not affect the NBR or that fiscal year. Because this is money that is already being sent to the local towns so that additional one percent which would increase by two percent with this Bill would put extra money into this account and those dollars would only be used towards. The only change you will see here is the dollars will have to be used towards educational purposes, either to replace equipment, or to fix the classroom or building or to do whatever that needs to be done, that’s educational expenses, regards educational expenses, sorry.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the proponent for his interpretation. However as someone who sits on a local Board of Finance and has dealt with this very issue for a number of years, I know that there are certain expenses that go towards the schools that are considered educational and some that are not. And those that are not considered educational do not add to the minimum budget requirement such as the purchase of equipment and things like that. Currently these accounts are used specifically by some towns for noneducational purposes that benefit the schools. Under this Bill they would no longer be able to use those funds for those purposes and these funds would be dedicated exclusively to, for example, paying for additional teachers which would add to the minimum budget requirement. So under this Bill, this Bill doesn’t just increase the percentage of excess funds that could go into the
accounts it does two other things. It first off changes who gets to decide where the money goes, it takes the power away from the Board of Finance and gives it to the Board of Education. And the other thing is it mandates that the town can no longer spend any of this money on noneducational expenses such as equipment, and maintenance and mandates that it can only be used for educational purposes such as instruction and teachers, thereby changing it from an account that can be used outside of the minimum budget requirement to an account that in the next year will add to the minimum budget requirement. If I can get a comment from the proponent on why that analysis is incorrect, I would certainly appreciate it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It would not effect the following years MBR, minimum budget requirement, for that city or town. These are dollars, again
that are appropriated to the town for educational purposes and they can use one percent with this Bill up to two percent to set aside to use towards any unexpected issues that may come up after the fact. They can go back into that account. But you are absolutely correct in regards to the Board of Education, they would make the decision to use those dollars for any project that is going on that has to do with an educational expense. And I think, I believe presently towns can use it for other expenses but this requirement would be that the education, it could be used only for educational expenses and it is not a mandate it is a “may” so they can choose whether they can do this or not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect I know that there are towns that have had legal opinions made, gotten as to the difference between educational and noneducational expenses that go to
schools. That the educational portion of it adds to the MBR the noneducational portion does not. Unfortunately were this Bill to pass there would be towns probably including my own that would no longer fund these nonlapsing accounts because every dollar that went into them would add to the MBR in the following year. Therefore I can’t support this Bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Dubitsky. Will you remark further? Representative Fishbein, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon to you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of good Representative Dubitsky. You know, I sit on my local town council. We’ve utilized this program. We found it to be of benefit
when the Board of Education saves money that this money can go into this account and then I know over the last two years, I think two years ago, this money was used to rehabilitate a football field at one of the high schools, a capital project which would not be interpreted as an educational project. I believe last year the $300,000 of this account was used for security upgrades at some of our schools, that would not be able to be done under this present language. I’m totally supportive of the whole process, increasing this from one percent to two percent but what this does it further restricts the utilization of the money and I’ll tell you as a local elected member of my town council if this language was to pass, I would never appropriate money into this unlapsing account. For those reasons that Representative Dubitsky did state and also it appears and perhaps a question is necessary to the proponent just to flush this out a little bit. If I may, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Sanchez.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

I’m gonna ask you a question. So we’re good.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

I thought you did but keep goin.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Yes and thank you, sir. Currently the way the procedure works is that a recommendation is made by the Board of Education to our town council who analyzes what the money is going to be used for and then approves. Am I to understand based upon your exchange with Representative Dubitsky that the town council would be taken out of that equation and that the Board of Education could make these decisions unilaterally? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, I believe is that the town council or the Board of Finance would not be taken out of the equation.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then I must ask why the language that is added to this, that I thought you were asked about only deals with this expenditure being authorized by the local Board of Education when we simply could have put by their legislative body as well as the Board of Education, but that language is not in there? If it is the intent of the legislation to continue to include that portion of local government that holds the purse strings why is that not in this language? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is the local Board of Educations that make this decision on how they’re gonna spend their dollars. I know that the Board of Finance and the Council will advocate a
certain amount of whatever it may be of dollars to their budget and then they make a decision on how that money is being spent. This would just take that, like I mentioned earlier, that one percent that they could do an unlapsing funds set aside they can increase it to two percent and then they can use that further down the road. It will not affect the MBR in anyway and it’s also not, it’s not a mandate. The local towns and cities can determine whether they want to do this or not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And with all due respect that was nonresponsive, so if I could just give a scenario that utilization of the two percent account, should this become a two percent account ends up with $500,000 dollars in this nonlapsing account as a result of Board of Education savings. By what procedure is that money expended? Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

It would be a local decision. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Local decision by whom? The underlying question was does the Board of Education make this decision without input because the only authority that is stated expressly in this language is the Board of Education. There is no reference to a mayor, first selectman, Board of Finance, town council nothing. So what is the procedure for the expenditure of that money? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Currently it’s not
specified. And so my understanding is they would continue to do what they are currently doing except for the difference here would be that one percent to two percent and the change in the Bill would be the expenditures be directed towards any type of issues that the Board, the local Board of Education may come up in regards to expenditures that they may need to fix something in the building or get equipment. So currently it doesn’t really specify who’s involved. I would imagine it’s a local decision and it’s up to that local board and the Board of Finance to make up that decision of what, how they’re gonna move forward this on the unlapsing account.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps some more pointed question. Does the Board of Education need authorization from anyone else in local government to expend any money in the nonlapsing account?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It’s education money so they make the decision at this point.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If that is the intent of this language as expressly in there, it would totally get rid of towns doing and utilizing these projects. It would add to added unnecessary Board of Education expenses. Cause that’s what used to happen in the past. Board of Education would have $500,000 left at the end of the budget year, they would say, okay what are our needs over the next two years, let’s spend the money. But instead this legislator in its good reasoning put together the one percent account and this would totally devastate that whole project, so. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further? Our Majority Leader, Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A rare, I’m not wrapping up at all. I just heard the debate and I think there is some confusion. This has no impact on MBR what so ever. Okay? It’s the existing provision that exists now and you are simply allowing Boards of Education to work with their town government to keep some surplus appropriations as the good Chairman of the Education Committee said, to accumulate funds that you can then use. The second question that I’ve heard and that would not affect the MBR. Again that is from an appropriation already given to the Board of Education for that fiscal year so it would not be adding on top of the next fiscal year appropriation. It is an account, it is a separate account. The second thing that I’m confused by is this notion that there is some
concern that the Board of Education unilaterally spend the money in the surplus account. There is really three ways it could work and I would encourage anyone to look at the Bill we talked about last year and the testimony as to why these are important accounts. But here’s how it works in practice. There’s three ways the money gets spent. If you do nothing and you read the Statute, the Board of Education unilaterally just decides how it gets spent. That is the default under the statutory provision. You have to get permission of your Board of Finance or your Board of Selectmen to put the money to begin with but once the money goes in, if it is sitting there and you do nothing, the Board of Education unilaterally decides how to do it.

