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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the House please come to order? Will the members, staff, and guests please rise and direct your attention to the Dais will Rabbi Alan Lefkowitz will lead us in prayer?

RABBI ALAN LEFKOWITZ:

First, happy holidays to everybody, and good morning. Prayer. Why do we do so? I’ve often asked -- been asked, “Why do we pray?” Prayer serves as a reminder -- a reminder for all the good we have. A moment to share for all our gratefulness for this gift called life. At the seasonal time, let us reflect on our gifts -- the gift of freedom
for all us Americans. Let us remember the freedom lies in the responsibilities of what it is yet to be. freedom is wherever we choose to see and hear it through the lens of our perceptions. The Bible recalls that God can appear in a thick cloud. The cloud was a symbol for all people to accept the responsibilities and forms in which God can be found. The afternoon sunlight, these rainy days, which we have certainly all been experiencing, and the dark ominous clouds of a summer storm. God is in all of them. The greatest freedom of all is to realize that we no longer need to live imprisoned by expectations and self-imposed limitations. For in that freedom, we can recognize our own divine nature and the possibility of being everything. We take this moment to send our condolences to those Christian worshipers who were brutally murdered this past weekend on such a Holy Day in Sri Lanka. And, we say Amen.

(All) Amen.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you, Rabbi.

RABBI ALAN LEFKOWITZ:
Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Would Representative Kate Rotella of the 43rd District please come to the Dais to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

REP. ROTELLA (43RD):
(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):
Thank you.

REP. ROTELLA (43RD):
Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Mr. Clerk, is there any business on the clerk’s desk?

CLERK:
Yes, Mr. Speaker. Communications from the
Secretary of State concerning special election held in the 19th Assembly District on April 16, 2019. And, this letter is dated April 22, 2019. Dear Mr. Jortner, this is to advise you that the return of votes cast at the special election held in the 19th Assembly District on April 16, 2019 for the purpose of filling a vacancy in the office of State Representative for said district, states the following candidates receives the number of votes annexed to their names:

Tammy Exum (D) 2407
Robert Margolis (R) 1253
Robert Margolis (I) 66

In accordance with Connecticut General Statute 9-215, Tammy Exum will appear before me on April 23, 2019 to be administered the oath of office. A copy of the official statement of votes signed by the State Board of Canvassers is enclosed. Sincerely,
Denise W. Merrill, Secretary of the State.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. Given that you
have received that letter and we are joined by our Secretary of State, Denise Merrill, and I see Representative elect Tammy Rush Exum sitting off to the left, we will now at this point have the swearing in of Representative Rush Exum.

DENISE W. MERRILL (SECRETARY OF STATE):

Thank you. Good morning everyone. It is my great pleasure to be able to swear in the newest member of this chamber, one of my favorite jobs as Secretary of the State, so please come forward. Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that you will support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of Connecticut so long as you continue a citizen thereof, and that you will faithfully discharge according to law the duties of the office of State Representative to the best of your abilities, so help you God?

TAMMY R. EXUM:

I will.

DENISE W. MERRILL (SECRETARY OF STATE):

Congratulations! [Applause].
REP. EXUM (19TH):

Thank you! Thank you! [Applause].

DENISE W. MERRILL (SECRETARY OF STATE):

Congratulations! [Applause].

REP. EXUM (19TH):

Thank you! [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative, we are very honored to welcome you to the House Chamber. I am looking at former Representative Slap, now Senator Slap. Derek, it was always hard losing you, but I think you have a very capable replacement. She’s already proven herself to be really in touch with the issues and the constituents. Tammy, this chamber is the people’s chamber. We all enter into vigorous debates on the issue, but it -- but it’s not personal. We do work well together. Every single person in this chamber regardless of political party has been elected because they want to make their state and their district a better place. I know you will continue that tradition, and we all look
forward to serving with you, so thank you.

[Applause].

Mr. Clerk, we -- I order that that letter be printed in the Journal. Is there any other business on the clerk’s desk?

CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The daily Calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. Are there any announcements or introductions? The fine Majority Leader of the 1st District of the great city of Hartford, Representative Ritter, you have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I too just want to welcome Representative Exum, no longer representative elect, to the House. I’ve had the great pleasure to meet Tammy and her team over the last couple of months, and I know she’ll make a wonderful addition to this entire Chamber. I also want to acknowledge I have a constituent who has a -
- who has great dogs, Mr. Speaker. Very, very cute, very loveable. Mark Bissonette who is here with his family, I believe, from Italy. If we could give them a nice ovation and welcome to the House Chamber, I would appreciate it? So, thank you very much. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Are there any other announcements or introductions? Chamber will stand at ease.

Chamber will come back to order (Gavel).

Representative Ryan of the 139th. No Representative Ryan of the 139th. Will the clerk please call Calendar 444?

CLERK:

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The fine chair of the General Law Committee who we’ve been hearing from a lot lately, Representative D’Agostino. You have the floor, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good morning.

REP. RYAN (139TH):

I move for acceptance of the House committee’s favorable report and adoption of the resolution.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on adoption of the joint committee’s favorable report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

REP. RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an interest arbitration award moving 34 deputy wardens into the Correction Supervisors Union. These are prior managers. They have not received a pay raise in about 10 years, and so they joined the SEBAC union’s
-- actually, before we approved the last agreement in 2017 --

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

(Gavel) Ladies and gentlemen, I know everybody’s getting settled into the Chamber. We’ve been running around all morning with various meetings. I would just ask if you’re conducting business please step out in the hall. Representative D’Agostino is trying to bring out a resolution. Representative D’Agostino, I apologize for the interruption. Please proceed, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, they were certified before the SEBAC agreement in 2017. The state and the deputy wardens were able to resolve a number of issues, but handful remained before we approved the SEBAC resolution, so they proceeded to further negotiations, and then ultimately interest arbitration where I should say the state prevailed on two of the main issues. The deputy wardens wanted a retroactive pay increase in 2015. They
also wanted overtime and comp pay since they work 24/7 and are on call. They lost both issues in arbitration. The state prevailed. This then follows the rest of the SEBAC architecture with respect to the GWI and annual increment increases as we had previously discussed with an annual incremental cost of $218,000 dollars in fiscal year '20, $510,000 dollars in fiscal year '21, annualized to $579,000 dollars, and I urge adoption. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the resolution before us? Representative Lavielle (speaks Lavalley) of the 143rd, madam, you have the floor.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Did you say Representative what?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

No. I said, Representative Lavielle (speaks Lavalley), you have the floor. [Laughter].
REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Lavielle (speaks Lavalley)?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Lavielle (speaks Lavell).

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Ah, Lavielle, Mr. Speaker. [Laughing].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I think we’re hearing each other a little differently. I thought I had it correct. You got a lot of noise around ya.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. So, yes, I have a few questions for the -- for the good representative, if I may?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative D’Agostino, please prepare yourself. Representative Lavielle, please proceed.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Hooray! So, the -- if I understand properly, the total annualized cost of this -- of the increments in this contract going forward will be
$570,000 dollars approximately?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, in response to Representative Lavielle’s [emphasis] question.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

[Laughing].

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

That is the annualized cost in fiscal year ’21. In fiscal year ’20, the incremental cost to the state is $218,000 dollars, and again, that’s principally made up of the standard 3.5 percent general age increase pursuant to the SEBAC architecture, and a 3 percent stipend, so in ’20, $218,000 dollars, ’21 annualized to $579,000 dollars.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Lavielle.
REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Can -- can -- I’m sorry, Mr. Speaker. Could I just hear the last sentence again, please?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

(Gavel) Ladies and gentlemen, the representatives are trying to ask questions about the resolution before us, and they can’t hear. Representative Lavielle, which is -- what would you like answered again, madam?

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Well, the very last sentence that -- that the representative just spoke about the total annualized cost of the contract.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, madam. Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, that’s -- I should just be clear. So, the fiscal year ’21, because it’s really a half year, the cost is $510,000 dollars for fiscal year ’20 to ’21 -- excuse me.
Fiscal year ’21. When you annualize that cost for that particular fiscal year, it’s $579,000 dollars, and the annualization comes in because of when the step increase goes into effect for some of the employees versus others, typically January 1st, but not January 1st for all, so when I say annualized, I’m just talking about that fiscal year ’21 year because it’s only a partial year, but the annual incremental cost for fiscal year ’20 is $218,000 dollars, the annual incremental cost to the state for fiscal year ’21 is $510,000 dollars. When you annualize just that last year, it adds another $69,000 dollars.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. So, that -- yes, that corroborates what I -- what I was thinking, which was that going forward the annualized cost would be about $579,000 dollars.
So, I -- there are how many deputy wardens who are involved in the contract?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Madam Speaker, 34 deputy wardens will be moving into the Correctional Supervisors contract.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And, is this then a -- this is not a new collective bargaining unit? They are joining an existing unit?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, perfectly stated.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I thank the representative. All right. Thank you. I noticed that the arbitrator who signed the decisions was from New York. Is there a reason that an out-of-state arbitrator was used rather than in-state one?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Madam Speaker, the Office of Labor Relations has a slate of approved arbitrators that they use. I’m unaware of any requirement that they must be Connecticut residents, and so obviously, this particular arbitrator is located -- is based in New York. I should say that I think that’s just the office address. I don’t know if the arbitrator actually lives in New York versus has an office there. Many of them obviously arbitrate disputes
like this in the entire region and some have offices located in different areas, but this is an arbitrator off of the state’s approval list that -- that they use, and this one in particular has an office location in New York, but I’m unaware of any requirement that they have an office in Connecticut.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

So, we -- we use arbitrators from out-of-state fairly routinely?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. You know I can’t say routinely or not. I’ve actually never broken down the numbers on where the particular arbitrators are located.

Through you.
Representative Lavielle.

Thank you very much. So, if again, I understand properly much like the other contracts that we’ve discussed during the course of this session the annual guaranteed increase that these employers will get in fiscal ’20 and fiscal ’21, each of those years amounts to 6.5 percent of their salary. That includes the general wage increase and the annual increment, is that correct?

Through you.

Representative D’Agostino.

Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes, but -- I guess I just want to put a little context there on that. So, that is obviously the last two years of the contract. The contract expires June 30, 2021, so for these last two years, typical with respect to the rest of the wage and hours SEBAC agreements,
it’s a 3.5 percent general wage increase and a 3 percent annual increment. Of course, that also includes the hard zeros for the last two years of no increases. I should note in this arbitration as well, this particular bargaining unit wanted an increase in 2015, so there were zeros -- excuse me. In ’16, ’17, and ’18. This particular unit wanted an increase in ’15 because they have only had two in the last 10 years, and they actually make less than the people that they supervise. That request was rejected by the arbitrators, so you’re looking at several years of -- years of hard zeros leading up to the general wage and step increases in fiscal years ’20 and ’21. All of that, of course, enters to the benefit of the state in just one final note on the general wage increase, and the step increase, of course, those amounts were budgeted in the reserve for salary account and included in the governor’s proposed budget.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, is -- is the representative suggesting that the rather substantial percentage increase that these employees are receiving during the next two years is in some way calculated to make up for the years of zero increases?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I’m not. It obviously doesn’t even come close to doing that if that was the case, and in fact, that’s -- that’s part of what the arbitrator rejected any kind of -- any kind of make-up increase. I should note the arbitrator also rejected a request for a 2.5 percent increase at the top step that these employees wanted as well, so it doesn’t make up for that. In fact, I think when you -- when you factor in the incremental
cost to the state -- I see a gavel ready to come down -- an incremental cost to the state of -- of a few hundred thousand dollars actually pales in comparison to the billions in overall savings from the SEBAC architecture of the hard zeros and the other increases in the past few years.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. (Gavel) (Gavel)

Again, ladies and gentlemen, please, I’m having difficulty hearing. I know that our good members are having difficulty hearing, so if you could all please take your conversations outside or take your conversations to a minimum so we can hear and have a respectful conversation, I would appreciate it.

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, did the employees under the contract receive anything else during the years when they were not receiving raises under the contract?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. It depends on how far we go back. Obviously, in the last 10-year timespan of this contract there were two general wage increases. There were also a couple of step increases I think in ’13 or ’14 -- I’ll have to check the dates -- but that was it. Now, in the other overall context of this contract, there is obviously a give and take. There were increases that they have had to pay in terms of their pension contributions, their healthcare contributions, etc. They did get the benefit of the rest of the underlying contract provisions with respect to, you know, vacation, sick time, that sort of thing. I should note again that the arbitrator also rejected a request for this particular union to make any overtime or extra time when, of course, they’re on call for 24/7, and the people they supervise do make
overtime.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am surprised that the representative did not also note -- and I was referring, of course, as I said only to the time period covered by the SEBAC agreement and this contract in that context. There’s also the matter of the four years of job security guaranteed that all of these employment -- employers -- employees received, and that’s something that a lot of people would consider to be worth its weight in gold, particularly given what the job market was in those years -- ’16, ’17, ’18, and continuing of course, but particularly in those years. And, I think that’s just worth noting. One may say that any savings -- if you consider some things to be savings -- would certainly be beneficial to taxpayers, but job security -- well, you know, is
job security for the person concerned. I thank the representative for his answers. I don’t have any further questions for the moment. We are -- we are continuing to get these contracts every week. They come through Appropriations and then they come to us on the floor. It appears that since the signature of the SEBAC agreement the idea of belonging to a collective bargaining unit has become more and more attractive for our state employees. The benefits and whether they’re retirement, post retirement, healthcare, and the wage increases are very expensive for our taxpayers. I still wonder sometimes how hard driving the negotiators for the taxpayers are, and these are going to mount up and up and up when it’s very difficult to find one cent to help balance our budget and to pay off our long-term retirement obligations to former employees as well as the current ones. So, I will just say again -- here comes the broken record just one more time -- certainly, unions make concessions. People talk about those all the time. No one talks about the
concessions the taxpayers make, and they make a lot, and in this case, once again, we have taxpayers -- these people are taxpayers. Please don’t challenge me on not recognizing these people are taxpayers. Every single last one of them is a Connecticut state taxpayer, but they represent 2 percent of the state’s taxpayers, so once again, you have 2 percent of the taxpayers and 98 percent the other taxpayers, and the difference between them is that the state employees who represent 2 percent of the taxpayers are getting wonderful benefits, very expensive benefits. The other 98 percent -- the difference is that they’re not, and they’re paying for those great benefits, and there is the difference. It’d be great if everyone got them, but since we can’t do that, that’s what we have today, and I really don’t think that it’s fair to any of the other taxpayers in this state.

    Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

    Thank you, Representative. Representative
REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I may, a few questions to you to the proponent of the resolution?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino, please prepare yourself. Representative Davis, please proceed.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I guess my first questions would be what is the role of a deputy warden? What do they do within our corrections system?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. The deputy wardens oversee the day-to-day operations at all the institutional facilities operating by DOC. That’s everything from our supermax facilities to our intake facilities in -- in various locations. They
really are sort of the eyes and ears, and the -- the daily overseers in the place of the warden, so they’ll set the schedules, they’ll make sure that everything’s -- all the trains are running on time so to speak. They do all of that and while they typically work a dayshift as you can imagine because of that role and because of the fact that our corrections facilities operate on a 24/7 basis, they are all on call on a 24/7 basis, so it’s not uncommon for the deputy wardens. They are the ones that get a call when there is an incident at a facility, when something’s occurred, whether that’s on the weekend, whether that’s at 2 o’clock in the morning. They are the ones who have to respond to that and go into the facility and make sure that everything’s -- that -- that folks are responding properly. So, really, they are -- they -- they have a lot of that entire day-to-day management responsibility hoisted upon them -- the 34 deputy wardens that we have.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

   Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you to the proponent of the resolution. Is there -- so the way that the system works as currently constructed, there would be a warden for each facility and then a series of deputy wardens for each facility?

   Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

   Through you, Madam Speaker. There are not wardens for each facility. I believe we have 11 or 12 wardens in the state of Connecticut. Now, most of them do cover a particular facility, but others have other responsibilities in their portfolio, and those dozen or so wardens are who the direct reports are for the deputy wardens of the entire correctional staff reports up to the deputy wardens. The sole reviewer of the deputy wardens are the
wardens, but I don’t believe that there is a warden at every facility. I mean obviously there are at some of the larger facilities, but others have more than one facility in their portfolio.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, it’s -- would it be safe to say then that these deputy wardens represent management in each one of these facilities?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That -- that’s precisely what they were. These were management level employees from the state. They were classified as managers until they were certified to join a collective bargaining unit in March 2017.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, that -- and I thank the kind gentleman for him and for that answer because it was my next question of when did they join this union if they in fact are actually management, and I guess my followup to that would be -- through you, Madam Speaker -- if they are management, in a similar situation in the private sector, would this type of position -- a manager -- be allowed to join a union?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. So, there’s -- there’s obviously different but similar criteria with respect to certification as a collective bargaining on the public employee’s side versus the
private employee’s side. I suppose we could probably talk about that for a while, but I think the short answer to that question is, yes. They could organize on -- on the private side provided they met the different criteria for that under the National Labor of Relations Act. They’ve obviously met the criteria here and were certified under the State Labor Relations Act. Obviously, there are some differences between the two, but that’s obviously a decision for the governing Labor Board. On the private side, it will be the NLRB. On this side, of course, it’s the -- the State Labor of Relations Board, and the certification process that they have to go through there, and the very statutory factors, which I’m sure I can dig up. I don’t have in front of me right now.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, so the way that
this is structured is that there is only really one person above these deputy wardens. There's a deputy warden that has a direct report to the warden of -- under their cognizance; is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, that -- that is correct. These folks only report to and are reviewed by the wardens and then all the COs report to the deputy wardens. The deputy wardens report to the COs. I should note just -- just as sort of a footnote to that that many of the COs actually make more, in some cases much more than the deputy wardens whose salary ranges $90,000 dollars to $115,000 dollars. The top person currently makes $115,000 dollars as a deputy warden.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, through you and perhaps the kind gentleman knows the answer, perhaps he does not, with the warden, who does the warden answer to? Does the warden directly report to the Commissioner of Corrections?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, that is my understanding.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, with these pay increases, I see that average salaries would go from about $99,000 to -- or would become about $99,000 to $115,000 dollars. I think that’s what the kind gentleman just mentioned, and through you, Madam Speaker, what sort of impact does that have on our pension system and the amount of payout that we would have to make given the -- this large increase
in average pay?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. So, with a cost -- the incremental cost of the various benefits on a yearly basis -- that is, of course, the Social Security and Medicare and Unemployment and the contributions to SERS, the State Employee Retirement System, that have to be made. For example, fiscal year ’20, the SERS contribution is about $23,000 dollars, the ’21 contribution is about $55,000 dollars, and that is all factored into the annual incremental cost for each fiscal year that I noted, so the $218,000 dollars, for example, for fiscal year ’20, includes the GWI, the annual increment increase, as well as those incremental impact costs to the State Employee Retirement System that has only be costed out to ’21 because as the -- as the Ranking Member of Finance knows that -- that will
then be done for the next few years after the next budget cycle where it will cost out the ongoing cost to the retirement system for all employees.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, when the arbiters looked at this case, was there any consideration at that time or calculations done about the number of these 34 wardens and how close they are to retirement age and would some of them retire shortly after receiving these pay increases, which would ultimately increase their pensions?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That, to my knowledge, was not part of the arbitration. I don’t -- I don’t know if that’s one of the statutory
factors. I don’t think it was related to the particular issues in front of this arbitrator. Of course, the arbitrator did consider the overall cost impacts when he rejected the retroactive pay increase request from the union when he rejected the request for overtime for these employees as well and rejected the 2-1/2 step increase for those at the maximum step. I should note there are none currently at the maximum step, which goes further to the gentleman’s question with respect to retirement. None of these folks are at max step. Only one is at the top range of salary at the moment, so this is a relatively young group. Many of them were just promoted around 2018, so the sense is that they’ll be -- they’ll be staying in our system hopefully for a while because they’ve done a great job and have good experience.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

(Gavel) (Gavel) Again, ladies and gentlemen, please take your conversations outside. Our members
are having difficulty hearing this important debate. Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I guess my final question would be in 2017, when the supervisors became part of the union, did the state challenge that certification? Did they question whether or not these -- these individuals should be certified and become a union, or was it something that was non-contested by the state?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, I -- actually, I do not know the answer to that if this was a contested certification or not, but I can -- I will endeavor to find out.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. And -- and, I certainly hope it was contested, and -- and I would hope it was because as we just talked about during this question and answer and -- and I’m done with my questions for the kind gentleman from Hamden -- but through the back and forth, we discovered the fact that the way that these individuals operate is that they are supervisors. They run the day-to-day operations of these facilities. They tell employees what their work shifts are going to be, who’s going to cover what position, so on and so forth -- by definition, supervisors. In fact, I believe their union is called the Correction Supervisors Union, and then we find out that they only report to one person, and that’s the warden that oversees them management, and then that warden only reports to the Commissioner. So, what we have here today is an arbitrated union contract for a group of management. Ladies and gentlemen, that is not what the union was designed for. Management is management. They are supposed to manage. Unions are designed to protect
the workforce, the worker, those individuals below management that are told what to do and said how they are supposed to do things. That is the purpose of the union in many cases is so that they can collectively bargain because they do not have the ability to set those things. What we have here before us today is an arbitrated contract for a group of management, supervisors, people that should not -- in my opinion -- be allowed to unionize in the first place, so I certainly hope the state challenged it. I doubt that they did given the past record of state allowing attorney generals and other lawyers who are classically trained in negotiation to become union members. This is the exact example of why we’re in the trouble we’re in today. Because we have allowed these types of contracts with automatic pay raises, no layoffs allowed, to go into effect, and then be arbitrated and passed through most likely with the support of this General Assembly. Ladies and gentlemen, I would ask that this esteemed House please vote against this
contract, not because those deputy wardens don’t do a great job. I am sure that they do. I fully respect anybody who walks into that prison every day to keep our inmates safe, keep their fellow workers safe because it’s a critical role of our society, ruled by law that we have a correction system and that these individuals exist. I fully respect the fact that many of them most likely do not get paid the same amount that their corrections officers probably do get paid with their overtime. That I do respect. But why I ask that this House reject this here today is because it is a vote on a contract for management, not a vote for a contract for workers that would traditionally be the ones allowed to unionize, and I am certainly not an expert in labor law. That is far from my wheelhouse; however, just on a -- on a basic search, from what I could find, these individuals in the private sector most likely would not qualify for union membership. The National Labor Relations Board would most likely reject their union membership if they were in the
private sector, but as we all know, the government sector does not fall under those federal laws.

So, through you, Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask that this House reject this contract, and we go back to the drawing table and perhaps look at whether or not these types of units should ever be allowed to unionize in the first place. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good morning, sir. Please proceed.

REP. CASE (63RD):

A few questions to you, Madam Speaker -- through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. As the good
Representative just spoke, how many management groups do we have in the state of Connecticut that are unionized?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. You know, I don’t know off the top of my head how many different management groups that we have. I will endeavor to -- to get a number. There obviously are a good number of them that are nonunionized, and there are managers usually at just about every level of administrative agencies that we know about -- DCF, DCC, etc. Just -- just while I’ve got the floor to answer the question that was asked. This was a challenged certification by the state, but the certification was eventually issued by the Labor Board, so the state did challenge the certification, and just -- just one other quick note on procedure on that issue with respect to certification and
management, etc., because this is an arbitrated award, if we reject the award, it goes back to arbitration where quite frankly I don’t know how we could do any better, and then it is deemed approved. It does not come back to this body, but that’s just answering the prior questions. I apologize to Representative Case for doing that. But, with respect to the question that he asked, I don’t know the exact number of managers.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the good Representative. I thank him for doing the best on answering that. As we heard this contract in Appropriations, we heard of many things, and you know, the managers are available 24/7, which is part of their job.

Through you, Madam Speaker. In this contract with these 34 wardens, what is their average salary
or their starting salary -- or their salary as of today?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. The -- the average salary is about $103,000 dollars. The range is a low of $90,200 dollars to one person who makes $115,000 dollars, but the average is obviously -- and most of them are lower than that when you see that the average is $103,000 dollars. Through you -- and again, no overtime and this is -- this is less than many COs make in terms of salary and overtime.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. So, is it correct to say that if this contract was to be awarded those annual salaries would go to the upwards of $115,000
dollars to $120,000 dollars with the 3.5 and the 3 percent increase?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, I mean we can do the math on some of them. Somebody making $90,000 dollars is going to make about 6.5 percent more in fiscal year ’20, so what’s that an extra $5000 dollars, and so you would add that on to the incremental cost for each one of these particular salaries at the 6.5 when you factor in the GWI and step, and again, the total cost of that in fiscal year ’20 for the 34 when you factor in salary, benefits, etc. is about $200,000 dollars.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, through you,
just a few comments, and I thank the good Representative for his answers. We’ve talked about these contracts and different things that are in them, and I don’t need to repeat them as others have. We’ve spoken about them in numerous times in the past few weeks. Ladies and gentlemen, we got to think long and hard when we do this. I’ve been working hard with some of the nursing homes in the state of Connecticut. We’re on the verge of 2500 walk-out strike. If anybody doesn’t realize, that’s gonna cost the state of Connecticut about $6.3 million dollars a week. I have one group who is also -- has already put out a million-dollar deposit on workers from outside of state to come in. We really need to work to prioritize where we put our dollars. It’s not about the workers don’t do a great job in the contracts that we are looking at. It’s about where we put our dollars, and I can’t fathom our most vulnerable people in our rest homes -- yes, they are not our union, but it’s how we pay DSS on reimbursements. DSS is responsible for
paying that reimbursable amount to these nursing homes that are going to be striking if we don’t come to a conclusion by May 1. That million dollars that was sent out last week by this one group is nonrefundable. We are heading down a very slippery slope. We keep approving 3-1/2 -- 3.5 percent contracts -- when does it stop? We need to look at and prioritize spending not only for these nursing homes that are coming up but for the IDD people and our most vulnerable. Think long and hard. We got some big bills coming up to us if this comes forward, and I don’t know. The people of the state of Connecticut are taxpayers, and as it’s said in Appropriations by many people, these workers are taxpayers, but these state workers are 2 percent of the taxpaying people in the state of Connecticut. We need to look and prioritize our spending and take care of our people that are the most vulnerable and need our help right now. I urge you to reject this contract and the contracts coming forward.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I may, a few comments and maybe some questions for the proponent of the bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

I stand now not only as a State Representative but a former correction officer for the state of Connecticut, and I find this particular resolution insulting. These people are not only managers -- Representative Davis asked a lot of really good questions, but they don’t make the schedule. Captains and shift supervisors -- these -- these people are upper management. They don’t even do that daily work of making out work schedules. These people should not be allowed to unionize, and they certainly don’t deserve these raises, and I have
friends who are deputy wardens. They’re not going to be too happy with me, but when we’re in these desperate times, you got people going on strike, you know, at Stop and Shop, real people doing the work. Unions were set up for people like that and correction officers they’re actually on the line doing the work. And, in all my time in corrections, whether a deputy warden is on call or not, zero times had I ever see a deputy warden get called in because we had an emergency. We have shift commanders that take care of that. So, if I may, I actually have a question for the proponent of the bill, if I may through you, Madam Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

You mentioned that COs make more money than -- in some cases than deputy wardens. Do you know what -- you mentioned the average salary of the deputy wardens. What’s the average salary of a correction officer in the state of Connecticut?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. For a CO salary, I don’t know. I don’t have the average in front of me. That’s just the salary. Obviously, they can make more in overtime as well as I understand it, but I don’t have the salary schedule for the COs.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

And -- and it’s been a few years since I’ve been in the Department, so I’m sure that salaries have increased, but I would be -- I’m willing to go out on a limb and bet that they’re no more than $60,000 dollars a year, and that -- that I would guess that it’s actually much lower than that, so under what circumstance would COs -- or how many overtime hours would a CO have to work in a year to get to $103,000 dollars or $115,000 dollars if
that’s what it’s going to be going to?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I mean if we’re
taking like a starting salary of $60,000 dollars,
obviously at time and a half, I guess if it’s just
your normal overtime schedule we can figure out the
math, but you’d have to work several hundred hours
of OT to get close to that.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

And, again -- and -- and most -- most people
don’t work that much overtime, and you know, they
have to have protections in there for correction
officers. The average life expectancy of a
correction officer in the United States is 61 years
old. There’s a reason why there’s protections in
place for that. I’m sure if we looked at the average life expectancy of deputy wardens, it would be much higher. I don’t know. I just -- I just find this whole thing insulting as a former union member. These are not the people that unions were intended to protect. These are upper-level management. They are on call. They never come in. It’s taken care of. This is bad for the state of Connecticut, and as a former corrections officer, I urge my colleagues to vote against this.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative O’Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Good to see you up there.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Nice to see you, sir. Please proceed.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

A few brief comments. No questions for the
good proponent of the bill. I won’t quote William Munny again today on this -- this proposal, and again, I will reiterate though that the deserve has got nothing to do with it. I have nothing against the -- the good people who are working -- the deputy wardens. I do agree with my colleagues’ comments about where we can afford to spend our -- our limited resources, and I do want to reiterate this. I know my colleagues are probably sick of hearing this, but New Canaan in 2014 sent $225-million dollars in income taxes to the state of Connecticut. That’s $225-million dollars from a town of only $18,000 people. That was the third highest amount of taxes paid to the state of Connecticut behind Greenwich, which at the time was roughly $780-million, behind Stamford at the time was only roughly $375-million, and then New Canaan was $225-million. In 2017, three years later after we all agreed there was a fairly significant increase in taxes, New Canaan’s contribution to the General Fund in income taxes went from $225-million to $190-
million. In those three years, $35-million dollars in taxes to the state of Connecticut left New Canaan, Connecticut -- $35-million dollars. My firm -- not me -- my firm was engaged to move people out of the state of Connecticut and establish residency in Florida and other -- other states. We are in a competition to keep our wealthy residents in the state of Connecticut. I understand where in a money crunch and that the desire to increase income taxes on the wealthy -- they can afford it. Yes, they can. But, guess what else they can afford? They can afford to move easier than anybody else, and they have been. They’ve been moving in droves by the millions of dollars of money leaving the state, and the one evidence I’d like to give of that is the boat tax. In our bipartisan budget in 2017, bipartisan best -- get the ring? Bipartisan best. In our bipartisan budget in 2017, we lowered the boat tax. And, guess what happened? Revenue increased. We lowered the tax on the boats, and the revenues increased. So, I’m not sure I’m gonna win
any votes on -- on the other side of the aisle on this, but hopefully, some of what I’m saying is sinking in and making sense. If we keep increasing taxes, I’m telling you people are going to move and they’re not being replaced by the same wage earners. So, while I have nothing against the deputy wardens getting paid more, I also don’t have anything against my son getting paid more, me getting paid more, my family and friends getting paid more, all my colleagues getting paid more. We simply can’t afford it, and therefore, I would respectfully request that my colleagues vote against this arbitration award.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Thank you very much. Would you remark further? Would you remark further on the resolution before us? If not, will staff and guest 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 COOK (65TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Resolution No. 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The resolution is adopted. (Gavel). Will the clerk please call Calendar 264?