Now let’s talk reality. If you are looking to spend the money on things that are not a good purpose, or a town council or a Board of Finance may find objectionable, remember the original request. Who has to determine an approve of the appropriation to the account? The town council or the Board of
Finance. So if you’re gonna go spend $55,000 dollars on widgets it will probably be rejected by the Board of Finance or the town council, or if they give it to you one year and you spend it frivolously or for purposes that it should not be spent upon, then the next time you go back the next fiscal year, they are going to say, no. There is a third way I’ve seen it done and it matters a lot because in cities like Hartford we need these accounts and it matters in suburban towns because you need the accounts there too. The third way is you do an ordinance. Several towns across the State of Connecticut have adopted ordinances for these accounts where they have an agreement on how it gets spent. So for example, you use the Statute, the money gets put into the account but then we have an ordinance that says, here’s how we’re gonna determine how the money is spent. These are great accounts, it has no impact in MBR, nothing is butchered, it is a very good Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader. Will you remark further? Representative Zullo of the 99th District.

REP. ZULLO (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have just two questions. The majority were actually addressed by the Majority Leader, so I thank him for that. And if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ZULLO (99TH):

Mr. Speaker, there has been some debate but I just want to make it clear. As I understand it, educational purposes means any and all educational expenses, that would include capital expenses like classroom equipment but also like a ball field for example? Through you, Mr. Chair. And this is to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.
REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Zullo.

REP. ZULLO (99TH):

Then I really have no further questions. Just one other comment, if I may Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed.

REP. ZULLO (99TH):

You know, I’ve seen in a lot of municipalities that at the end of the fiscal year you have Boards of Ed racing to spend money before it returns and reverts back to the general fund. These lapsing accounts help Boards of Ed keep some of that money and be able to utilize it more efficiently and so for that reason I am supportive of this Bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Zullo. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? From the
42nd District Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions through you to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

    Please proceed.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

    First off going back on the educational purposes, I know we’ve talked about what that it means here and that would be legislative intent. Is there anywhere in Statute that the phrase “educational purposes” is defined? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

    Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

    Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

    I have some concern over that how broadly or
narrowly that might be interpreted. I think that if we are putting a phrase in there like that we ought to be defining that in Statute going back to the line of questioning that Representative Fishbein had concerning this very issue. I think there could be some question as to that, what that means. And then the final thing is the third change and I appreciate the Majority Leader coming in and clarifying some of the points, my concern with the third section and the change there approved by the Board of Education is it appears by that language the State is then absent an ordinance which the local government would decide would then allow the Board of Education once the money is put in an nonlapsing account without any action by the Board of Finance or finance committee of a town, the Board of Education can just spend that money. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Is that the correct interpretation of that third subsection?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.
REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Can you repeat that question please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Yeah, please. Representative France please restate your question.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Absolutely. The third phrase of, essentially I’m paraphrasing, states that the expenditure must be approved by the local Board of Education. That seems to imply by enacting a Statute that once the funds at the end of a fiscal year are deposited in the nonlapsing account, that the Board of Education unilaterally by a vote can then chose to spend that fund without any oversight of the Board of Finance or the town council in a council form of government. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is my
understanding that the Board of Finance does not approve what the local Ed, Board of Educations do not now presently with their budget.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

I thank you for that answer and I would agree with the budget of the current fiscal year. So once the budget is passed and the finances for the Board of Education of that town in a current fiscal year that is absolutely correct. But we are now talking about funds from a prior fiscal year that the Board of Education has not statutory authority to spend. We are now granting [Audio cuts out].

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

We'll try again. Representative France. How you doing over there? Try pushing your button again, sir. You have? Just once. We'll get to you, Representative. Chamber will stand-at-ease for a second.

Representative France maybe you could use
Representative Dathan’s mic and we’ll help you try to get your questions asked while these technical difficulties are ongoing. No, the other one, the next one. Representative Dathan’s mic. How’s that workin?

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

And where I was going, and I appreciate just to review we had, that is correct, the Board of Finance does not have any authority to dictate to the Board of Education in the current fiscal year. So one the town approves whether by referendum or representative town meeting, and the budget approved for the current fiscal year, the Board of Finance does not have any say, it is solely with the discretion of the Board of Education under the oversight of the State Department of Education. However we are not talking about funds from the
current fiscal year. We are talking about funds from a prior fiscal year and currently Boards of Education have no authority to spend money from a prior fiscal year. This is expanding the role of the Board of Education as I read it. Is that? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that and I have serious concern over that in this fashion. So before I became a legislator I was the Chair of the Finance Committee in my town. So we’ve had an ordinance in Ledyard for 15 years dealing with this very issue and how that happens is it is a nonlapsing, nonrecurring capital account. The Board of Education presents and comes to the Finance Committee and seeks
approval for capital expenditures. I think that is the appropriate role and that’s the way the role is now. But by enacting this legislation today what we are effectively doing by State Statute, absent and ordinance at the local level we are saying that the Board of Education has sole authority to spend money outside of the fiscal year. That is not their role. That is not the purview and that is not the current law and I think that is great expansion of the Board of Education’s responsibility that is effectively no oversight. Because as I stated Boards of Education by act of this Body as well as State Court decisions they are political entities of the State under the oversight of the State Department of Education. What I would argue is that is that the expenditures made at the town level effectively has no oversight say the Board of Education until after it’s done and then by then it’s too late to have any remedy. We should not be expanding the role of the Board of Education to spend money outside the current fiscal year and the oversight and the representation of the
town is by the Finance Committee or the Board of Finance and the Board of Selectmen or town council in that town and I would object to expanding that role because I believe the town is not represented well from an oversight perspective to spend money outside of that fiscal year. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not will the staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. I believe we’re all set. Oh, I’m sorry, I didn’t see your light because it’s not on. Representative McCarty [Laughter].

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the second time. If I may for just a quick point of clarification. I think there was a little confusion today on how the funds could be spent between educational and noneducational provisions and I would say that the funds that are allocated to a Board of Education budget would be considered those
funds so some of the discussion today that centered on noneducational pieces was not, in my opinion, not correct. The Board of Finance and the Selectmen would still have the authority to put the funding into the account, the only change in the Bill is that it allows the Board of Educations to have some authority to how those funds would be spent. We have had cases throughout the State where funds were spent inappropriately and not for educational purposes and as we know, the taxpayers of the town supported those funds going into education and so I would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Bill today. It has no impact on the MBR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker for the second time.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Of course. Thank you, Representative McCarty. So I was not ignoring anyone, right now when the buttons are pushed I am not seeing anything. So if anyone else would care to remark, please raise your hands and I’ll hope to call on you.

Will you remark further? Will you remark
further? If not will the 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 BUTLER (72ND):
Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

   The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

   House Bill No. 7112

   Total Number Voting 144

   Necessary for Passage 73

   Those voting Yea 132
Those voting Nay 12
Absent not voting 5

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] The Assembly will be at east.

The Chamber will come back to order. Will the Speaker please call Calendar No. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 179, getting ahead of myself.