CLERK:
On page 31, Calendar 264, House Bill No. 7043, AN ACT CONCERNING BREASTFEEDING IN THE WORKPLACE. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Labor and Public Employees.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Good morning, Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The 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, madam.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This bill establishes certain criteria that an employer provide an area must meet for employees expressing breastmilk. The current law requires employers to make a reasonable effort to provide a room or other
location other than a toilet stool where an employee can express her breastmilk. This bill specifies that this area must be free from intrusion or public exposure while the mother expresses her milk. It also requires that there is an electrical outlet and that there is also a refrigerator of some sorts where she can keep the breastmilk.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

(Gavel) Ladies and gentlemen, again, I ask you to please quiet the Chamber or take your conversations outside. We’re discussing important pieces of legislation that impact our residents in the state of Connecticut. Madam Representative Porter, please proceed.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I will just conclude with the fact that this passed out of the Labor Committee unanimously, and I move adoption, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question before the Chamber is on
acceptance -- no. I did that. Will you remark further on the bill? Representative O’Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. The clerk has an amendment LCO No. 7131. I respectfully ask the clerk call the amendment and I be allowed to summarize?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO No. 7131, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 7131, offered by Representative O’Dea.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing no objection. Representative O’Dea, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Madam
Speaker, the amendment before you we believe clarifies and improves the language to allow employers to provide certain aspects of the bill that otherwise they may not, if they couldn’t provide all of them. So, what we believe this bill does is simply clarify in line 7 that an employer shall -- well, through lines 5 -- an employer should make reasonable efforts to provide a room or other location in close proximity to the work area other than a toilet stall where an employee can express her milk in private and provided there is no undue hardship such room or other location shall, and then it goes through provide free -- space be free from intrusion and shielded from the public, include or be situated near a refrigerator or an employee provided portable storage device, and three, include access to an electrical outlet. The purpose of this amendment is that if one of those three things is not reasonable and the other two area, the employer will be able to provide the other two. We don’t want the employer to not provide any of those if
just one of them is unreasonable. So, for example, -- and to the proponent, I believe, I would ask this be a friendly amendment, and I’d ask for legislative intent. Well, first, I ask this be a friendly amendment.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

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

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, yes, to the good Representative, this is a friendly amendment.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative O’Dea.

REP. O’DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Doesn’t it feel so good to say yes [Laughing] to amendments. In any event, Madam Speaker, just for legislative intent I want to just clarify that the intent of
this bill is that it does not affect areas the employer does not control. So, in other words, if you have an employee who is an electric contractor and your employee is out on a job in an area that the employer does not control, this bill does not impact any area that the employer does not control; is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. That is correct.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative O’Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):
Thank you very much. Now, so I ask that the amendment be adopted at this point in time.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Will you remark further on the amendment? Will
you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All in favor please signify by saying, aye.

(All) Aye.

All opposed? The amendment -- the amendment is adopted. (Gavel).

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, and --

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative O’Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. My last comment for legislative intent. The purpose of this bill is for employers to provide these things when it’s reasonably practical, and I would urge my colleagues to support the bill as amended.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Polletta. Please proceed, sir.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):
Good morning, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good morning, sir.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Very briefly, I rise in support of the bill as amended. I understand it’s a friendly amendment, and this bill came out of committee unanimously and with this amendment, it does make the bill a bit better, so I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Dathan.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Thank you, Madam Chair. As I am in support of the bill with the amendment as a mother of three kids who had very many times had to breastfeed -- or express in the bathrooms, in the car whilst I was working. I see this as a very, very friendly bill for working mothers.

Thank you very much.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise with a comment about the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand today in strong support of this legislation and want to thank my good friend and colleague, Representative Porter for her leadership on this bill as well as the members of the Labor Committee and the other co-introducers of this bill -- Representative McCarthy Vahey, Representative Linehan, Representative Conley, and many other champions of this legislation. As stated earlier, this bill is so critical to helping support working moms and women in the workforce who wish and are able to continue breastfeeding when they return to work. This is something that we know has enormous health benefits
for the health of the mother and the child. In fact, the American Academy of Pediatrics recommends that if women are able to and want to that they attempt to exclusively breastfeed for the first six months, but despite that recommendation, according to a CDC 2014 report, 79 percent of women start off breastfeeding, and then that drops down to 50 percent after six months, and one of the reasons for that is it becomes increasingly difficult when you return to work to continue this activity. So, the legislation we have today aims to support women in the workforce who wish to continue this activity. It also send a signal to women that Connecticut is a friendly place for working moms and that we support women who wish to continue breastfeeding, and overall, it is going to go to supporting the health of the mother and the child and supporting financial stability for women and families across Connecticut, and I -- I’ve had personal experiences with this having just gone through this, but we are so fortunate here at the Capitol to have legislative
leaders that support us as women. We have lactation rooms at the Capitol that are private from the public, but many women across the state do not have that access, and that’s not fair, that’s not right. We -- we’ve heard stories about -- I talked to a woman who worked at a fast food restaurant, and her boss denied her a private space, and she had to go pump in her car and faced harassment and taunting from people watching her do this activity. I talked to another woman who worked at a non-profit that had a perfectly legitimate space but was denied this right from her boss, and I talked to a woman recently who was called to jury duty and was shown the room that she was able to pump in, and it was completely exposed to the public and full of rusty, dirty equipment, and so again, this bill is trying to rectify these injustices and make our work places more friendly to women across our state. So, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Thank you, Representative. Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Chair -- Madam Speaker.  [Laughing].  I’m so used to saying Madam Chair, but thank you, Madam Speaker.  Madam Speaker, I rise.  I have a question for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Porter, please proceed yourself.  Representative, you may proceed.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.  And, to Representative Porter, can you give me some information and let me -- tell me the details of this bill and who defines or determines what is reasonable on behalf of the employer?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker.  The employer
determines what’s reasonable.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, if for some reason the employee didn’t feel that was a reasonable accommodations, through you Madam Speaker, what would be the process?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That could be taken up through the labor commissioner.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, Madam Speaker, can you tell me has there ever -- has there been complaints or any data indicating that there have been complaints from employees or women
specifically that there employer were not accommodating them?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I do not have data in front of me, but there has been anecdotal stories told behind women, such as myself included, who have not had access to proper spaces to breastfeed.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, and through you, Madam Speaker. I know that you had mentioned that you heard stories on that. Were -- through you Madam Speaker, were any of those stories reported to the CHRO or the Department of Labor where we can get some information?

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. We would have to get that information for the good Representative.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you to the Representative for answering my questions. Just a couple of comments on that. I believe the employers today are very, very accommodative to women. I am certainly a proponent of women breastfeeding. I think it’s the best thing they can do for them -- for their infant, and I know -- and I really know and I understand the importance of it, and I’m sure many women in here would agree with me. However, I do feel that this is a mandate on an employer. I have not heard any data, had any statistics that there’s any complaints at all that people were not
being accommodated employees. I believe it will cost the employer extra money that they may not be able to afford, and again, I -- I do believe that employers are accommodating their employees through this process, so I have a concern with that, so based on that, Madam Speaker, I will not be supporting this bill today, but I appreciate the effort. I think it is -- it is good, but I believe employers are doing their job in accommodating women, especially today. It’s -- it’s almost second to none that this is taken care of, but again, I believe it’s an undue mandate on employers. It lacks a lot of detail. You know, what’s considered a refrigerator, what’s considered an electrical outlet, how big is the room, how small does the room have to be. Who’s gonna determine if it’s unreasonable or reasonable. I believe we have a process through CHRO and the Department of Labor that if somebody had a complaint they can certainly go through the process and do that.

So, thank you, Madam Speaker, and based on that
information, I will be voting no today, but I really appreciate the effort. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I rise for a few comments on this bill. I want to applaud the way the process has worked this time. I think this bill strikes an excellent balance with respecting and honoring the decisions of women to continue breastfeeding while working, while at the same time acknowledging that for some employers providing a truly dedicated private space may impose a hardship. Wearing my Executive Director of the Children’s Museum hat, the building in which we are housed was the former public library built long before women were returning to work while still having small infants whom they need to feed. On my wish list as we go through our strategic plan is to have a dedicated room where not only my employees but my
visiting nursing mothers can feed their infants in peace and security, but in the interim, I think this bill takes an excellent first step on accepting that for some employers two-thirds is better than nothing. They need to make all reasonable efforts and also saying to women we want you to be able to be women in the fullest sense of the word, to have your children, to feed them in the way in which you desire, and to go back to work if you desire. That’s what being truly free is about -- being able to make those choices and having those choices honored, so again, I applaud the process, and I urge my colleagues to support this amended bill today.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just would like to close out with this, and some of the concerns that
were mentioned regarding the bill that it is stated in this bill that there has to be a reasonable effort, which means any effort that would not impose an undue hardship on the operation of the business, and when we say an undue hardship, it’s any action that requires significant difficulty or expense when considered in relation to factors relating to the employer, so I just want to put that on the record.

It was stated that it is a mandate, but there are specific guidelines in this bill that state that it cannot be an undue hardship, and that we’re only asking that the employer exhibit a reasonable effort to accommodate a woman who wants to breastfeed or either express breastmilk.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Will 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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

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? And, if all of the members voted, the machine will be locked and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7043 as amended by House A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
The bill as amended is passed. (Gavel). Will the clerk please call Calendar 306?

CLERK:

On page 38, Calendar 306, substitute for House Bill No. 7141, AN ACT REGULATING ELECTRIC FOOT SCOOTERS. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Transportation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you. Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good afternoon, sir. Please proceed.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question is acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Lemar, you have the floor.
REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you. Madam Speaker, the bill before us addresses the definition and regulation of electric foot scooters. As with all technology, micromobility and low-level transportation options are becoming more and more prevalent, and the technology is evolving on a year-to-year basis. The bill before us would provide structure and regulations to this emerging market that you’re seeing on a lot of college campuses and a lot of urban areas across the country. Left unregulated, there have been problems, so we have decided that the state needed a framework for which we could regular electric scooters and allow municipalities to adopt reasonable and rational regulations for their towns. Madam Speaker, the clerk is in possession of amendment LCO No. 7251. I ask that the clerk please call the amendment, and I be leave of the Chamber to summarize?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO No. 7251, which
will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 7251, offered by Representative Lemar, Senator Leone.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? I’m hearing none. Representative Lemar, you may proceed with summarization of your amendment and --

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The amendment makes two small structural changes. One, defining the weight of an electric foot scooter to be less than 75 pounds or two, to define the safety standard by which the helmet that a rider must utilize must meet.

Through you, I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the
amendment? Will you remark on the amendment?
Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would support the amendment and suggest we do this by voice vote.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Johnson, on the amendment or on -- or you want to wait until we’re -- okay. Thank you. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further? If not, I try your minds. Will all those in favor of the amendment hereby say, aye.

(All) Aye.

Opposed? The amendment is adopted. (Gavel).

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Now, as amended, this bill provides I think the necessary regulations for our state and our municipalities to craft
responsible regulations that will allow electric scooters to be utilized in our communities were relevant, provide the necessary protections for commuters, walkers, pedestrians in those communities as well.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a couple clarifying questions for the chair, if you -- through you. Could you please just describe so everybody’s on the same level in terms of what we’re talking about related to an electric scooter?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for the
question. I think it’s really important that we have a baseline understanding of what we’re talking about here today. An electric scooter you’re seeing utilized on a lot of more warm weather climates throughout the country as they have more yearly usage in those locations, but an electric foot scooter is a vehicle that weighs 75 pounds or less, has two or three wheels, handlebars, a floorboard that could be stood on while you’re riding. You often times will kickstart it. There will be a small electric motor attached to maintain a relevant speed. You’ll ideally see these in bike lanes traveling less than 20 miles per hour. It’s a form of mobility that’s very accessible to people of all ages, and is utilized in our urban areas quite frequently as a state.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):
Great. Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, just to clarify then what amended Bill No. 7141 would do is to regulate the electric foot scooter much like we do now with e-bikes, right, so it will outline the equipment size, speed, where they can be parked, how they can be parked, and then as amended also broadens some of the safety standards for compliance with that; is that correct?

Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, yes. That is exactly right.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Excellent. Thank you, Madam Speaker. This bill did pass unanimously out of the Transportation Committee, and I would support this and encourage all my colleagues to do the same.
Thanks so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I had the privilege of visiting some family down in Tennessee in Nashville just recently, and one thing that caught my attention other than the incredible economic growth there, which was amazing because you know they have very favorable tax climate even though their actual physical climate is very similar to us, so it’s amazing to me that with those kinds of things that you see economic growth unforeseen in New England; however, but one thing I did notice was these scooters being used. Scooters that were rented -- I think Lyft was one of the companies, a few of the other ones, and through you Madam Speaker and I think the ranking member had just mentioned this bill would allow for those regulations. Would it be done through the state level or at a local
level?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, yes.