CLERK:

On Page 23, House Calendar 179, House Bill 5521

AN ACT EXPANDING REQUIRED HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR PREEXISTING CONDITIONS, Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Insurance and Real Estate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon you have the floor, sir.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I move Acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative Scanlon, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and again, good afternoon. House Bill 5521 is something that I hope today will be a great win for many of us in this Chamber and in fact I hope all of us. And that is the idea that nobody in the State of Connecticut who has a preexisting condition should be discriminated against when it comes to the purchase of health insurance. In our State today according to the Kaiser Foundation which is a nonprofit organization 522,000 people have a preexisting condition, that is one in four people in the State of Connecticut. They are our loved ones, they are our family, they are our friends and they are one in four people in Connecticut. And today we as a Legislature can get together and give every single one of those people
the confidence that we take seriously the notion that nobody in the State should be discriminated against because they had cancer or because they have heart disease or because they have any other ailment that in previous years before the Affordable Care Act became the law of the land, would have caused them to either be dropped by their insurance or their insurance could go up because of that preexisting condition. Things that some case have nothing to do with behavior that they have lead their lives for, their genetic conditions the things that have affected their families for generations. And so today what this Bill will do, if we passed 5521, is two things. It prohibits short-term health insurance policies which are becoming infrequently more popular from discriminating against preexisting condition and number two, perhaps more importantly it changes the way in which somebody could be considered to have a preexisting condition, to match the federal law of the land. Right now the federal law says that you don’t have to be medically
diagnosed by a doctor or you don’t have to be under medical advice to have a preexisting condition which means that you might know that you have a preexisting condition but you don’t necessarily have to go to the doctor to know that because that is something that you already know. And this Bill would match the federal law right now that says that without medical diagnosis or advice you do in fact have this preexisting condition you cannot be discriminated against. And so this is something that we hear a lot about in politics whether it is in Washington, whether it is in Hartford, I heard a lot about it when I was knocking on doors last year. People are afraid in the State of Connecticut, Mr. Speaker and they worry about going back to a darker time in this country and in this state when people who had preexisting conditions could be discriminated against simply based on the health characteristics that they have regardless of whether they caused those to happen or not. And so I hope that all my colleagues here today can get behind
this Bill and give our constituents the peace of mind that they need that says that regardless of what happens in Washington, regardless of whether the Affordable Care Act gets repealed that Connecticut Law will protect them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato of the 77th District, you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few questions for the proponent of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you. Just a few questions. I’ll just start with mainly I think the first main language change which is on Line 38. Why the language change which goes from “for which” to “whether or not” again Line 38. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you. That simply codifies the federal law so in the Affordable Care Act, and I can read you the citation of the current ACA as written that is the language that is in the Federal Code and we want to bring Connecticut State Statute up to the Federal level when it comes to preexisting condition. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

And so if this is already within the ACA, required by the ACA, is there anything lets say in the form of a bulletin by the Department of Insurance requiring companies to practice what the ACA requires? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The Department
issues a bulletin in August of last year that had to do with short-term care policies and preexisting conditions but the change that we’re talking about specifically on Line 38 has not been something that has been to my knowledge a part of a recent bulletin by the Department of Insurance, this is just a change that we are proactively making to make our State Statute in line with the current Federal Statute regarding preexisting condition. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

And so is there a fiscal note? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No there is not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):
Is there any, well I’ll say this first CCM did submit testimony in opposition stating that it was a mandate. However those municipalities are already required to comply with the ACA and already have plans that provide this coverage so would there be any fiscal impact on our municipalities specifically? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Not that I am aware of and I think that testimony was part of, while they did list that Bill on there, there was seven or eight other Bills that they were testifying against that day that they, in their words, said were mandates but this is currently the Federal Law of the land so unless the ACA is repealed this would not require any changes what so ever and therefor I do not see this as a new additional mandate.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

And just one more thing, if you, if you could just walk me through, is there any distinction between let’s say, if somebody got into a car accident what they’re type of coverage would be under this plan as opposed to let’s say if somebody was or was not diagnosed with an illness. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. So the best way I think I can answer my good friend’s question would be to point her to Line 37 which says that a preexisting condition provision is that section of defining that, is a “condition that was present before the effective date of coverage, whether or not any medical advice, diagnosis, care or treatment was recommended or received before such effective date.” So in my good friend’s questioning I believe
she is sort of implying that if somebody had been a car accident would that count. If that person would have received that medical advice for that perhaps, but the intent of this law is a preexisting condition more along the lines of a disease or something that is inherent in their body chemistry more so than an acute pain situation like a car accident. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Mr. Speaker actually. Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

And I know under the Joint Favorable Report that it says that it redefines preexisting provision to encompass preexisting conditions that may have been recognized, or may not have been recognized or treated by a medical professional prior, can you state any conditions that were not covered prior that you believe may now be covered under this Bill? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Mr. Speaker, I apologize [Laughter]. If my friend can repeat the question I would appreciate it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato. Please repeat the question.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Yes. I’m just looking at the Joint Favorable Report and it indicated that there may have been conditions that were not covered before that are now additional ones that would be covered preexisting conditions that would be covered as a result of this Bill. Can you think of anything specific or I don’t know if that statement is correct? So again, are there any conditions that were not covered before that are now as a result of this Bill. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. No it is not my understanding that there is anything that was not covered before that is now. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

As the proponent of the Bill stated the ACA is already currently the law of the land. This Bill does not change anything that we aren’t already doing or already covering and again also I believe that was also confirmed from the bulletin that was issued by the Department of Insurance. My colleagues can also pull the testimony submitted by various groups and although the, again, CCM did file some testimony in opposition I do not believe that they’re would be any additional costs under the current practice, language and practice of the insurance companies and their policies because this is existing law. And because of those reasons, I will be supporting this Bill today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Vail of the 53nd District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, a question or two for the proponent of the Bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please prepare you so, Representative Scanlon.

REP. VAIL (52ND): Just for clarification purposes, so people who have a preexisting condition now but that is diagnosed, they are currently covered whereas the people that may have had a preexisting condition that is undiagnosed and they wouldn’t be. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman could maybe rephrase his question, I am having trouble understanding his question.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

The goal of the Bill is that there is this certain situation people with preexisting conditions they are not diagnosed, that may fall through the cracks so to speak and this Bill is trying to address that issue. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. In theory yes, but it is more just to keep this in line with what the Federal Guidelines are right now which says it doesn’t matter if you have or have not been diagnosed or seen by a doctor, you still would have a preexisting condition cause physically you still do regardless if you are seeking medical for that condition. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Okay, and again I had some concerns from the municipal mandate piece that the public testimony CCM submitted but the fiscal note that says there is no fiscal note to municipalities. I voted against this in Committee and I am going to be voting in favor of it today here in the House. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative O’Dea from the 125th District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a brief question to the proponent if I may? Through you, Mr. Speaker. If the ACA is repealed will this new provision increase the cost of insurance for Connecticut residents? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, I don’t believe
so because right now the insurers are covering this and covering people with preexisting conditions based on the fact that they can’t discriminate against them currently. And so if the ACA is repealed, there would be no cost increase to the insurers because they have already been doing that if our law then kicks in.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative O’Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thanks, proponent. But theoretically again we all want preexisting conditions to be covered. That does I think we all would agree increased the cost to everybody which we are willing to do particularly because it is throughout the country. My concern is if the ACA is repealed would it be fair to say in other states that don’t have the preexisting coverage their insurance may go down or should go down theoretically and ours would not? Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is an interesting question and I think that on our Committee, the Insurance Committee we weigh questions like that often because many of the Bills that we see are new mandates that are certainly well intentioned and are great but they do sometimes add the cost. I would look at it from a different perspective though, Mr. Speaker, I would say that when we do not have people who have debilitating illnesses or preexisting conditions utilizing health insurance they find other means to get the care and that often means they go to our hospitals and they seek care that way which drives up the uncompensated care costs that all of us then have to share that burden of. And if you talk to, you know, your local hospital every single day they have people walking in those hospitals, those emergency rooms that do not have insurance, but they have serve and serious medical
issues that will absolutely cost them a lot of money to care for that person. And so I think there is a lot of states around the country right now that are debating legislation just like this and that if the ACA was every fully repealed you would see a lot more of them doing that. Again because I go back to pointing out the fact that there are 522,000 people in our State who have a preexisting condition, one in four and that is something I think no constituency group in the State would ever want to see go away as far as I’m concerned.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative O’Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much for that response and I will admit I voted against, I was one of the few that voted against the Bill that came before us previously last session requiring us to offer the essentially ACA Plus to Connecticut residents because of my concern about costs. I am thinking
about whether or not I am going to vote for this and I appreciate the proponents’ responses. I am thinking differently now. I would ask where did the statistic come about 500,000 people have a preexisting condition? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The Keiser Foundation, which is a nonprofit healthcare think tank that does provide a lot of data like this throughout the country. We use their research a lot through our Committee. They put out the numbers from the entire country. I believe it was two years ago and the number in Connecticut was 522,000 people that were nonelderly adults with preexisting conditions, very important distinction there. This is not seniors, this is people under the age of 65 who have a preexisting condition. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative O’Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Well it’s good to hear that I’m not considered a senior and I thank the good proponent for his response to my questions, and I’m still thinking about it. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Conley of the 40th District. You have the floor ma’am.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to speak briefly on the Bill and thank the Chair for his hard work on this Bill putting it through. This law does adopt the Federal Standard to allow Connecticut residents to get medical care for their preexisting conditions regardless if things change in Washington and before we had the federal law, many folks in Connecticut were left out of insurance coverage due to conditions either genetic conditions or bad luck or unfortunate medical situations. There are many
conditions that are not diagnosed quickly and there are some health conditions including CTE, Alzheimer and many diseases of the brain that cannot be properly diagnosed until an autopsy so folks with a lot of conditions have been left in the dark and this does protect all the residents of Connecticut to get their health coverage, to get their medical conditions taken care of and paid for by their insurance without the fear of the Federal Law change, so I urge all my colleagues to support this Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Cheeseman of the 37th District. You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I want to thank the proponent of this Bill for bringing this out. I too like Representative O’Dea had concerns about the essential health benefits last year and what it would do to the cost of coverage. I think as admirable as the ACA is, we have to admit that
for people who are buying individual coverage it has been highly, highly destructive. My son has seen his premium quadruple over the course of from 2013 to now. He has gone from a high deductible plan granted but it covered every Anthem Hospital and doctor in the country to a high deductible plan with an increased deductible, a Connecticut only HMO and a 40 percent coinsurance. I have two constituents who prior to the ACA were in Connecticut’s very successful Health Reinsurance Association Pool. One of them said to me she never had better coverage in her life. I know one who said he was paying $8,000 dollars a year, his out-of-pocket costs are $30,000 dollars a year. I know we’re looking at a public option in Connecticut. I have yet to see the details of that, but my fear is that again for those people who are buying individual coverage were still gonna be left with unaffordable options. Having insurance doesn’t mean you can use insurance. So I look forward to the debate going on. This is a very important issue, everyone should have coverage. I
am very grateful to have the coverage I do now because I do would be paying $1,000 a month with a high deductible were I not in the State plan. So let’s assure people who need coverage do it, but let’s not close our minds to options like the State of Maine who have a very good pool. Let’s look at other states and let’s do everything we can to provide people with health insurance at a price they can afford and a price the State can afford. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I really appreciate the comments from my friend on the other side of the aisle. I know this is a difficult thing but I really believe, truly in my heart, that this is a great thing that we can do on a bipartisan basis today on behalf of our constituents who are worried everyday about losing these protections they
have under this and I just want to close by thanking Representative Conley, she did standup earlier, she introduced this Bill along with Representatives Linehan, Borer, Muchinsky, Johnson, Rotella, Cristin McCarthy-Vahey and all of them did great work on this and brought this to our Committee and I want to thank them for this. And I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this Bill today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will you remark further on this Bill? Will you remark further on this Bill? If not 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 BUTLER (72ND):
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 No. 5521

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Voting</th>
<th>146</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):


REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and yes you did get the name right. I rise for the purpose of an
introduction. I have with me today a number of members from the Turkey Hills Study Group from East Granby. It is a group that has been in existence for 104 years and they are dedicated to learning new things, so they decided they wanted to learn a little bit more about how their state government works today and they are joining us in the house and I would appreciate it we could give them a warm House welcome. [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

I would also like to welcome the group and hope they enjoy their stay.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Borer. You have the floor, Madam.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you for allowing me a moment and indulging me for an announcement but as I sit here and do the work for
the State of Connecticut with my great colleagues, I also sit here with mother’s guilt because it is my son’s 18th Birthday today so I just want to wish him a Happy Birthday. I have a feeling he’s not watching us on his 18th Birthday but want to make sure he knows I love him and Happy Birthday to him. Thank you. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Well the beauty of technology is you can play it back for him on CTN and you could show it to him. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 118.

CLERK:

On Page 14, House Calendar 118 House Bill No. 7313 AN ACT CONCERNING HOMELESS STUDENTS’ ACCESS TO EDUCATION, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Sanchez from the 25th District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for Acceptance
of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative Sanchez you have the floor, sir.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, all this Bill does, it places into State Statutes parts of the Federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act that requires states to ensure that each homeless child has equal access to the same free and appropriate public education as provide to other children. I urge passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative McCarty of the 38th District. You have the floor.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a comment and then one quick question to the proponent
of the Bill. First I would concur with my colleague that simply this Bill puts the State of Connecticut in compliance with the McKinney-Vento Act. Currently however throughout the State many of the municipalities are not following these requirements because the State Statutes do not offer them the insight to how Appeal’s process would work in a hearing for the unaccompanied youth. So this Bill is certainly all it is doing is putting the State of Connecticut in compliance with the Federal Act. The State was notified with one of the visits by the U.S. Department of Education that we were out of compliance since we did not offer in our Statutes the hearing process and the appeals process for these unaccompanied youths. So that’s basically the genesis of the Bill but for clarification if I may ask the proponent one simple question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you. Would you be able to explain so
through this legislation if we have an unaccompanied youth who is denied access to school accommodation what would the process be?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The unaccompanied youth could then ask for a hearing and then a process will then start where he would get a hearing in regards to whatever issue at hand and the process would just give him the same opportunity to be able to be in that particular school system or district.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MC CARY (38TH):

Thank you for that clarification and then just to follow up and if at the hearing this student was denied access is there an appeals process? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Sanchez.
REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there is.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I would just close again by saying that I support this Bill. I think it is an important Bill. We have in the State of Connecticut over 5,000 homeless youths, 1,500 of those children are under the age of 18. These are some of our most vulnerable students as they are unaccompanied, they do not have the support of a parent or guardian so I think this is a very important Bill. [Mic cut out]

Mr. Speaker, I’m using my good friend to my right here, to allow my microphone went off. I hope that wasn’t on purpose [Laughter]. But I would just like to again summarize by this is an important Bill for the State of Connecticut. I was saying that this will impact our most vulnerable youths that are unaccompanied. They have no guardian or parent’s
parental support. It just really outlines in the legislation the process for an unaccompanied youth to seek access to schools so I strongly support this. There is no fiscal note and it came out of the Education Committee with unanimous support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will you remark further? Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

I would just like to say it is a good Bill and it ought to pass. Thank you. [Laughter]. Wonderful. Would you remark further on this Bill? Please raise your hand because we lost a little connection here. I want to make sure I’m not missing somebody. Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I definitely support this Bill especially for the homeless kids. But as a State we really need to do better when you have homeless children going to school, to find them
homes. Could you hear me? So I would hope, if you’ve ever seen people homeless in the evening or in the day, it is not a good sight. So it is a laudable goal, I am definitely supporting this but when we find young kids, that are homeless, we have to do, you know, we want the education but we need to try to find them homes or somewhere to sleep, or somewhere to live. So that’s all I have to say. I want to applaud the good Ranking Member and the good Chair but we really need, when you find these folks, these young kids, they also have to have a home also. So, thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you. Okay, we’re having a little trouble with the board. So if anyone would like to remark further, please stand, raise your hand so I can recognize you.