This provides a state structure for regulations in which would comply with the Office of State Traffic Administration’s rules and regulations, but also allows municipalities to adopt their own rules about parking and where they can travel in that municipality. Nashville is a perfect example of a place that saw this booming in their community, had to play catchup in order to regulate appropriately, and we want to get ahead of that concern so that there is a standard across the state of Connecticut. The industry itself, both Lyft, Lime, Bird and others have weighed in on this and are supportive of this regulatory framework, and I think this allows this technology to take off and thrive while also providing necessary protections for our residents.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I’m glad to hear that because what was often the case is that these scooters were just literally left on the sidewalk in the middle of anywhere, and that was the business model. That’s what they were told to do -- once you’re done with your trip, just leave it wherever you are, so there were scooters strung across the sidewalks in almost every neighborhood that we visited. And, through you Madam Speaker, the taxation on these types of products; would they be charged just the sales tax or would they be charged a similar fee per ride like the ride-sharing companies do today? I think it’s a 25-cent fee per ride.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lemar.
REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, you will see these regulated similar to the bikes that are for rent or the e-bikes that are for rent through most of our municipalities at this point. There are these ride-sharing agreements that are entered into by local municipalities that are subject to state laws on taxation as well. This would model that in its entirety and would allow communities to adopt their own regulations on how to tax the property that’s located in their communities parked in a structured facility, so you will see those regulations have further teeth. As this technology emerges further, there will likely be some conversation reformed to how they’re taxed, but at this point, it would model the current existing language and law.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, the individual
municipality would not be allowed to put on an additional fee or tax or surcharge?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you. The individual municipality could enter into contract with the host ride-sharing community if they’re going to utilize the public space, so if they’re going to construct a ride-sharing facility on a sidewalk or in a public location, they could enter into an agreement with that company about a structured base, but if you own your own private e-scooter that you operate independently in confirmation with the law at the state and local levels, then the community could not tax that operation of that use.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, often times throughout the country, I have noticed and for tourism-based kind of activities -- Shegway (pronounced) or a Segway that’s used to go around and would this legislation encompass those types of historical tours or other things that use Segways to get around the city?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, yes. We envision a lot of communities, particularly colleges campuses, more urban areas where we’ve seen that utilization for tourism, for historical tours, the local communities that have embraced this usage or have relevant on-road or protected cycle tracks are finding e-bikes to be useful in that regard, and we think e-scooters are a technology that will be utilized much more frequently because of the ease of use, particularly for mobility-limited pedestrians
who want to engage in a two-mile tour in a local community, struggle with the walk of that, and are not able to maintain or manage riding a bike. E-scooters are providing a great opportunity for folks to engage in those historical tours, and our local tourism officials are being really creative in how to utilize this technology to get around their towns, but we -- we think our municipalities should have the authority to write regulations that are responsible in the usage locally how we do that.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I will be supporting the bill here today as seeing a city that has this used a lot in Nashville and has some looser regulations about where they are, I certainly hope that for public safety sake that they -- that they are regulated a little bit more; however, I am a little fearful that the municipalities might go a
little too far or have the ability to put on taxes or fees that would make these -- this new emerging technology something that I think could be very positive for the state of Connecticut. I hope that we don’t overregulate it or overtax it to the point where it doesn’t get utilized as well as it possibly could, but for those reasons, I’ll be supporting it here today.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I just want to rise and say that I’m supporting the bill. I want to thank the chairman of the Transportation Committee and the Transportation Committee for their work in getting this bill -- bringing this bill out into the floor. I represent a university community. I have numerous people in my district that utilize these types of methods of transportation. There are
people also in the next district over, another university community, and this has been a problem for them for a little bit of time now, so I just want to thank you, and I’m supporting this bill, and it’s a good bill. It ought to pass.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you -- thank you, Madam Speaker, and good afternoon. One question --

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good -- good afternoon, sir. Please proceed.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

One question through you to the proponent for legislative intent. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

To the good Chair of Transportation, I support the bill, but as far as the helmet for the cycles, I
want to for legislative intent make sure it’s not -- in the bill, there’s autocycles, motorcycles. Will that be intended just for the -- the scooters or for all motorcycles and scooters?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. For legislative intent, under existing law, e-bike riders must wear a helmet meeting the minimum specifications established for bicycle helmets, so bicycles helmet, e-bike helmets, and now e-scooter helmets will be the covered entities, and they will have to comply with the -- one of these three product safety standards that are universally adopted. This was the language that we thought represented the overwhelming vast majority of helmets in use, but had the necessary product safety standards that are universally accepted that meet the minimum safety requirements that we would want our folks to utilize
on road.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you for that answer. No, that’s fine, so it’s for the cycles, the electric scooters, the bicycles, but not like a motorcycle?

Through you, Madam Speaker. I apologize.

[Laughing].

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Through you, the questioner is exactly right.

That’s right.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

All right. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you. Thank you so much. Thank you,
Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, Madam Speaker, a question for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

So, I see the legislation includes scooter -- e-scooter riders as among vulnerable users; is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, yes, it does.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):
And, again through you Madam Speaker, I also see that it attaches to e-scooter riders the same rights and responsibilities and duties of bicycle riders; is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, yes.

That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

And, through you, Madam Speaker. So, I assume that would apply in the case that an e-scooter rider inadvertently knocks down a pedestrian, so the same legal requirements and sanctions would apply to that e-scooter rider who was not looking where he or she was going and took out an unsuspecting pedestrian?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Madam Speaker, through you, yes. That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank the proponent of the bill for his answers. I think we need to encourage these new innovative forms of transport. My D.C. inhabiting younger son says he uses them all the time to get from department to department, but we also need to bear in mind we do have a population that’s aging that might not be nimble enough to jump out of the way of an e-scooter, so we need to protect everybody who’s using our sidewalks in the most responsible way possible.

I thank the proponent of the bill, and I thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be in support.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative
REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Madam -- thank you, Madam Speaker.

Just a few comments on the bill. It’s very fortunate to -- to vote for this bill from the Transportation Committee. Before the vote, I actually spent a weekend in Salt Lake City. I had never been before and visiting some friends of my girlfriend out there, and we actually spent the entire weekend when we weren’t -- at least during the daytime, not driving through the city but actually riding around on -- on these scooters. First time I had ever used this, you know, ride-sharing technology, and I thought it was fantastic. We -- we would ride around. We’d drop off a -- drop off the scooter, it would charge -- charge my account through my cellphone. We left it -- we’d leave it on the side of the road, had to take a picture of it to prove that the scooters were left in a safe location. You take a photo, you park it, and then somebody else who just leaves a restaurant
instead of wanting to walk or take a cab can hop on a scooter, so I think this technology with the proliferation of ride-sharing and the sharing economy has made it great and accessible for -- you know, for folks to participate in a form of transportation that cuts down on carbon emissions and -- and makes a day in the city or -- a really great time, so I think it’s a good bill for us to pass to promote our tourism in cities in the state of Connecticut. It’s great reducing carbon emissions, and I’m happy to support the bill.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended before us? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Will members take your seats? And, the board 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 ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7141 as amended by House A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The bill as amended has passed. (Gavel). Do we have any announcements or introductions? Announcements or introductions? Representative
O'Dea of the 125th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

    Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a brief announcement, if I may, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    You may proceed.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

    So, Tom Shields had a birthday yesterday. It was your 45th. Oh, I’m sorry. You were born in 1945 [Laughing], so Tom was the former Chief of Staff for Bob Killian as a messenger, and I would like the House to give him a warm happy birthday applause [Applause], and thank you for your service.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Happy birthday, and thank you for your service to the state of Connecticut. Any announcements or introductions? Representative McCarthy Vahey of the 133rd. Will the clerk please call Calendar 440?

CLERK:

    On page 57, Calendar 440, substitute House Bill No. 7367, AN ACT CONCERNING THE USE OF THE PENFIELD
REEF LIGHTHOUSE AS A COLUMBARIUM. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Planning and Development.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey, now you may proceed, of the 133rd.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it’s wonderful to see you up there on the Dais today.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you so much.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative McCarthy Vahey, you have the floor.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill allows Penfield Reef Lighthouse to be used as a Columbarium, and for those of you who are like me and need -- needed to look this up in the dictionary, a columbarium is a place where the cremated human remains can be stored. This bill allows DEEP to authorize a lease for the bottomlands of the lighthouse, and the lease must provide for relocation plans in the event of a lease termination, and must be approved by the DEEP commissioner. The use of the lighthouse in this case will generate a perpetual care fund that will allow for the ongoing care of this historic structure, and since 2005, the General Services Administration and the Coastguard have been attempting to find bidders, and this bill will allow Americares to purchase the lighthouse and hold the lease if successful.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark
further on the bill? Representative Zawistowski of the 61st, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of interesting bills that come out of the Planning and Development Committee, but I think that the proponent of the bill will agree that this is probably the most unusual one this year. A couple of questions for the proponent of the bill, Mr. Speaker, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker. How many -- how many urns would be the capacity for this lighthouse?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, I am not certain of the number of urns. What I am
certain is that there are very clear specifications in terms of the shelving, the labeling, and the type of urns that need to be used, which would be secure and would assure that in the event of a weather-related event or any other disaster that they would be secure and there would not be ashes that would be in the sound.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, will these urns be stored directly in the lighthouse or in the bottomlands or submerged lands?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the urns would be stored within the lighthouse structure itself.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, can the lease with the DEEP be assigned or subleased?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, no. the lease may not be assigned or subleased. It must be -- it must go through the DEEP commissioner.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, what happens if the lease is not renewed by DEEP?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that if the lease is not renewed that --
well, the lease actually must contain provisions and plans for potential relocation of remains in the event that there is termination or if the renewal does not occur.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

And, thank you, and through you Mr. Speaker, what happens if there is a hurricane or somehow the -- the lighthouse is destroyed be it partially or completely? What happens to the lighthouse and also what happens to the urns that are housed there?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker, again, the lease requires a relocation plan in the event of such disaster, and in addition, this would be a purchase by a company who would then be responsible for the care and upkeep of the building itself. The
light at the top of the lighthouse, which is still an aid to navigation is maintained by the Coastguard, but the owner, if they were successful in getting a lease from us, the state, would then be responsible for the repairs to the building.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, and through you Mr. Speaker, has the company that’s planning on leasing this made arrangements for perpetual care for the remains?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, I am not certain of the specific steps that they have taken, but again, the lease will require that there be perpetual care of the remains if in some event the company goes under or if there is some reason that they are not able to renew the lease, so that will
be negotiated with the DEEP commissioner.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is actually a pretty novel way of -- of finding a permanent home for human remains rather than some people prefer to have their ashes scattered. This is a much more palatable way if they’re interested in the ocean, but also, it presents a very novel way of preserving a historic property that has been -- the town of Fairfield has been very interested in preserving this property for some time, and it’s -- it’s a good way to be able to make sure that it does get cared for in the long run. This went -- went through the Planning and Development Committee unanimously. It has no fiscal impact. I’m going to be supporting this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Thank you. Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would concur with the good ranking member’s remarks. This is an excellent way for the town and the state of Connecticut to be able to preserve a historic structure and to have a place where folks can -- more and more folks are choosing to be cremated, over half of Connecticut residents in the past couple of years, and this is an excellent use for this facility, so I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Will you remark further on the bill? Representative Hennessy of the 127th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick question. So, can loved ones -- family and loved ones come visit? Is that open to -- to the public or just family members? How does that work?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative McCarthy Vahey.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, this question did come up in committee as well. The lighthouse is an important navigational aid. It’s a very dangerous reef, and in fact, though some have attempted and at times successfully been able to walk out to the lighthouse, it is only reachable by boat, and in that case even can be a dangerous endeavor, so it will not be a place where people would be able to visit in person; however, the company has suggested with the support potentially of funds that had been raised by the town when they were working to purchase the property to put in telescopes where people could actually view the lighthouse from land, but that is all still to be negotiated, so the answer -- the simple answer to your question is no. It would not be a place where people would be able to visit.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Hennessy.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you. That was all my questions.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Will you remark further on the bill? Representative Case of the 63rd, you have the floor.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple quick questions to the proponent of the bill. Interesting concept. Through you, Mr. Speaker. At the end of a 30-year lease, what then happens?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, that’s a great question that has been asked by others as well, so at that point in time, the folks who have the lease
would be able to renew in conjunction in working together with the commissioner of Environmental and Energy Protection. However, as I had stated previously, if for some reason that company was not going to renew, the lease requires that there be a plan for relocation that is written into the lease, so it would either be a renewal or there would be planned relocation that was part of the lease.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good afternoon, sir. Please proceed.

REP. CASE (63RD):

So, I thank you for your answer. Just the remains going into this facility; is it families requesting them or can there also be indigent that the state has in their hold?

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This would be much as any other columbarium where folks would be purchasing for their loved ones the opportunity to be there or to have their loved one’s remains there in the columbarium. It’s not my understanding that there would be any folks who are indigent who would be part of this, but I’m certain that the company would be open to having a conversation, but we did not have that discussion with them as part of this bill.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. So, in that last answer, I heard the remark that these people would be purchasing spots within this facility to put the remains; is that correct?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, that is correct. So, there is a company that is working to purchase the lighthouse. They actually were the successful bidder through the General Services Administration. They would be partnering with an organization called the Eternal Light Foundation, and when urns were purchased to be placed in the Columbarium, this would then create a fund that would allow for the upkeep of the lighthouse and the safe keeping of the remains.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, Madam Speaker. Are there any other private-owned facilities that have urns or bodies on them?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, if I believe the good Representative may have been referring to other lighthouses or perhaps other facilities, one of the things that this bill does is allow the lighthouse to be used as a columbarium. Currently, there are columbariums that are within cemeteries that are five acres or more, or if it’s less than five acres, the town or Board -- the town mayor, Board of Selectmen, or in some cases, the Planning and Zoning Commission would have had to approve that structure being in a less than five acre area. This bill would allow for Penfield Lighthouse to also serve as a columbarium. What I will say is that this company, America’s Castles -- thank you -- is also looking to do this in other places in the country as well.

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

   Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank you for your answers. Just a couple more questions. A concern because it has come from a constituent who wanted to have a piece of property and use it for a cemetery use, and I -- I believe there’s statute out there that those need to be run or owned by municipalities or churches. How does this fit into that?

   Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

   Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I’m not certain. This -- this bill very specifically addresses the use of the lighthouse for that purpose and adds it to the purposes that I mentioned before, so I’m -- I’m not certain how or if, and I don’t believe it would address that other specific purpose.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. And, has the Department of Public Health approved this and gone through with that? I believe that would be the right agency, I’m not sure, but when you’re placing somebody’s remains, they need to be under some agency so the agency knows where they are, and given this to be a state-owned facility that we are leasing, we are still owning of the property that is being placed in there.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, indeed, the organization would be required to work through the Department of Public health as well as the Department of Environmental and Energy Protection to
take all the steps necessary as if they were a
columbarium in a cemetery of five acres or more or a
smaller one as approved by the town.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I’m done with
questions right now, just a few comments. I think
it’s a great way to think outside of the box. I
don’t know if it’s -- wow. Okay, to think outside
of the realm of things [Laughter], but this is a
state-owned facility, and I’m concerned that we’re
not in the business of holding onto remains and also
benefitting the sale of spaces to put remains. That
concerns me. I don’t know if there will be any
other discussion. I know that I appreciate this
coming forward. I have worked on and tried to work
on legislation on -- because we are all running out
of places in our municipalities to put the remains
of somebody, and we tried to work it on a private
piece of property but wasn’t allowed to because of regulations, so that’s where my concern would lie, and the good woman -- the good Chairwoman also said that it’s very difficult to get to this. I’d be very concerned on how these remains are going to get there in a safe manner, if they had to be taken out of the facility in a quick time because of a major storm coming or something out of nature happening. I guess there’s a lot of unknowns with this, and I’m not sure at this time if this is the right thing and the right way to raise funds to save or to work on a such a historic place. I’m all for keeping the historic lighthouse intact, but I’m concerned on other ways of just allowing bodies and remains of somebody to be in the lighthouse in a state-homed facility.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a few points of
clarification, and I thank the good Representative for his questions and comments. The building itself is owned by the Federal Government. They have been trying to dispose of the building since 2005. There have been multiple bids over a period of time. The last effort was unsuccessful because we as a state were unable to provide the lease for the bottomlands, which is where our sole jurisdiction lies. We do not have ownership of the lighthouse itself. That is through the Federal Government. In addition, I just wanted to comment that the design of the urns, which ironically is to look as a lighthouse and to be stacked appropriately is very much to assure the safekeeping in the event of any kind of weather-related incident, and that they would be able to survive such -- such an incident, so just again to clarify this building is owned by the Federal Government, and the Federal Government has approved this sale, a deposit has been put down. They are unable to complete the sale because until the organization follows through and obtains a lease
from the state, the Federal Government will not grant them the sale and complete the sale.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good afternoon, sir. Please proceed.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Yes. Just some questions for the proponent, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Go ahead, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you. So, why is DEEP involved in this transaction if Federal Government owns it, a private individual/party is going to purchase it, why is DEEP the gatekeeper to this function?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, that’s a great question. The DEEP -- the Connecticut Department of Environmental -- Energy and Environmental Protection is involved because the state has jurisdiction over the bottomlands, and so in order for the purchase to be able to go through, we have to provide as a state the ability for them to lease the bottomlands. We are not transferring sale and ownership of the bottomlands. Simply, the Federal Government is transferring ownership of the building, and so DEEP is the agency that has cognizance over that, and in addition, DEEP is involved because they need to assure that there are the proper protections in place with the lease in terms of what happens with those cremated remains.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, if I could inquire as to the expertise that DEEP would have with regard to those remains as opposed to the Department of Public Health, which deals with this issue on a regular basis?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, indeed, the Department of Public Health as I had referenced earlier is absolutely involved as is the case in other situations with other columbariums and cemeteries as well, so there is -- there will be two agencies that would be involved in the final approval of any plan moving forward for the Penfield Reef Lighthouse.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, am I to understand that presently has DEEP and/or DPH approved this or is this the gatekeeping function to that approval?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do not know what conversations have already been had by this company with DEEP or with DPH, but what I do know is, yes, we -- in order for them to move forward whatsoever and go through that approval process to submit the plan and obtain the lease, they are required to obtain this approval from us, and as I mentioned earlier, the previous attempt by another organization, which was a non-profit to gain control of the light house was unsuccessful because we were unable to provide a lease for them, so this process will be unable to move forward. The bid will be -- the sale will not go through if we’re not able to
provide the lease for them.

   Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

   Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, just it’s unclear to me our role in providing the lease. If we don’t own -- DEEP has control over the bottomlands, Federal Government owns the lighthouse, why would the state of Connecticut be in the function of providing the lease?

   Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

   Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, Madam Speaker, I would refer the good Representative to line 6 of the bill is occupancy of the submerged lands held in public trust by the state, and so that’s my understanding as to why we are in need of providing this authorization because these lands are held in
public trust, and it is through our authority that we’re able to allow that lease to move forward.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, if I am to understand that we are providing that authority is there compensation to the state for providing that authority via that lease?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. As far as I know, no.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, may I inquire -
- perhaps the good Representative doesn’t know --
but it would seem to me if we’re giving somebody the
ability to utilize a right via a document, why the
good taxpayers that had something to do with the
acquisition of the rights would not be compensated?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, thank you to
the Representative for the question. I do not know
currently if the Federal Government is paying us for
the use of the lighthouse, but I am going to guess
that they are not, but I will emphasize that that is
simply a guess. I do not know what the current
arrangement is, and I certainly can understand the
Representative’s question in terms of that, but I
would argue that this is a facility that, again, is
a navigational aid that is being used today by
boaters and folks who are out on the sound. It is
something that we would hope to keep in good repair,
both as that navigational aid, which again the Coastguard is responsible for -- that light portion of the lighthouse. The building itself in order to be able to keep that light going needs to be maintained. It is also a historic structure, so we -- I -- I view this as a win/win in terms of we have a private company that is interested in creating a trust that will allow funds that can continue to upkeep and maintain that property. Back when Sandy occurred, in -- well, in 2015, the Federal Government actually provided $1.2 million dollars to do repairs on the lighthouse, and those were post storm funds, and we had had periods of time in the past when the lighthouse was in a state of disrepair. We don’t know what kinds of funds will be available, so I certainly respect the good Representative’s question, but we’re hoping that the -- the use of those funds to keep that building in good repair and in good function to keep people safe out on the sound will be a win/win for the state and all of its residents.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I note in line 30 through - oh, 35 it states nothing in this subsection and no provision in any lease authorized pursuant to this subsection shall be construed to relieve the owner of the Penfield Reef Lighthouse from the obligation to pay all costs associated with cleanup, remediation, or reconstruction in the event the lighthouse is damaged or destroyed. If I could ask the good Representative, are we acquiring some sort of security interest bonding or something like that -- I don’t see that addressed in here -- to protect the taxpayers should this company go belly up let’s say?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):
Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the Representative for the question, which is a good one, and currently, no we are not.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, when I looked at this bill originally, I -- it sounds like a good idea, but I -- I just don’t know that the taxpayers are property protected. I look forward to -- I do look forward to the rest of the debate, but I’m a little troubled.

So, thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Case for the second time.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, a question in doing a little bit of research. So, we had a special resolution on the ballot last November.
Does this fit into that special resolution that we did on state-owned or state-leased property?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I don’t know.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Cause 18-1 requires us to have a public hearing and a number of things that happen in order for a state-owned piece of property or building to be leased out to a private entity. Has that happened?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This bill had a public hearing in the Planning and Development
Committee.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I think in the resolution the -- there’s specifics on how the public hearing is to be held because it is public dollars, and it is a public facility. I would just urge caution because then it goes into the agencies after the bill is passed, I’m concerned that we’re not falling into that resolution that every voter in the state of Connecticut had to vote on this past November.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Will members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing].
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 COOK (65TH):

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 voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7367

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel). Will the clerk
please call Calendar 475?

CLERK:

On page 63, Calendar 475, Senate Bill No. 1039, AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL INTEREST. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Government, Administration, and Elections.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):

I move acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence of the Senate.
Representative Fox, you have the floor.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, public official state employee was required to file a statement of financial interest, must identify certain assets and liabilities held by him or her, the officials or employee’s spouse or dependent children residing in the official employer’s -- or employee’s household. This bill exempts the names of dependent children residing in the filer’s household from public disclosure under the FOI Act. In order to maintain a complete and accurate disclosure, public official state employee was required to file a statement of financial interest, will continue to disclose the names of his or her spouse and any dependent children residing in his or her household. However, to increase the protection and safety of dependent children, the names of such children will not be available for public information. This bill was unanimous out of the GAE Committee, and has no fiscal impact. I move
passage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Will you remark further on the bill?

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and the good Chair of the GAE Committee has summarized the effect of the bill, and it is a good bill. Certainly, the disclosure of the information of who is living in the household is an important part of the statement of financial interest. However, the privacy of the names of the dependent children who are in that household is sacrosanct, so the -- when you look at things that are disclosed under FOI, and one of the principles is what is the public interest in that information, and certainly, we can all agree that when we’re looking at dependent children in a particular household there really is no public interest in that information, so it’s certainly appropriate, and it’s a good bill to protect that information, and I recommend the members of the
House pass that.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Will 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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

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. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:
Senate Bill No. 1039, in concurrence with the Senate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate.

(Gavel). Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I move that we suspend the rules and immediate transmit Calendar 475 to the governor’s office.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question is on suspension of the rules to immediate transmit Calendar 475 to the governor. Is there objection to suspension of the rules? Is there objection? I’m hearing none. The rules are suspended for the immediate transmittal to the governor. (Gavel).
Will the clerk please call Calendar 411?

CLERK:

Page 52, Calendar 411, House Bill No. 5817, AN ACT CONCERNING OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL CHECKERS IN POLLING PLACES. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Government, Administration, and Elections.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Good afternoon, again, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good afternoon, sir. Please proceed.

REP. FOX (148TH):

I move acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Fox, you have the floor, sir.
REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, for each election, the official checkers must verify the names of electors on the official checklist before they may receive their ballot and vote. Per Connecticut law, the elector must announce their street address and name to the official checker or checkers in a tone sufficiently loud and clear so as all election officials to hear the same. The law is silent as to whether the official poll checker has to announce the information conveyed by the voter. Many polling locations, campaigns, and candidates use unofficial checkers to report the names of those who vote to their respected political parties. This bill requires official checkers to loudly and clearly announce elector’s voter identification number after checking his or her name on the official checklist so that the unofficial checker may hear it. This bill received unanimous support of the GAE Committee and has no fiscal impact, and we move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Will you remark further on the bill?

Representative Candelora. Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and the good Chair’s accurately summarized the substance of the bill and a few questions through you for the chair?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Madam Chair -- Madam Speaker. As we walk through this, what is the role of the official checker?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The official checker is the individual who I guess checks in the elector.

Through you, Madam Speaker.
Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that, and in that role, through the elector process -- the election day process, the official checker working through the registrar is essentially working to enact or to implement the election day results and to bring voters through and in that role is effectively under the oversight of the Secretary of the State; is that true?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you. And, could you clarify we’re also talking about unofficial checkers and what is -- what is their role in the election process?

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DELTA SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Unofficial checkers are -- their roles are (inaudible - 02:48:42) are identified in 9-235 of the Connecticut General Statutes. Essentially, their role is to identify for campaigns or candidates who have selected them ahead of time, those who have voted in the election to report that information back to the campaign.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer. So, in that description as -- they -- they are not under the oversight or the process of the Secretary of the State. Who are they responsible to or how are they appointed?

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank the Representative for the question. Under Connecticut General Statute 9-235, they are appointed by the -- well, there’s a number of different manners in which they are appointed. One of which is they are appointed by the candidates via the town chairman, and they are to be their names submitted to the registrar of voters in each municipality.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that. So, the official checker is under the oversight, if you will, of the Secretary of the State. The unofficial checker is effectively a political operative, if you will, working for the campaign under the oversight of the town chairman for the respected party; is that
accurate?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, and to the Representative, I don’t think that’s entirely accurate. They’re -- they’re appointment is made by way of the town chairman. I believe technically they’re under the authority of the registrar of voters and who’s in turn, I suppose, under the authority of the Secretary of the State.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer. I -- I guess I’m a little unclear in that -- in their role in looking at the section of statute covering there doesn’t seem to be any specified rule, role, and responsibility for the unofficial checker, just a
process of how they are, so how does the unofficial checker know what their responsibility is and who they report to?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I’m just referring back to section 9-261. The -- the Representative is asking under who’s authority do the official checkers fall?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you. For clarification, it’s really how do they know what their official duties are? Who tasks them? Because under the statute, it shows how they’re appointed. It does not really state that they’re under the oversight of the Secretary of the State. It really implies if they are appointed
through the campaigns and appointed by the local town chairman it would appear that they are now under the authority of the town chairman and they report back to them. Is there any time when the unofficial checker makes a report to the Secretary of the State’s office or through the registrar?

Through you, Madam Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe the statute is silent as to whether the unofficial checkers must file a report to the registrar or the Secretary of the State.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer. They are silent, and in having this discussion about the role of the unofficial checker, who do they normally respond to
and what are they -- what is their purpose of being in the polling location on election day?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The purpose of the unofficial checker is to compile the information of the electors who have voted that day and return that information back to the campaigns.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

And, I thank you for that answer, and that’s my understanding of their role as well, which would put them in a category or of a political operator in a sense that they are working for the campaign and not representing the state or the state’s interest or the Secretary of the State. They are representing the campaign and helping that campaign in whatever
manner they were appointed through the local political authority of the town chairman.

Now, as we get to the meat of what is being here is the change is that the official checker shall upon checking the name of an elector announce such elector’s voter identification number in a tone sufficiently loud and clear. That -- that is not a current requirement for the official checker, nor is reviewing back to the Secretary of the State’s testimony is that a current responsibility. Can you elaborate? Is this an expansion and is this something the Secretary of the State is supportive of or sees as a need?

Through you, Madam -- Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe the Secretary of the State testified in the public hearing or submitted testimony that she was not either supportive or in opposition to the underlying
bill. I think she felt as though that the bill -- that she worked with the proponent on the bill, but did not indicate whether she supported it or opposed the underlying bill.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you. That’s my recollection as well, and I believe she also added that she didn’t believe the legislature was necessary, and when we get to the point of the tone sufficiently loud and clear as to enable any unofficial checkers to hear the same, which will be the voter identification number, it gets back to the what is the role under current law for the unofficial -- or for the official checker and what do they do for with their interface with the voter as they come into the polling location?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.
REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The role of the official checker is to essentially take the identification information from the elector as they come in to vote.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer. And, in that -- that specific information as I understand that you confirm is essentially their name and their address; is that accurate?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Essentially, that’s correct.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.
REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that clarification. So, the voter ID number is not something that the voter even is aware of in general, but much like any other identification information could be used by somebody to identify who the individual is, and so the question becomes with the voter ID, since it’s not used in the official checker’s role, is really just to get the name and address of the voter who is coming in to validate that they’re eligible to vote, the voter ID would seem to be privacy information. What protects the individual voter from that information being provided to the public at that point?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. The Representative is asking what protections does the voter have that the voter ID number may not be made available to the
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

That is correct, Madam Speaker.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I suppose that the information is already available to the public, and that the unofficial checker will likely have access to voter ID number, so I’m led to believe that the Representative, although I’m not certain, is more -- is possibly concern over the fact that the information is announced out loud and perhaps, therefore, exposes the voter to the -- the voter’s information to the public?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

That is correct.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

So, if the end -- if the Representative is concerned about the information being made public, I guess the protection available is the individual is there voting anyway in a public location.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

That is correct. Thank you for the answer, and that is correct, but only the people that are physically there. the general public doesn’t know who shows up at any particular time in a particular location, and the process for the general public to have access there’s remedy there. There is a
process to request for the registrar. Right now, that information is being under the proposed change, essentially yelled out for everybody in the polling place to know, so once again, how is the individual voter have remedy for that information being held private, and does the voter have a right to object to having that voter ID number called out?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The underlying bill does not propose a remedy to the voter if he or she is felt as though they have been treated wrongly through their voter ID number being announced publicly.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, and I -- I agree. I do not see any
remedy for that. Now, down to the point of sufficiently loud and clear, what is the -- who is the arbiter of what is sufficiently loud and clear? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The -- the idea of being sufficiently loud and clear is referenced in 9-261 earlier in the same bill lines 7 -- lines 7 through 8. I suppose that the arbiter is the -- so long when the voter shows up and announces their name and address to the official checker, that standard there is supposed to be sufficiently loud and clear, so then that same language is repeated later on in the bill.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

And, I thank you for that, and -- and I guess
the election officials, which are in the line that was cited by the good Chairman makes sense. Generally, the election officials are right in the vicinity of the official checker, and so I guess to the point of when we’re not adding unofficial checkers to be within hearing range of that or the voter ID number being said sufficiently loud, what is the remedy if one unofficial checker doesn’t clearly hear the voter ID, and they’re across the gym -- in some cases, that’s where people vote in towns -- and they aren’t able to hear. What is the remedy at that point?

Through you, Madam Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you to the fine Representative, typically, the unofficial checkers are located in close proximity to the official checkers, so ideally, they will be able to hear the voter information called out in a tone
sufficiently loud and clear enough.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

And, I think and that’s I guess where I’m puzzled by the need for this. If they are sufficiently close to the official checker, then I’m not certain why this legislation is needed if they are -- if there is an issue with the fact that their official checker is not calling out the voter ID number that would be one thing, but that’s not what is being proposed here. It’s stating that they are calling it out or implying I should say. They’re calling it out but not sufficiently loud, so if the official checker -- or the unofficial checker is not in close proximity due to logistics of a particular polling place, if the unofficial checker does not hear clearly the number that is called out by the official checker, what is the action at that point?

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you to the fine Representative, I suppose the first remedy would be for the moderator of that poll location would be notified.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

And, I believe that would be appropriate. The moderator is overseeing that action, but I guess more specifically if that voter has now gone on to vote and the unofficial checker has not heard the vote, is that official checker then prevented from moving on to servicing the next voter in line until that is resolved?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.
REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. The underlying bill does not address the actual process that the Representative is referring to. I think the idea behind this is that it will give some leverage to the unofficial checkers as well as the official checkers some more clarification as to their role announcing the voter identification numbers.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

And, I thank you for that, and I think that’s all the questions I have to kind of work through this, but some comments on the bill itself. The issue that I have here is we are providing an opportunity for campaigns to have unofficial checkers appointed by their local town committee to be present to help in the election process and to help voter turnout and those several things that are particular to a political campaign. The Secretary
of the State is responsible to ensure that the election is carried off in a legal and a proper manner, and the official checkers are under that responsibility through the registrars to the Secretary of the State. What I see here is an ability for an unofficial checker whether it be for any reason to interrupt that process where they have no real authority to interrupt the election process, and I have very strong concerns that we’re dealing with an issue that happened in a very narrow number of polling locations that really should be resolved locally and that are statutes shouldn’t be changed to fix what really is a local issue in one particular town. That ought to be something that the registrars and the people that come in to vote they can all work this out together, and I have some serious concern that in the extreme since there is no remedy specified in the statute that we could end up with a particular polling location being locked down because an unofficial checker and an official checker can’t come to an agreement on what is
officially loud and clear; thereby causing delay, causing interruption to the voting process, and really creating it and making it cumbersome for the voters, and I think that is where I think this while well-intended trying to resolve an issue, I think is inappropriate to be mandating and legislating this in the statute, and that we ought to be working together at the local level to deal with these narrow issues that are not broadly -- not broadly occurring. The Secretary of the State indicated in her testimony that she had no reports of any issues that dealt with this particular issue, so that is why I think she was neutral and felt the legislation was unnecessary. For all those reasons, I would encourage my colleagues to vote against this bill. I think it is an issue that is a local narrow issue that ought to be resolved there and not be in the book of statutes.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Miller.
REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Madam -- Madam Speaker. Sorry, I was going to say Madam Chair. Through you, Madam Chair, I have questions to the proponent of the bill, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox. Please prepare yourself. Representative Miller, he is ready.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker. The purpose of the checkers are to do what -- the official checkers?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The purpose of the official checkers is to check the names of each elector who enters the polling place to vote.

Through you, Madam Speaker.
Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

And, the purpose of the unofficial checkers is to do what?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

To you Madam Speaker, through you, the purpose of the unofficial checkers is to allow the candidates to track and record who has and who has not yet voted.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. If the unofficial checker cannot hear the identification, whatever -- whether it’s a name or the number, will they be able to fulfil their responsibility to track the voter -- the elector?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. No.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Do campaigns use the unofficial checkers as a get-out-to-vote activity?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. They do and I do as well.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Miller.
REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Do you know how that information is transferred back to the campaign?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Typically, the unofficial checker bring -- carries the information back to the campaign either by in person or over the phone.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Do you know what the campaign does with that information?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.
REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes, in my campaign, what we do is we check off the individuals who have voted, and if you see an individual who have not yet voted, you got to call them or contact them somehow to encourage them to get out to vote.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Do you know who’s in charge of all the activities that occur during -- in the polling place, namely if there’s a violation of any law like if a campaign walks in, a candidate walks in with a t-shirt advertising who they are?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Typically, the moderator of that polling location is the first in
charge.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

I’m sorry, Madam Speaker. I didn’t hear his answer.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Typically, the moderator of the campaign of the polling location is in charge.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

So, through you, Madam Speaker, this bill was to make law, if there are violators, do you know how that would be handled?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. My understanding is the first person to be notified would be the moderator of that polling location.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. So, do you know what happens when the moderator finds a violation and reports it to the registrar’s office?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Typically, the registrar attempts to address the matter on their own.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. How would that be any different than if this bill became law and there are violators?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I don’t see there being any difference.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank the proponent for his answers, and I just have a comment. So, as a candidate, the -- it’s important to get it -- to have activities to get out to vote, and there are some areas where voting is very difficult. Difficult in the sense that people
need to be reminded to vote a little more often than maybe in other areas, and I know for me as a candidate the way I run things is there is an unofficial checker that I employ as a candidate. That candidate -- I also employ a towel runner who then picks up the information and brings it back to the campaign. What I experienced this year was I had unofficial checkers sitting there for four hours, not recording any information, and I lost -- as a candidate, lost four hours of tally information. I reported it to the registrar several times, and it was not -- the problem was not resolved until noon, and so what that did was it prevented four hours of us as a candidate, our campaign, getting voters out to vote, and this is a state where we emphasize the importance of getting the votes out. Excuse me. We -- to me, not being able to do this is a way of suppressing the vote, and so -- and I know that I see that my representative, my colleague is looking at me like I’m crazy, but for me, it’s very important -- it’s
very important to get that out because there are some people that are marginalized and they don’t -- they really do need help to get out to vote. I even -- the Public Housing -- I want to thank all of my colleagues for voting -- the Public Housing legislation that we made that we voted out of here and is now until law because those families don’t get out to vote, and so we need to give them as much help as they need to make the process easier for them. And, so I’m asking my colleagues to vote for this piece of legislation because it will encourage more of our families or voters to vote, so I thank you very much to the proponent of the bill for answering my questions.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Madam Speaker, so I rise with a few questions for the proponent of the bill, through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you. So, in all respect to the former Representative who was speaking and some of the conversation that has already happened, I to have had much experience using unofficial checkers, and I think that’s the whole point. They are unofficial checkers. So, right now, within the voting process, it is something that candidates may choose or not choose to do; is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, and to the fine former ranking member of the GAE Committee, the answer is yes.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Devlin.
Thank you, Madam Speaker. And so, through you, they are not formally part of the voting process; is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

Representative Fox.

Through you, Madam Speaker. That is correct.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

Representative Devlin.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, so my experience has been that unofficial checkers are allowed when those names have been submitted within a certain period of time to be within the voting polling location; however, they are -- they sit behind the official checkers, and they are in no way to interfere with the process of voting.

Through you, Madam Speaker, is that a correct
scenario?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, and so also through you, Madam Speaker, you know it’s somewhat regrettably or not the luck of the draw that if you can hear the voter who comes in that states their name and address that then you’re able to mark that off. It is in no way the obligation of the -- of the official checker to relay that information; is that true?

Madam Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Under current law, through you, yes, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

So, I understand the frustration that sometimes our unofficial checkers don’t get all the information, and they try to lean and listen, you know, but they can’t interfere with the overall process to slow the lines down or make it anymore challenging for the official checkers and to keep those voting lines moving, especially in those early morning hours when it’s crunch time, and you’ve got a lot of people moving. So, I guess I would just state that, you know, as candidates we try to do everything we can to advantage ourselves in getting the vote out. It’s not -- I don’t see it as a voter suppression that I’m not calling the people who, you know, that we try to contact those people who haven’t been out and get them out as much as possible in addition to multiple other things that we do for voter outreach and wouldn’t support at this point trying to formalize something that is a
specific campaign event as opposed to the process of voting, which I think is very important.

So, through you, Madam Speaker, I’d like to thank the good Chair of GAE, and I appreciate the opportunity to share my views. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Carney.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Just a few questions, through you, to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Okay, so to the good Chair of the GAE Committee, I was just wondering what do the -- I did see a registrar of voters did testify on the bill, and I was just curious whether she supported or opposed the legislation?

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe the registrar of voters were in opposition to the bill in a sense that -- but they also -- they also advocated for a further expansion of electronic voting pollbooks being used in addition.

So, through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Carney.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you very much, and I -- I appreciate the good proponent of the bill bringing up electronic pollbooks because I think as we’re moving further into the future a lot of towns are taking advantage of that, and I think that’s certainly a very good solution to this problem if -- if municipalities, especially where there could be potential issues if they look into using electronic pollbooks. Two of my four communities do, and it’s made unofficial
checking ten times easier.

Just another question though. Who would be responsible -- I guess if there is a complaint who would be responsible and would that person be penalized? If so, what would that penalty be?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I’ll take the question in two parts. The first, who is responsible? I supposed as we indicated the moderator would be the first party to be notified, through the registrar. The second question, and I believe the Representative wants to know the -- the punishment? Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Carney.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Yes. Any penalty.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The actual online bill does not speak to consequence for noncompliance. However, Connecticut General Statute 9355 states that any election official upon who any duties impose by part 1 of Chapter 147, willfully omits or neglects to perform any such duty or does not -- does any act prohibited there in for which punishment is not otherwise provided shall be guilty of a Class E felony. So, the punishment if -- if -- if an official checker willfully and neglects to perform such duty, the penalty would be criminal in nature.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Carney.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

I appreciate that response. Now, what if an
official checker for -- for a health reason or really any reason is unable to speak loud enough for the unofficial checker to hear them?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, I suppose on a hypothetical that if this law is to pass and this said proposal is passed by law, the unofficial checker will be required to be able to speak in a volume sufficient for an unofficial checker to hear.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Carney.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Okay. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the good proponent. I guess I do have concerns with that piece of the bill and through the good proponent’s explanation. You know, it is very
difficult to find folks. I mean it’s certainly difficult from a campaign point of view to find unofficial checkers, but it is also difficult to find official checkers on election day. It is a long day, and -- and you certainly have to find folks who may not have to work, but you could run into problems though with folks who for a medical reason or for another reason cannot speak loud enough for certain unofficial checkers to be able to hear them, so I think we’re running into some issues with this legislation. I would say that I agree with my good ranking member on the committee. I don’t think that legislation is necessary for this. I think we’re actually creating additional issues with this legislation like the one’s I addressed, and there are alternatives. There are electronic pollbooks, and one of the things my district did is -- is the official checkers actually wrote the numbers down on a sticky note, handed it back to the unofficial checker, the unofficial checker had a binder that my campaign put together. They crossed
off the voters who voted, and every two hours, that went to my campaign headquarters, and we were able to -- to do it that way. We were not reliant on official checkers announcing the numbers, so I would say to anyone who does have concerns, this can be worked out within your municipality through various ways. I don’t think this is the correct way to do it, so I will be opposing this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Will 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 make sure your vote’s been properly cast. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, the clerk will take a tally. The clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 5817

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel). Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Rose of the 118th, madam, you have the floor.

REP. ROSE (118TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of an introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Please proceed, madam.

REP. ROSE (118TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All of you see a group of young men and women standing before us. I am pleased to introduce you to the class of 2019-2020, our intern class. [Applause]. Mr. Speaker, I believe these young men and women up here learned one of the first lessons hurry up and wait. They’ve been out in the hallway for about 20 minutes waiting for us. Thank you for your patience. I’m standing here with a familiar face, someone who is my friend, my co-chair in this bipartisan committee, Senator Eric Berthel. I think you need -- [Applause] -- there you go. [Laughing]. And, we are very, very excited today to announce that we are officially kicking off our 50th anniversary of the Intern Committee. This was founded in 1969. [Applause]. A quick recognition -- Lisa Roy who is -- we couldn’t run this committee without her direction, works tirelessly to make sure that we all have a great experience with this program. These folks are
coming in here, putting in endless hours, they’re doing classwork. At one time, this program was considered an easy “A” as they say. No so much anymore. These folks have been working very hard with all of us this year. We had 63 -- was it 63? Sixty-three legislators who participated in our program this year -- 53 House members and 10 in the Senate, and I just would like to say thank you so very, very much for all that you’ve done for us. We hope that you’ve learned a lot of things. We hope to see you back. Some of you we might see you back in our seats. Once again, congratulations and thank you. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative.

Representative Buckbee of the 67th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It’s good to see you back up there, sir.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you, sir.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

Just to echo as ranking member of the Internship Committee, this is an incredible group of students. They really deserve every bit of accolade that they’ve received, and it’s been a blast to work with them. They are in intelligent group of students, and if anyone has any question about where their future is, there’s zero question with this group of students who are here. Absolutely, an outstanding year for so many that we have the chance to work with, but I think it’s also very important if you would all turn around and face that way and give some applause to those people who are upstairs looking for you, and applaud them for doing a great job getting you here as well. [Applause]. The parents, grandparents, families who are upstairs who are enjoying this day are extraordinarily proud and just as proud as we are of you and your work you’ve done in the House, and a great job I have to say by the legislators themselves who had interns and took
the time to work with your interns and to share this process with them. It’s a pretty special thing to be able to have on our side and a super special thing for you guys as well, and I do hope we see you in some of these seats at some point down the road.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further? Representative Vail of the 52nd, sir, you have the floor.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and just a quick remark if I could? I just want to give a shout out to my intern, Jordan Betts. [Applaud]. Jordan, in -- in the 50 years of the intern, I can’t say this with absolute certainty, but he’s probably the first intern that’s more well-known than the representative he works for, so thank you, Jordan. I appreciate all the work you did for me, buddy. Thanks. [Applause]. Representative Reyes of the 75th, sir, you have the floor.
REP. REYES (75TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support and honor of my great intern, Mr. Michael Anderson, from East Haven, and the young gentleman has come to me full of thirst and knowledge for everything that goes on in government, and it’s already been pointed out here earlier by some of my colleagues -- the future is absolutely very bright for the state of Connecticut, and it’s like the -- through the -- through the opportunities like given to these folks right now that the -- the state can grow, and I wanted to let Michael know that -- to keep his eyes on the bills we’ve been working on because we say we’re going to get those across the goal line, and with your help, sir, we will. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative.

[Applause]. Representative Sredzinski of the 112th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m joined by the Representative of the 70th District to congratulate our intern, Mr. Jeremy Karu [phonetic] who is a New Jersey born and raised student at the University of Connecticut with a GPA of 3.7, majoring in political science and communication as a double major. He is president of his fraternity, and his future plans -- first of all, he’s a former Eagle Scout for those of you that have been to those events. Proud of your Eagle Scout achievements, fraternity president at UCONN, and also planning on going into the Navy, and then into the political spectrum. On behalf of Representative Rebimbas and myself, thank you very much for your service this session. We greatly appreciate it and look forward to bright things in your future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative McGee of the 5th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand to acknowledge my intern, Alexis Keith. Wave your hand Alexis so everybody can see. All right. [Applause]. And, I just really appreciate all of the work that you’ve done throughout this session in helping the black and Puerto Rican caucus, and really going above and beyond. I appreciate you. I look forward to hearing and seeing all the great things that you will accomplish. Thank you so much. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Linehan from the 103rd, madam, you have the floor.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege to thank my intern, Michael Rider, who has been absolutely amazing. I want to thank you, sir, for all of your hard work. You have come in here happy, ready to work at all times even though the Children’s Committee can be a bit crazy. We appreciate you and appreciate your time, but most of all, something I think that’s
really, really exciting is that tomorrow you will be here, and you will let everyone in this room see just how hard you worked for our manufacturer’s fair tomorrow -- our Student Manufacturer Connection Fair. You did an incredible amount of work, and this fair has now tripled in size. It’s probably the best one we’re ever gonna do, and you had such a great hand in that -- the robots and all, so I want to say thank you so much. And, Mr. Chair, when -- or Mr. Speaker, when you come down and you take a look at that fair tomorrow, just know that Michael Rider had so much to do with that, and we’re so grateful for your work, and we can’t wait to have you come back. Thank you so very much. Good work. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative.