If not will the 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 BUTLER (72ND):

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 the tally.

The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7313

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent Not Voting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] The Assembly will stand-at-ease.
Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 117.

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Borer of the 115th District.

You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative Borer you have the floor.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does is
allows the EMTs who have three year refresher training to add an educational component around health conditions that affect those serving or have, are currently serving or have served in the Armed Forces. In other words this Bill will help the EMTs to identify, speak to and treat those who may be impacted by PTSD.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Vail of the 52nd District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and if I can a question for the proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Is there any fiscal note attached or associated with this additional training? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Borer.
REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, no there is no fiscal note associated with this Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

And that being said, I think this is a good Bill and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Ackert of the 8th District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a question to the proponent of the Bill. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you. I went through the legislation and found that there was actually, testimony that I would think from the ambulance providers or
anybody’s reach out and provide comment on it at all that the Committee was in favor of and also is the training readily available for these responders? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Borer.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is a good question. We notice that there was no public hearing testimony so we did reach out American Medical Response and a couple of other organizations to better understand, you know, what the training would look like or if it already exists, every three years training and there is a behavioral health component to that training. They envision this will be about one and a half hours and they will have somebody come in and speak from the Armed Forces to talk specifically about health conditions both physically and mental health conditions that would impact Veterans.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the good lady for her answers. I always get a little concerned as a Veteran myself that we ask a lot from others. I’m glad that this is something that the responders are on board to provide the training for these and I will be in support of the legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you and Representative Borer, just to make sure that we cross the “t’s” and dotted the ‘i’s” could you move for adoption for the Bill if I missed that?

REP. BORER (115TH):

You might have missed that. I might not have said it. Oh, I did say it. But I am going to say it again. Please adopt the Bill, we move for Acceptance.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Very good. Will you remark further? Will you
remark further on this Bill. If not will the Staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Will 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 BUTLER (72ND):

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

The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7249

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those voting Nay: 0
Absent not voting: 5

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Bill passes. [Gavel]. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 156.

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Arconti of the 109th District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Mr. Speaker I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Adoption
of the Resolution. Representative Arconti, you have
the floor.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this
Joint Resolution’s offered to acknowledge the hard
work that has been done by Seaview Village in
Bridgeport to establish themselves as a municipal
energy savings area. This community acts in a very
environmentally friendly way and they are committed
to our clean energy future and a clean energy
community. This Resolution passed the Committee
unanimously and I urge it’s adoption. Thank you,
Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Ferraro from the 117th District,
you have the floor, sir.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Hello. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to echo
the comments of my colleague across the aisle. This
Resolution is an opportunity to recognize the
Seaview Village for the hard work they did in
establishing themselves as a municipal energy saving area and producing a clean energy for underserved community in Bridgeport and I recommend that my colleagues support the Bill and pass the Bill. Thank you very much, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Gresko of the 121st District.

You have the floor, sir.

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be echoing the comments of the previous colleagues. The City of Bridgeport does have a history of energy innovation between fuel cells, solar, wind and now this Seaside Village will be a shining star in the East End and I totally expect the same result as we had in Energy in an unanimous passage of this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rosario of the 128th District.

You have the floor, sir.

REP. ROSARIO (128TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is good to see you up there. I rise in support of this Resolution. This municipal savings area for the East End is something that’s gonna be a nationwide example for a low income, shoreline community to have great energy and renewable energy and it is something that I fully support. The people in the East End of Bridgeport fully deserve this and I urge Adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you very much. Will you remark further? Would you care to remark further on the Resolution before us.

If not will the 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 BUTLER (72ND):
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 Joint Resolution No. 57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Voting</th>
<th>144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Resolution is Adopted. [Gavel]. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 226.

CLERK:

On Page 29, House Calendar 226, House Bill No. 7178 AN ACT CONCERNING DISCLOSURES BY REAL ESTATE BROKERS AND SALESPERSONS, Favorable Report by the Joint Standing Committee on Insurance and Real
Representative Dathan from the 142nd District.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.

Representative Dathan would you remark further? You have the floor.

Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 7178 bring the Statutes more into line with the nature of real estate transaction today where many home buyers use technology to help them in their home search before meeting with an agent. This Bill allows residential real estate licensees to answer questions and show a property before signing a legal
agreement with the client. The agreement would have to be in place before a buyer makes an offer on a property. We’ve done this on the commercial side two years ago and this Bill brings the residential transactions in line with the commercial. It has no fiscal impact and it was voted unanimously in Committee.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Did I hear you move Adoption?

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Oh, I move to Adoption. Sorry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato of the 77th District. You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Two brief questions for the proponent of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you. Representative, is there a fiscal
note to this Bill? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dathan.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Sorry. No there is not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavlock-D’Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

And was there any testimony in opposition to the Bill. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dathan.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Thank you very much. Through you, Mr. Speaker. There was no opposition in public hearing and the Connecticut Realtors voted, excuse me, testified in favor of this Bill in public hearing. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavlock-D’Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. As the proponent of the Bill already stated the Bill does simply extend the law passed in a previous session to residential properties. It updates disclosure laws to accommodate for the growing practice of on-line searches by perspective buyers. Again the Connecticut Realtors support the Bill and I urge my colleagues to vote in the affirmative. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will you remark further?

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

No further remarks, thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will any other Representative like to remark further? Will you remark further on the Bill?

If not will the 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.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to ensure that 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 No. 7178

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Voting</th>
<th>143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 190.

CLERK:

On Page 24, House Calendar 190 House Bill 7105
AN ACT CONCERNING THE PENALTY FOR COMMERCIAL VEHICLES ON STATE PARKWAYS, Favorable Report is Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom of the 129th. You have the floor, sir.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on 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, as the Chamber is probably aware, commercial vehicles are not allowed on our State Parkways including the Merritt Parkway and the Wilbur Cross. The Bill before us would decouple the offense of driving a
commercial vehicle on a parkway, set it out separately in Statute and establish a fine of $500 dollars for permissively operating a commercial vehicle on our State’s parkways. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is necessary as we have seen certainly over the last several years several incidents in which trucks are on our State parkways some of which have ended in tragedy including a death in November of 2017 of a Stanford individual when he rear-ended a truck out of Pennsylvania that tried to stop short from clipping one of the historic bridges on the Merritt Parkway.