Representative Johnson of the 49th District.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I for point of personal privilege would like to recognize my
intern, Porter Brazal [phonetic] who has been working very hard here, and I want to thank him very much for the work that he’s done. Yes, wave your hand Porter. You’ve been out there. He’s been out asking people to co-sponsor legislation we’ve been working on. He’s been working on constituent issues, and he’s also thinking about going to become a history teacher when he finishes college, so thank you so much for your great work. It was wonderful to have you here as a student intern. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative. [Applause]. Representative Turco of the 27th District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. TURCO (27TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to quickly thank my intern, Sarah Keen [phonetic] from Wolcott. Sarah’s a senior from St. Joseph’s College. She’s going to be graduating in only a couple more weeks. Sarah, you did an amazing job
for me and my office and for the town of Newington. We thank you and wish the best in your future success. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative. Representative Borer of the 115th, madam, you now have the floor.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, of course, want to rise and recognize my intern, Melissa Amato [phonetic]. Melissa is a little older than the rest of the interns, but that’s because throughout Melissa’s life she was impacted and faced with friends and family who have had challenges in mental health and substance abuse, and she decided she was going to go back to school and do something about it, so I’m very proud that she took on that challenge, and we really appreciate all the work that you’re gonna do in the future for all the residents of Connecticut, so thank you. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, Representative.

Representative Rose of the 118th, for the second time.

REP. ROSE (118TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege. I just want to quickly say I couldn’t have done this session without you, Jean. This girl has been my right hand, and you know we all have wonderful staff, but we are crazy busy up here, and Jean has held my office together with my constituents. She has texted me at 11 o’clock at night over a weekend to tell me I don’t really have to be here on a Monday for an appointment when I thought I had to be. She’s always thought ahead, and I hope to see you up here again with a staffer’s badge -- just saying. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Representative Hilda Santiago of the 84th District, madam, you have the floor.

REP. SANTIAGO (84TH):
Thank you -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say thanks to my intern, Rosa Motose [phonetic] who has -- this is the first time that I had ever signed up to have an intern, and she has been wonderful, a great help to my aide, and also to myself. She is planning to become a lawyer. She also worked and graduated from the Latino Leadership Academy, and that was a lot of fun, and so I wish you the best and thank you. And, I also want to give a shout out to Michael Rider cause he is from Meriden, and he is on the democratic town committee, so he has been very involved in our town committee, and without him, I wouldn’t have gotten a lot of door knocking in my district, so he was -- I’m very grateful to you too, and thank you. And, I think that this is the group that I’ve seen the most diversity in a long time and having people that speak Spanish and women and young men has been very helpful, and I also want to say, gracias por todo lo que has hecho (thank you for everything that you’ve done), and good luck in the future. [Applause].
Thank you very much, Representative.

Representative Robyn Porter of the 94th District, madam, you have the floor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise as a personal point of privilege to say thank you to my wonderful intern, Paige Sorensen. You want to wave? There you go. Yeah. She’s a superstar. She came in, she did the work, and then she did more work. There was never enough work for her to do, so I just want to thank you for your due diligence and how you came in. You really are an overachiever but in my book, that’s a good thing, so keep doing what you’re doing, and I wish you all the best in your future endeavors, and I hope to see you back in the building doing something. Whatever it is you dream of doing, may that dream come true, and I want to say thank you to each and every one of the interns cause there’s quite a few of you that didn’t intern for me, but you know, you got a special spot, so
thank you for all that you’ve been doing for the colleagues that I work here with, and just keep it -- just keep doing what you’re doing. Stay focused and understand that you’re here for a reason. Make good use of this time, and continue to network, and make the connections necessary to ensure that your futures are as bright as they can be. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. The Chamber’s electrician, Representative Ackert of the 8th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and because the mics weren’t working the other day had nothing to do with me -- just saying. [Laughter]. But, for a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. It’s what a great group of people we’ve had, and I’ve got to say that my office became the best used that I’ve ever had since I’ve been in it by Jeremiah Langer, so Jeremiah, a little shout out to you. Thank you for
being here and helping out, and thank you to all the interns. You’re such an asset to this Chamber, so thank you. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative. Representative Michelle Cook of the 65th District. I thought you were just up here with me, but you move quick. You have the floor, madam.

REP. COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot have a conversation about this from there, so thank you for giving me the opportunity. I just wanted to stand and rise and first thank all of the interns because if it wasn’t for you the things that we are able to do here would not happen. We do have great staff, but the interns really do make us work in a totally different way, and you all put immense amount of work and dedication into the process, so thank you for volunteering and being here each and every week, but I want to give a special shout out to my intern, Madelyn -- Madelyn Ferro [phonetic], and her mom is
in the -- up in the gallery, and it’s really cool to see parents come in and watch their -- watch their children grow to young adults and to the achievements that they make, but Maddie has been an amazing asset to not only my office, to my legislative aide, but one of the coolest things that we do here is when they do the mock caucuses and the mock sessions, and on April 2, I got a text from Maddie, and it said, I won the mock democratic caucus nomination for speaker, and I would say in every year I’ve been in office I’ve had an intern. It is an incredible opportunity for myself because I feel that we learn so much from our interns, but I would have to say that this year, Maddie, I have learned so much from you and the dedication and your -- your willingness to try to figure out things that we didn’t understand, and the continuously digging deep into what’s next to try to get the answers so we can help not only each other but the constituents that we serve, and so Mr. Speaker, from my -- from my speaker as an intern to our speaker, I just want
to say thank you for giving me this opportunity and let you know that I have a great speaker in my legislative aide -- intern.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Very nice, Representative. [Applause].

Representative France of the 42nd District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege to recognize two interns that we had this session. First is Chip Crowley [phonetic] who is the fourth intern from the Coastguard Academy. After many years of the academy not providing a legislative intern, restarted that program about four years ago, and Chip is the fourth intern we’ve had up here, and one of the things I do with each of them is to sit down and ask what their interests are, and Chip had an interest in Environmental Policy, and we were able to interface with both Scott Bates for the Port Authority as well as a local project in the Southeast Connecticut area
that has had some challenges, and he’s been working at putting his expertise and his interest to work, and his -- his support of my office and the local issues down there has been tremendous, and thank you for all the work you’ve done, Chip, and he’s joined tonight -- today by his father who flew out from California to be witness to this great event, so welcome, sir, to this event. And, secondly, Tim Anop [phonetic] who is a student at University of New Haven and was assigned and did great work for the conservative caucus and also provided interface for the legislature down to the group of students down at the University of New Haven and provided an outreach opportunity so that we can have a conversation about the issues of the day, and really about how -- how to be engaged as young people who want to be, and it was a great opportunity, and I thank Tim for all his work, as well as supporting the caucus and as well as the opportunity to engage with his fellow students down at the University of New Haven. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause].
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. The dean of the House, Representative Mushinsky of the 85th District, you have the floor, madam.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank all the interns for giving their time and energy, and keeping us on track and helping us track our bills, bring out witnesses up, help prepare testimony, and all the things you’ve been doing, and especially thank my own intern, Winnie Wang [phonetic] who comes all the way from China. She’s here with her -- you can put your hand up. You can wave too. There she is, and she’s a student at UCONN, and is learning all about the U.S. while she’s a student here. I know she will do great things whether here or wherever she decides to live. A very astute intern, and so hardworking that she has asked to extend her pass beyond her internship date, so that she can continue to come in here on off days and help move legislation, so that’s really
a wonderful thing. It shows great interest, and we are so lucky to have you here studying at UCONN. Thank you, Winnie, and thank you to all the interns for helping us do our job. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative.

Representative Bob Godfrey of the 110th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate it. What a great job all of you have done this year. This place could not really function through the course of a session without the interest and the help that you have provided to not only your individual legislators but to all of us as an incredible amount of work that you do that keeps the wheels of the House and the Senate turning. I want to single out my intern, Andrew Mianos [phonetic], the young man standing down at this end of the group. He comes from Rocky Hill. He’s a student at UCONN. He’s -- he came to me highly recommended because he had done
work with the -- our Secretary of the State, Denise Merrill, last summer and fall. They were very enthusiastic about him, and now after all these weeks, I know why they were enthusiastic about it. He’s a great researcher. He can write, and folks, that’s a really important skill to be able to have if you want to succeed in whatever you decide to do. He’s really good with constituents. He’s -- he’s a full-time intern, so he’s really become fully integrated in the functioning of not only my office, but with helping out with a number of other legislators. He’s already involved in politics back in Rocky Hill. He’s one of those young turks. Keep an eye out for him. I think we’re going to see him again. You can run anywhere you want, just not again me. Okay? Is that all right? [Laughter].

But, I also want to thank Lisa Roy. What an incredible job you’ve done again this year. I know it’s a labor of love, and -- and you -- you come in, in the morning, eager to go to work, eager to interact, especially cause I’ve helped a little bit,
but the recruiting is always a challenge going out and talking to the various colleges and universities across the state, both public and private, to help recruit students to come up here and -- and help us out, so thank you very much for another very successful year. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an introduction, I rise to thank my intern, Matt Long, who did excellent work in my office this year. Mr. Speaker, I first met Matt when I -- shortly after I became the chair of the Higher Education Committee. I was doing stakeholder meetings with student activists from around the state, and -- and Matt and a couple of other activists came into my -- one of those meetings and made a very distinct impression. He is -- he is no shrinking violet. He -- he offers his opinions
freely, and -- and he makes a memorable impression. When he walked into my office this year and introduced himself as my intern, I expected no less from him than to continue that tradition of speaking his mind, and certainly, he does that. He is also an elected official. He is on the Board of Assessment Appeals in his hometown. I am sure that he will have a bright political future in front of him as long as he continues to maintain his principles, which I’m sure he will do and to speak his mind as he has done so often in my office this year. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Matt Long, for the work that you’ve conducted in my office this year. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Winkler of the 56th District, sir, you have the floor. No. Representative Doucette of the 13th District, you have the floor.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege. I’d like to take a moment to
recognize Ms. Morgan Russell from Eastern Connecticut State University. I’ve had the opportunity to have her assisting me for the last few weeks, but most importantly, she began the session as the intern for the late Representative Ezequiel Santiago, and I know Zeque was very proud of the -- of the work that she did and was very proud to have the opportunity to work with her, work very closely with her. I just checked back -- on March 7, which was really our busy time at the end of the Banks Committee, right before our deadline, we have a number of meetings and a very busy time, Representative Santiago posted a photo of himself with Morgan and Cassandra, his aide, and the Banks clerk, and titled it his “Dream Team”, so he was very proud to have the opportunity to work with -- with Morgan, and I just wanted to acknowledge that for the Chamber and thank her. Thank you.

[Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Thank you very much, sir. Representative
Arconti of the 109th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise for point of introduction and first thank all the interns for their great work that they did for both sides of the aisle this year. It wasn’t too long ago -- well, a little longer ago -- that I was in your shoes. I served in the internship program in 2011, and actually found myself running for the seat I now have the following year, so maybe we’ll see some of you back here next go around, but I wanted to thank my intern, Brook, for all the amazing work she did for the Energy and Technology Committee this year. She did a ton of research for the committee, and it’s not an easy committee to do research for, very technical -- technical subject matter, and I believe her next venture will take her over to DEEP, so good luck on that, and I’m sure we’ll all be seeing you again shortly. [Applause]. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, sir. Representative Sanchez of the 25th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for purpose of an introduction. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the interns for the outstanding work they’ve done this year, and Lisa Roy, again, great job, but most of all, I want to thank my intern who helped us tremendously in the Education Committee, which his Tony Perez Sova [phonetic]. Tony, thank you so much. I know at times I had you do some research, and the research really helped me with some bills, so thank you for that, and Lucy [phonetic] also wants to extend her thanks for all the help that you did with her too in the Education Committee on many of the bills that we, of course, are going to bring out soon in the House, so thank you. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Dathan of the 142nd, you have the floor, madam.
REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to get up and thank all of the interns, but particularly, Marina, who was so sweet and had such a great attitude, and I can see you going really, really far, and thank you for all your support that you’ve given me for the last several months. Good luck to everyone, and thank you for all your work and all you do. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Representative Rochelle of the 104th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ROCHELLE (104TH):

Thank you very much. I just want to rise to thank all of the interns for their hard work this semester, and I particularly want to thank Katie Embrosio [phonetic], my intern. She consistently impressed me with her organizational skills, effective communicating, the research that you did. You went above and beyond at all turns, and it was so wonderful to work with you, and I look forward to
seeing where you go in life. You’re gonna do great.
Thank you. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Delnicki of the 14th District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. -- thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I rise to recognize Brian Martin who was a big help with the crumbling foundation issue and did some analysis for me, and helped out a number of other members of the caucus, and was always there and always available, and willing to jump in at any time. Thank you for your help, and thank you to all the other interns. I’m kind of jealous. I wish I had this opportunity when I was your age, which was quite a few years ago. Thank you. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I figured I pause so you’d look up to see who’s next, but you’re gonna have to look back this way. The only one left is me. On behalf of the entire Chamber, I really do want to thank you for your
efforts. It’s a golden opportunity. Many of us who serve in this Chamber as elected officials came up here for other reasons, and then we decided to get involved in the political process, and more importantly, become a public servant, so I wish you all the best in your future endeavors. I thank you for your service to this Chamber, and hopefully, we’ll see some of you back as state reps in the future or staff or some other function. The state is a great state, and working together, we can make it even better, so thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, if we can give them another round of applause, I’d greatly appreciate it. [Applause]. And, as is tradition, you’ll be making your way down to the first floor where you’ll be doing your photos, so thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Will the Chamber come back to order and will the clerk please call Calendar No. 342?