If folks Google trucks in Merritt Parkway they will see several instances a year, if not a week, of where trucks are on our highways tying up traffic.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom. [Gavel] Ladies and gentlemen we have a few more Bills to do today, I know the Representative is struggling to be heard even by his Ranking Member on the other side of the Chamber, so can we have conversations moved out to
the hall, but please stay by the Chamber because we will be voting quickly. Representative Stafstrom, please proceed.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker as I was mentioning, I believe there is an extreme need for this Bill based on the sheer number of trucks and commercial vehicles we see on the Merritt Parkway and the Wilbur Cross as they hit the historic overpasses, tie up traffic, delay folks getting to work and as indicated have caused accidents including death on our highways. Certainly any of us who drive from Fairfield County to the Capital know it’s a regular occurrence to see trucks and trailers. There was a trailer this morning coming southbound as I was driving up here which of course requires major police response, shutting down of the highway and significant delay and inconvenience to our residents of our State. So I would urge support for the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further? Representative Rebimbas of the 70th you have the floor, Madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I rise in opposition to the proposal before us not because it is not a well-intended one, and certainly the proponent of the Bill and the good Chairman of the Judiciary Committee I think deserves certainly a lot of accolades for the hard work and thought that has been proposed in the Bill that is before us. And unfortunately there has been tragedy as a result of these trucks on the Merritt Parkway. I just don’t think that the approach we’re taking here is appropriate. We are increasing a fine that currently is $100 dollars all the way up to $500 dollars. The impact that may have on the driver and/or company and we have to think about a lot of these drivers maybe independent contractors so we are not talking about huge corporations, it might be an independent contractor that a $500 dollar fine
could essentially be a week’s pay or even a month’s pay in this regard and unfortunately we don’t have the statistics to show exactly how often is this occurring or whether or not there is actually repeat offenders. I don’t think anyone would intentionally drive their truck on the Merritt Parkway that could case serious damage to the bridges but most importantly serious damage to their truck. The same vehicle that is providing a livelihood to their families in that regard. Again it is something that we have to look at and it was so important that there is actually in 2017, a Public Act 17-230 that we asked the DOT to look into this very issue to try to determine how could we deter this trucks from getting on the Parkway. How could we provide appropriate notifications? Guess what? The DOT still has not done that or if they did they haven’t shared it with the General Assembly which is exactly what they were supposed to do. But yet here we are today putting, setting that aside and saying, let’s increase these fines that may unfortunately have a
really financial impact on these drivers. If I thought for a minute that these drivers actually took it into their mind, well this is a short route, I’m gonna get on this, I’m gonna destroy my truck and destroy these beautiful bridges but I’m gonna do it anyways, I will be right there with the good Chairman in supporting this. But I don’t believe that’s the case and because of that unfortunately I think there is going to be a financial heavy impact and yet were going to be negating the real issue. How to get the appropriate notification and communication to these individuals. That is what we should do. We should go back to the DOT, make them do what’s be requested of them. So I do, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker rise in opposition to the Proposal before us.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam Will you remark further? Representative Hennessey of the 127th.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I’ve been
a truckdriver most of my life and I can attest to the previous speaker that I would imagine most people that drive commercial vehicles are on parkways by accident. There is a lot to being a truckdriver and mistakes do happen and to increase this fine from $100 dollars to $500 dollars is I think a little outrageous and I will be voting, “no”. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill before us? Representative Rutigliano of the 123rd. You have the floor.

REP. RUTIGLIANO (123RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One question to the proponent of the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom please prepare yourself. Representative Rutigliano please proceed.

REP. RUTIGLIANO (123RD):

Does the increase fine apply just to tractor-trailer vehicles or all violations on the Merritt
Parkway like trailers and U-Haul trucks and such?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is to any commercial vehicle operating on the Merritt Parkway as defined in the regulation which would include trailers as well as busses. Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rutigliano.

REP. RUTIGLIANO (123RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker. So if somebody is trailering a boat, a personal vehicle, or their personal watercraft on its trailer registered to them, this would not apply? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe it would apply.
REP. RUTIGLIANO (123RD):

    Thank you, sir. I am really sympathetic to this Bill as a driver on the Merritt Parkway on a daily basis there is a truck or a vehicle blocking one of our historic bridges almost on a daily basis. It takes hours of our life on this parkway. But I will say to the good Ranking Members point we did do a Bill in 2017 that tasked the Department of Transportation to come up with a system for high warning devices on major interchanges to the Merritt Parkway and other restricted access highways and they have yet to complete that. So is may support this Bill because it is such a serious problem and on a daily basis a serious problem. I would also take this moment to encourage the Department of Transportation to do the job that they were taxed to do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark
 weiter? Representative O’Dea of the 125th. You have the floor, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just real briefly, echo the comments that were just made by my good friend and the Ranking Member is correct. I am concerned about the fine but I will tell you last session there was a tractor-trailer going northbound in a southbound lane, just last session. I see trucks on it every day. It takes at least one trooper and frankly it should take two to make sure it’s safely removed from the highway. So I am going to be in support of this but I would reiterate what has been asked of the DOT, please, we need you to do this study. We need you to put stay right, pass left signs on our highways, please. I’m beggin for that, for years and I ask for support of the Bill. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative.

Representative Candelaria. You have the floor, sir.
REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you question to the proponent?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Looks like he’s prepared. Please proceed, Representative.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a quick question. My question is so the fine is increasing from $100 dollars to $500 dollars and is this on the first offense? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, yes.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Mr. Speaker this is where I am having a little bit of an issue with this Bill, because I myself, and I am saying this publicly rented a U-Haul truck
and by mistake I got on the Merritt Parkway. So if that would have been in the instance, I would have been ticketed $500 dollars if this had moved forward. That God I realized it and got off at the exit right away, but it was an honest mistake and I am assuming there are a lot of drivers that don’t understand and will hop on the Merritt Parkway mistakenly realizing it and by the end of the day, will be fined $500 dollars. So this Bill does not provide a mechanism where someone is offered at least an opportunity to get a break for the first offense. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly someone could challenge the ticket, this would be a ticket under our normal centralized processing. They could appeal it and try to plead their case but yes, it would provide a $500 dollar fine even in the instance of a first offense.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Mr. Speaker, I have no other questions for the proponent. I don’t think I will be able to support this today for the reason I have stated because I think that we are making a mistake if we’re gonna penalize individuals that legitimately do make a mistake and get on the Parkway and they are not afforded an opportunity so. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further? Representative Cheeseman of the 37th. You have the floor, Madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

He is prepared, please proceed, Madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):
All right, thank you. Through you, I have some questions about the other part of the Bill and how they relate to changes for people who are in violation or perform infractions who are not residents of states with whom Connecticut has reciprocity, there are so many references to Statutes and I am unclear as to what in fact this changes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker this actually doesn’t change anything with respect to any other moving violation all it does is simply specify that by breaking out the offense of driving a commercial vehicle on the Merritt Parkway that is a separate offense that can be processed through our Centralized Infraction Bureau. So in other words either residents of the State of Connecticut or states with which we have reciprocity can process that payment on-line through that system whereas now
it is comingled with other offenses and this simply specifies that it is a conforming change. Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Okay and Through you, Mr. Speaker. So that portion only applies to this new infraction?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

That’s correct. Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I thank the proponent of the Bill for his answers.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam. Will you remark further on the Bill before us? Representative
Kupchick of the 132nd. You have the floor, Madam.

REP. KUPCHICK (132ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Question for the proponent of the Bill?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. KUPCHICK (132ND):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Does this include combination license plates, for example, vans, trade-vans, electricians that have combination plates that are just service vans? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that those vehicles are currently allowed on our state parkways. They would remain allowed on the state parkway. This does, this Bill does not change the eligibility of who can travel on a state parkway; it merely increases the fine for someone who is in
violation of that law. Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Kupchick.

REP. KUPCHICK (132ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just a comment, I am giving pause to the fact that $500 dollars is a lot of money and for an independent trucker who probably doesn’t make all that much, and like has been stated earlier, I don’t think people are doing this on purpose, $500 dollars is a lot of money to ticket someone who may have made a mistake and some of my friends who are police officers have mentioned in the past that every time the Legislature raises fines for anything, distracted driving, speeding, stop signs police tend to not give out as many tickets because they feel bad for people because it is such as high amount. So I think we should also take that into consideration. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam. Will you remark
further on the Bill before us? Will you remark further on the Bill before us.

If not will the Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Members 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.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7105

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Voting</th>
<th>143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those voting Yea: 98
Those voting Nay: 45
Absent not voting: 6

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 264.

CLERK:


SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I apologize Mr. Clerk, it is actually [Audio cuts out]. Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill is passed temporarily. Will the Clerk please now call, it was my mistake that they are covering for, Mr. Clerk. Please call Calendar 204.
Keep 264 handy, we’ll get back to that.

CLERK:


SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Haddad of the 54th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative Haddad you have the floor.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very simple
Bill that addresses a very important topic. This Bill attempts to require our public universities to collect data and provide it to the General Assembly regarding food insecurity of their student body on college campuses. Mr. Speaker we heard testimony this year from folks at the University of Connecticut, a student at the University of Connecticut who did a survey on campus that indicated that ten percent of the student body at UConn has experienced a time when they went without eating for a whole day because of lack of money or other resources. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we know we heard testimony from a student at Manchester Community College that runs a food pantry. I don’t know if most people know this, but I think all of our Community Colleges in Connecticut now have food pantry on campus to address food insecurity that seems to be fairly significant among their student population. At Manchester they have upwards of 200 to 300 visits a day at their food pantry. So this Bill attempts to address that issue, to provide us
with additional information so that we can address this issue in the future. It requires the public universities to do an assessment of food insecurity on their campuses. The details of that are outlined in the Legislation and they will report to us prior to our next legislative session with that information.

Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment. It is LCO 7038. I would ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 7038 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A” (LCO 7038) offered by Representative Haddad, Senator Haskell, Representative Turco.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Haddad would you remark on the Amendment before us.
REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a simple Amendment. It just corrects a couple of wording issues that existed in the original Bill. It clarifies that when we are talking about food pantries that we would include food pantries that are run by other organizations on college campuses not just by the institutions. It also clarifies that when we are talking about emergency grants to students that we would include emergency grants that might be provided by the foundation of the institutions rather than directly through the institutions. I move adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? Representative Hall on the Amendment.

REP. HALL (7TH):

I would just like to accept this friendly Amendment, it makes technical changes, Mr. Speaker. So I accept it as friendly Amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, Madam. Will you remark further on the Amendment before us, if not, let me try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying, “Aye.”

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, “Nay”. The Ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Right back to you Representative Hall of the 59 District. You have the floor, Madam.

REP. HALL (7TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We did, I won’t be repetitive, my good colleague talked a lot about the testimony we had. It was voted out of Committee unanimously and there is no fiscal note. So, I fully support it and the Bill should pass. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam. Will you remark
further on the Bill as amended? Representative Turco of the 27th District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. TURCO (27TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. But unfortunately Mr. Speaker, food security is real on our college campuses. I was recently at Central Connecticut State University, right borders my district in Newington and met there with educators and with students that said that there are students that are hungry, there are students that are dealing with housing issues and this is an important Bill although a simple Bill just so we can find out more information on what our colleges are dealing with, what our students are dealing with and then we can work to address it in the future. We cannot have a topnotch workforce that we need here in Connecticut if we don’t have the most educated students possible and if students are hungry, they are not learning and doing their best in school. So, thank you, Mr.
Speaker and I’d appreciate if my colleagues will support this Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Dillon of the 92nd District. Madam, you have the floor.

REP. DILLON (92ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking in support of the Bill, I want to thank the Committee bringing this Bill before us. The issue of hunger and food insecurity in higher education actually first came to our attention nationally in case of athletes because a lot of kids from low income families who were on NCAA scholarships were living off campus and going off the food plan and sending money home to their parents but they didn’t have enough to eat so that they could compete. That was a story here with one of our own athletes. It was a story in Oklahoma with the football team and now we learn years later that the issue is much, much larger than the issue
of competitive sports. We learned at a visit to Southern Connecticut States College this year. They made a presentation of the food insecurity in their own student body and what they were doing. It is very, very forward thinking for you to bring this before us. Thank you very much and I’m proud to be part of it.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam. Representative Betts of the 78th District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much, sir. I’m not gonna ask any questions but I did want to say I am going to be voting no on this. I do not understand why the Board cannot do this without us passing Legislation requiring them to do it. We all know it is important, it should be done, but I certainly don’t understand what the role of Legislature is when the Board has the ability to do it itself. So that is the reason I’ll be voting no. Thank you very much,
sir.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will you remark further on the Bill before us? Representative Doucette of the 13th District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill and I just want to take the time to acknowledge the Cougar Pantry at Manchester Community College which to my knowledge is one of the first of its kind in the State and for Gordon Plouffe, a student from Manchester Community College who started that some years ago and came to the Higher Education Committee to testify and I think that testimony was so valuable because I think a lot of the members of the Committee and certainly the general public are not aware of food insecurity being an issue on our college campuses especially on the campuses of our community college. So it is a good Bill and I ask my colleagues to support it today. Thank you.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill before us as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

If not Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Members 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.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted please check the board to assure your vote has been properly cast.

Have all the members voted? If all members have voted please make sure your vote is properly cast. The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take the tally.

And the Clerk will announce the tally.
CLERK:

House Bill No. 7257 as Amended by House A

Total Number Voting 144
Necessary for Passage 73

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please pause. Representative Gonzales for a transcript notation.

REPRESENTATIVE GONZALES (3RD):

Mr. Speaker, on the Affirmative.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much. So noted. Will the Clerk announce the tally.

CLERK:

On House Bill No. 7257 as Amended by House A

Total Number Voting 144
Necessary for Passage 73
Those voting Yea 129
Those voting Nay 15
Absent not voting 5

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill passes as amended [Gavel].
Representative Ritter of the 1st District, sir.

Will the Clerk please call House Calendar No. 9.

CLERK:

House Calendar No. 9, House Resolution No. 10

RESOLUTION APPROVING THE STIPULATED AGREEMENT IN
HUGO ANGELES, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ESTATE OF ATHENA
ANGELES, ARTEMISA ANGELES BY HER NEXT FRIEND AND
FATHER HUGO ANGELES AND HUGO ANGELES, INDIVIDUALLY
V. STATE OF CONNECTICUT. Favorable Report of the
House Standing Committee on Judiciary.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Now, Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we
recommit House Resolution 10. Thank you, Mr.
Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Without objection, so ordered. Are there any
announcements or introductions? Representative
Ferraro of the 117th.

Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 264.
On Page 34, House Calendar 264, House Bill 7043
AN ACT CONCERNING BREASTFEEDING IN THE WORKPLACE,
Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Public Employees.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Porter of the 94th District, you have the floor, Madam.
REP. PORTER (94TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative Porter you have the floor.
REP. PORTER (94TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an act concerning breast feeding in the workplace. This bill establishes certain criteria that an employer
provide areas, must meet employees express in breastmilk. Current law requires employers to make reasonable efforts to provide a room or other location other than a toilet stall where an employee can express her milk in private during a meal or break period. The Bill specifies that this area must be free from intrusion and shielded from the public while the employee is expressing her milk. It also requires the area to include or be near a refrigerator or employee provided portable cold storage device in which the employee can store her breastmilk and have access to an electric outlet. This Bill passed out of Committee with bipartisan support by a unanimous vote and I move adoption Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Question before the Chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative Porter I believe you have described the Bill so is there any further comments? Would anyone else like to speak further
on the Bill? Representative Poletta of the 68th District, sir you have the floor.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. With that just a few questions for the proponent of the Bill. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

To my good friend and colleague on the Labor Committee, Representative Porter is there a fiscal note attached to this Bill. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

No there is not. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

And thank you for that answer. On Line 5 I am looking at reasonable effort and my [audio cuts out]
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Chamber will stand-at-ease. Representative Poletta does your mic work now?

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

[No audible response]

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Polletta if you would like, you could use Representative Zullo’s mic so you can continue if you don’t mind.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Is it just the Republican mics that are broke this afternoon or also the opposition? [Laughter]

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

I’m sure it’s just a coincidence, sir.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Through you. [Laughter] No one wants to hear me. As I was saying before, Through you, Mr. Speaker. To the good Chair of the Labor and Public Employees Committee on Line 5 we have reasonable effort made by the employer for the employee, could the good Chair explain what reasonable effort would
mean. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Porter. Is yours working, ma’am? Representative Porter is yours?

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Call the electricians.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Ma’am if you like you could use Representative Hall’s mic. Thanks for doing that so it looks like it’s happening on both sides, appreciate that. [Laughter]. The Chamber will stand at ease. Representative Porter it is my understanding your mic is now working. Did you press the button? Representative Porter would you try your mic again, please. Can you hit the button. Representative Porter?

The Chamber is back to order. Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we temporarily pass this Bill.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

This Bill is temporarily passed. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. - what is this, 95.

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Linehan, ma’am you have the floor.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative Linehan you have the floor.
REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill established a Bill of Rights and expectations for children placed in the Department of Children and Families Out of Home Care also known as foster care. It is looking to insure that certain rights including the emotional well-being and the child’s health and safety. It requires each child’s caseworker if the child is of an appropriate age to meet with him or her in private and explain these rights annually and at anytime that the child is placed in a new out-of-home placement. The rights include being in a safe environment, ongoing contact with siblings, parents and friends if desired and there is meaningful and regular in person contact with the caseworker. The Bill also requires the caseworker to provide and explain the Sibling Bill of Rights which we are codifying into law and that anytime the child is placed in a new out-of-home placement and yearly. The DCF Sibling Bill of Rights was developed by the Youth Advisory Board and it lists ways to protect
the relationships of siblings separated as a result of DCF’s intervention.

This Bill was passed out of Committee unanimously and Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment 71, LCO 7128 and I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 7128 House Amendment Schedule “A”.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A” (LCO 7128) offered by Representative Linehan, Representative Green and Representative Currey.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

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

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is clarifying that both the child in the case of the Bill of Rights and the Sibling Bill of Rights is acknowledging the form. It is acknowledged by both the caseworker and the child as well as it gives DCF the leeway to use their discretion regarding the Sibling Bill of Rights in the rare occasion that a sibling is the abuser. Additionally it clarifies that if the child does refuse to sign the form that the DCF can note that in the file. And with that said Mr. Speaker, I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Question before the Chamber is the Adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the Amendment? Will you remark? Representative Green you have the floor. Is your mic working? Representative Green my understanding is that you may have to go to the Minority Leader’s microphone and use hers.

REP. GREEN (55TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in
support of this friendly Amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the Amendment before us. Since the button’s aren’t working if you care to remark further would you please standup and wave at me. If not. Will you remark further on the Amendment, if not I will try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying “Aye.”

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Opposed. The Aye’s have it, the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’d just like to say that this Bill has been supported by a wide range of people including the Advocates as well as everyone in Committee and I urge passage of this Bill.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Green did you want to remark further?

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

Yes, I do thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill received bipartisan support from both sides of the aisle. It also received a report from DCF and also from the Child Advocacy so I encourage my colleagues to support this Bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, ma’am. 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 RYAN:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?

Will the members please check the board to determine if their 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 No. 7403 as Amended by House A

Total Number Voting 144
Necessary for Passage 73
Those voting Yea 144
Those voting Nay 0
Absent not voting 5

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The Bill as Amended is passed [Gavel]. Are there any announcements or introductions? Any announcements or introductions? Representative Harding I believe you have one. Is your microphone working? Would you go to your Majority Leaders, Minority Leader’s seat to use that microphone. So
if you have an announcements you’re probably going to have to go to your respective leader’s desk to be heard.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

[Tapping on microphone] Oh, it works. Perfect.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker for purpose of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I have two young ladies from the greatest town in Connecticut, Brookfield, Connecticut. I have Riley, Ashley and Ava from the UConn 4H Program in Fairfield County and they are here today representing that organization. They’ve also given us the ice cream that we are all enjoying today. So for that sake alone I would ask for all of us to give them a warm
welcome. [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you for bringing the ice cream, we appreciate it. Thanks for being here.

Representative Lanoue, I believe you also had an announcement. Where is he? The Representative is not present. Okay, Representative Ritter, sir you have the floor.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was beginning to think your neck didn’t work. Just a quick announcement, it is for a good cause and I will gloat second after the good cause, but every year we have the Capital Hoops Tournament. The Blair Family puts it one and raises scholarship money for a student from New Britton High School, I believe that is correct. It has been a tradition for 2o plus years. When Joe became Speaker he made it a priority to recruit basketball players to play on the team, the fruit of that labor is evident in our third straight championship for the House of
Representatives. Cheating is one word, but I will say, Madam Minority Leader, that we one without Franklin Perry with a torn ACL and that was quite an accomplishment. So we recruited extra hard without Franklin’s services this year. So if you don’t want to cheer for us, at least cheer for the scholarship for the family. Okay, here we go.

REPRESENTATIVES:

[Cheering with applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Hearing none, Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk is in the possession of today’s Go List and I move that we refer the Bills as indicated.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Objection? Is there objection? Hearing no objection, the Bills will be referred as indicated. Okay Representative Reyes you have the floor, sir.
REP. REYES (75th):

Sir for, Mr. Speaker for purposes of General Notations, Josh Elliott - Business in District.
Brandon McGee - Business outside the District.
Minnie Gonzalez - Business outside the District.
Tad Dillon - Business in District.
Joe de la Cruz - Business in District.
Mike D’Agostino - Business outside District.
Steven Meskers - Personal.
Julio Concepcion - Business outside Chamber.
Russ Morin - Business outside Chamber. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Senator. Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick announcement that next Wednesday is the Student to Manufacturer Connection Fair. As you all know we have over 500 students coming in from respective districts. We also have over 30 manufacturers, a lot of them are also from your districts. We hope that you come and stop by and say hello. It does go
from 9:00 to 3:00. Session I believe starts at ten. We will be sending out an e-mail to everybody to let you know when your district students are coming in or when a manufacturer from your district will be there. We encourage everyone to stop on by. Thank you so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Betts you have the floor.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of Journal Notation and anybody else who has to make an announcement, I believe all the microphones are working now. Thank you very much, Ann Clark and everybody who tried to rectify that problem.

Representative Fry missed votes do to illness. Representative Perillo is out on business. Representative Camillo Labriola are in District due to missing votes. Representative Cummings had to leave for business. Thank you very much, sir.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, sir. Are there any other announcements of introductions? Are there any other announcements or introductions. Hearing none, Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There being no further business on the Clerk’s desk, I move that we adjourn subject to the Call of the Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The Motion is to Adjourn subject to the Call of the Chair. Is there objection? Is there objection? Hearing none, the House is adjourned subject to the Call of the Chair. [Gavel]

(On motion of Representative Currey of the 11th District, the House adjourned at 3:38 o'clock p.m., to meet again at the Call of the Chair.)
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