CLERK:

On page 43, House Calendar 342, House Bill No.
7282, AN ACT CONCERNING NEWBORN SCREENING FOR SPINAL MUSCULAR ATROPHY. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Public Health.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, so good to see you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Nice to see you as well. Please proceed, sir.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

I move for acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Steinberg, you have the floor, sir.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a very simple bill but a very important one. This would require that among other newborn screenings that we
also test for something called spinal muscular atrophy. It’s an extremely rare disease. It only applies to about 10-12,000 babies in a year. That’s roughly 1 in 10,000 babies, but the impact can be devastating on a family. The more severe form of the disease is disabling and extreme, but there is good news. If we screen early, there is -- there are therapies that can lead to a much better outcome, so by requiring this, and there are roughly maybe 36,000 babies a year that would require this screening, we can hopefully prevent the more extreme situation for virtually all of the babies that might come down with this disease. I move for passage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill? Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I concur with my good chairman. This is a very straightforward bill, perhaps the most powerful testimony received this year in the Public Health Committee from a young
woman who suffers from spinal muscular atrophy. I would note from my colleagues that with 36,000 live births a year in Connecticut at a cost -- increasing the cost for the test by 13 cents a test will make this a wash because it will only cost about $5000 dollars per year. I urge my colleagues. I think it’s a very good bill, a very good public health idear, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Will 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 COOK (65TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill 7282

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel). Our esteemed Majority Leader, Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I could have everybody’s attention for a very important announcement about something we’re going to do tomorrow, I’d appreciate it if the Chamber could be as quiet as we can be. just one second everybody.
Yep, thank you. Tomorrow at noon, we will be having our memorial service for former State Representative and all of our very good friends, Ezequiel Santiago. It’s gonna start tomorrow at noon, so we’re gonna start with our normal — with our prayer and Pledge of Allegiance. We will go right into the memorial, so if members could try to be here on time. Obviously, be in their seats. His family is going to be here as well. It will be a chance for all of us to — to listen to each other about what is one of the most difficult things a lot of us have had to deal with serving with somebody, obviously, and he was a great man, so a chance to honor his legacy and his family at the same time. So, we will see everybody here. We have a few more bills to do here today, but we’ll see everybody here tomorrow at noon. Okay.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Carney.
REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to say I know we recognized many of the interns before, but I failed to recognize my wonderful intern, Kelly, and she’s actually the intern for Representative Cummings and Representative Betts. She’s done a great job this session. She is a junior at Quinnipiac University. She’s studying Political Science and Public Relations, so she’s going to be a pretty big deal someday down in Washington, and she actually used some of her political skills to get elected this year to be vice-president of her class next year, so I just would like the Chamber to recognize our wonderful intern this year, Kelly. [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Congratulations. Representative Borer.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Can you hear me? Oh. [Laughing]. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I apologize I missed that last vote. I was in an important ethics training. I would like
to be confirmed in the affirmative -- Calendar No. 342, Public Health bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Coming back to order. Will the clerk please call Calendar 207?

CLERK:

On page 64, House Calendar 207, House Bill No. 7261, AN ACT PROHIBITING REQUIREMENTS FOR PRESCRIBING CLINICALLY INAPPROPRIATE QUANTITIES OF OUTPATIENT PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Public Health.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good afternoon, sir. Please proceed.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

I move acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill.
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, Madam Speaker, and I rise today in support of House Bill 7261, whose simple premise is that we want to make sure that doctors are making decisions with regard to psychotropic drugs and not insurance companies or what are known as pharmacy benefit manages or PBMs, which are sort of like the middlemen between drug companies and insurers. We want to make sure that if a doctor does not believe that a patient of theirs should be getting a 90-day prescription for a psychotropic drug to treat their behavioral illnesses, that the doctor should make the final call on that and not the insurance company, and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill? Representative Pavalock—
D’Amato.

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

Thank you, Ms. Speaker. A few questions for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, madam.

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

Thank you. To the Representative, under this bill, I think concept wise it came out of committee unanimous, if I recall, but I have a few questions in regards to the fiscal note. As far as the increase for a 30 to 90-day supply, what would the fiscal impact be for this bill?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, the fiscal note that is in this bill today from OFA has been disputed by the comptroller’s office and just a few moments ago both myself and Representative Pavalock
got a letter from the comptroller clarifying what he believes to be an inconsistently within the fiscal note, and the primary basis of his belief in this is that on July 1 of this year, the comptroller’s office will enter into a new pharmacy benefit manager contract that has been negotiated with the comptroller’s office for the last few months. It’s a historic contract that we can talk about at a different time, but specifically, for our purposes today, the important thing to note is that this practice that’s in this bill, 7261, will be the new benefit of -- or the new existing contract as part of the PBM, so this will not result in a fiscal note going forward because his will already be part of the new PBM contract. It will certainly have an impact, in my opinion, in the positive when it comes to regular consumers that have individual and groups plans, but in the purposes of fiscal note, it will not have a fiscal note according to the comptroller’s office and the letter that I just received from the comptroller.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

And, when would that -- when that new plan go into effect?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. July 1, 2019.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

Has that contract been executed yet?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. The contract has not been executed or announced publicly, but there -
- it is my understanding from the comptroller that there has been a contract that has been solidified, but that has not been executed yet.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

What type of drugs will this apply to?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. It applies to psychotropic drugs only.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

And, do we know the percentage of this type of drug -- what percentage this type of drug makes up in our state employee health plan?

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I don’t have the exact percentage of what psychotropic drugs represented from the state employee health plan or that they do on the individual market or group market, but it is not a majority of the drugs that are prescribed on either of those plans.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

I do have some concerns, although I do appreciate and support the concept of the bill. We did receive the fiscal note, which discusses that or states that 64 percent of all prescriptions with our state employee plan are filled as a 90-day supply, and that the per-cost -- per-day-cost of a 30-day supply generic would go from -- 30-day supply would be 54 cents and 90-day supply $1.11, and it was an
104 percent increase. Now, I do understand that what you’re saying now is that the new plan that the comptroller’s entering into there would not be that increase. Now, considering if it’s still being negotiated, I’m a little concerned as to seeing that actually with -- as an attorney, of course, I like to see things in writing and know that there will not be an increase. Of course, I do understand that OFA is required to provide their analysis based on current -- the current situation, and I do understand that they cannot give us exact dollar figures considering it is -- it does depend on how much -- how many of these prescriptions are requested and filled. However, I do have some hesitation as to knowing exactly what the dollar amount would be. I don’t think it’s clear in this fiscal note. I -- I am not fully clear as to what it would be in -- in the new plan that the comptroller would be signing. I do, though -- I do, though, support the bill as a concept overall. I think it has been an issue. I know I’ve heard from
constituents they feel like they’ve been being forced to take a 90-day prescription against the advice or what their doctor is requesting that they fill, so I do think it’s important. Again, I -- I also appreciate that it is narrow to outpatient psychotropic drugs. However, if there -- is there any other -- is there any other information that the comptroller has provided as to if this overall would be any type of savings for the state maybe in the long run or with various issues that current patients may have?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, and that’s a great question. I’m glad that the -- my good friend, the ranking member, brought that up. So, the goal of this is also to try to save money, and that is because the comptroller was sort of anecdotally telling us and folks that were coming to us from the
psychological and psychiatric community were talking to us about the fact that a lot of times these folk don’t necessarily need these drugs or they don’t work out well. A patient goes on one of these psychotropic drugs. They get back to see their doctor in a short time. They realize that’s not working. They go back to the drawing board. What we were really worried about and what our friends from the psychological community talked about was they don’t want people who have behavioral health issues to be just given a prescription for very powerful drugs for 90 days and then nobody sees them. They could be working. They could not be working. Specifically, though, about savings, in the comptroller’s letter to us, he said that in a recent analysis -- I quote, “In a recent analysis performed by the comptroller’s office, it was found that approximately one-third of all first-time 90-day supplies were never refilled resulting in significant costs around $5-million dollars annually to the plan net of the additional discount
associated with a 90-day supply, so $5-million dollars of lost state money because of these unfilled prescriptions. That, again, is just on the state employee plan. That’s not on the partnership plan. That’s not on the individual group market, but $5-million dollars is a good chunk of change as far as I’m concerned, and I think that one of the intentions of this law is to try to save the taxpayers money but not overprescribing drugs that don’t actually have any value or they were not the clinically asked for amount by a physician.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

And, I -- this is probably may take your best guess, but why would those prescriptions not be refilled?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Scanlon.
REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, my best guess would be sort of what we were talking about a moment ago, which is that in my experience -- I have a Political Science degree, not a real science degree, but medicine is about trial and error, and sometimes a clinician, at least in my personal experience with my own family, they may try a drug, your body may react poorly to that drug or it may give you an adverse side effect that you don’t want. You go back to your doctor and you say, hey doc, it’s not working out for me. Can I get a different drug? If you’re just going off 90-day supply, sometimes that prescription has been or it’s already out there in the world and you can’t take that back. This would hopefully help us not have that happen, so if the doctor said, you know, Sean, I think that the 30-day supply is more appropriate, that is a decision that my doctor is making on behalf of me. An insurance coming into that and saying, no, we will only give you a 90-day supply is not -- is not based on anything medical.
It’s only based on money, and that is not an outcome that I think we want for our constituents, and that’s the motivation for this bill.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

And, I see that under the municipalities and the municipal impact. Do we know or was there any testimony as to what the potential fiscal impact would be on municipalities?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Again, according to the comptroller’s office, who we spoke to earlier this afternoon, they said it would be minimal, and it is also offset by the fact that many 90-day scripts are not filled -- refilled rather, resulting in wasted unnecessary costs.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

As my final statement, I -- I strongly agree with my colleague that a lot of times the insurance companies are the ones who are making these decisions as to what financially and fiscally is going to save them money or -- or more efficient for them. Taking power away from the doctors and what they think is best for their patient, they have an obligation to protect and to -- an oath to protect the -- the health of their patients, and I think a lot of times with the way prescriptions are handled that it doesn’t take the health of their patients into the best decision of their health into account, and so with that, I will be supporting this bill. Again, I do have reservations about the upcoming contract with the pharmacy benefits managers and what they would be. Again, we can only go off of what -- what information is given to us and the
comptroller has provided. Reassurance is that the new company is already practicing this, and so there would not be a fiscal impact, and with that, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Thank you. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further? 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 COOK (65TH):
Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to see if 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. 7261

Total number Voting 148
Necessary for Passage 75
Those voting Yea 148
Those voting Nay 0
Absent not Voting 2

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel). Will the clerk please call Calendar 147?

CLERK:

On page 16, House Calendar 147, substitute House Bill No. 7225, AN ACT CONCERNING PUBLIC HOUSING. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Housing.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McGee.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good afternoon.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

The clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 7263. I would -- I’m sorry. I move acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill. I’m so excited about bringing it out, I skipped the entire process.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

I understand your enthusiasm, sir.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

[Laughing].

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question is acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative McGee, you have the floor.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The clerk now has an amendment, LCO No. 7263. I would ask the clerk to please call the amendment, and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO No. 7263, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 7263, offered by Representative McGee, Representative Ritter.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? I’m hearing none. Representative McGee, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Madam Speaker, this amendment -- this amendment strikes the underlying bill and leaves only section 5 and 6 of this particular bill. Madam Speaker?

Okay.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):
I move acceptance.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of the amendment. Will you remark? Representative Dauphinais.

REP. DAUPHINAIS (44TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to ask a few -- a few questions regarding the amendment.

I’m sorry. Through you, I wanted to ask a few questions. Can you explain to us what prompted this bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative, on the amendment?

Representative Dauphinais, on the amendment?

REP. DAUPHINAIS (44TH):

On the amendment. This amendment. Yes. I’m sorry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you. Representative McGee.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Since last spring,
there have been local groups, local residents complaining about the conditions of their apartment units, and quite frankly, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development alongside many of these residents in urban areas, specifically the city of Hartford have basically been living in conditions where they have filed complaints to the local municipality to their landlords or property owners only to be disregarded, and I got to tell you having gone to some of these apartment units, many of these apartment units experiences rodents, vermins -- I really didn’t know what those were -- leaky pipes, broken doors, and unfortunately, the municipality as well as the state did not have mechanisms in place to help address many of these slum landlords that exist in many of our communities, so this -- this amendment will simply just provide some opportunity for municipalities as well as the state to hold LLCs and owners accountable for these horrible conditions that residents live in.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Dauphinais.

REP. DAUPHINAIS (44TH):

Thank you. A few comments, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. DAUPHINAIS (44TH):

First of all, I just want to thank our Chair, Representative McGee, for a very, very good amendment. This, I believe, will address some of those problems of being able to track down irresponsible landowners -- landlords when they’re trying to find them and have problems addressed, so I appreciate this good amendment, very friendly amendment, and I support it and ask those as well to support it.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

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

(All) Aye.

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

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, just really quickly I’d like to thank the entire Hartford delegation as well as our majority leader for his leadership alongside many of the residents in the city of Hartford to really address this concern that’s just not common in Hartford but throughout the entire state with respect to slum landlords, so I appreciate the entire caucus as well as our delegation for supporting this amendment and also our committee.

Thank you so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark
further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Will 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 COOK (65TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7225 as amended by House A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>148</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those voting Yea 148  
Those voting Nay 0  
Absent not Voting 2  

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The bill as amended is passed. (Gavel). Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 92?  

CLERK:

On page 9, Calendar 92, substitute House Bill No. 5683, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A DRY-LAND WATER SAFETY INSTRUCTION PILOT PROGRAM. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Children.  

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Linehan.  

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move for acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill.  

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The 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, madam.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This bill is an act establishing a dry-land water safety instruction pilot program. This was born out of the Women -- the Commission on Women, Children, and Seniors. We put together a water safety commission, and together we met with a woman named Jenna Masone [phonetic] who is the principal of Wolfpit Elementary School in Norwalk, and she had a program all set that she is using in her school that utilizes gym class to teach students about water safety. We know that not all students here in the state of Connecticut have access to a pool or to swimming lessons, so this has proved very beneficial in her school, and we’re now looking to make this into a pilot program. What this bill would do is create a pilot program for no more than 15 communities around the state where the PE and gym teachers would be trained on this program that already exists, so that they can teach children
through a variety of movements and song how to stay safe in and around the water. Almost 800 children drown in the U.S. every year, and over half of those children, are under the age of 4. Many minority children drown as well as minority children are three times more likely to drown than their white counterparts, and that is the reason why in this bill what we’re looking to do is choose areas, which are high -- which have a high minority concentration because of those facts. We’re looking to increase children’s access to swim lessons. We recognize it’s a first priority, but what about communities where access to a pool is limited? That’s where this will come out. The bill does create a pilot program now, but what we would like to do is after that pilot program takes effect there will be reports done to the Commission on Women, Children, and Seniors, bring that back to the legislature to see if we make this a program statewide. This bill did pass out of committee with unanimous support and with that, Madam Speaker, I move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill? Representative Green.

REP. GREEN (55TH):

Madam Speaker -- there we go -- thank you, Madam Speaker. This bill made it through the Children’s Committee, and it was supported 100 percent bipartisan, and it should pass. It’s a good bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Will 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
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Will all 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. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill No. 5683

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel). Will the clerk please call Calendar 97?

CLERK:

House Calendar 97, which is on page 63, House Bill No. 6997, AN ACT REQUIRING THE PROVISION OF
INFORMATION CONCERNING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SERVICES
AND RESOURCES TO STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND GUARDIANS.
Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move for acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question is acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Sanchez, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Madam Speaker, this bill requires the State Department of Education to publish information on it’s website by January 1, 2020, and annually thereafter on domestic violence, and they will be in consultation with the judicial branches’ office of
the Victim Services in Connecticut’s Coalition against Domestic Violence. Under this bill, SDE must disseminate its information to local board -- school boards and each school board year starting after 2020 and 2021 school year. Each school board must in turn provide it to any student or student parent or guardian who expresses to the school employee that the student, parent, guardian, or the person residing in the home does not feel safe because of domestic violence. It authorizes the transfer of his or her records as well to another school district, and they will then provide that information. Madam Speaker, the clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 7023. I would ask the clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO No. 7023, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 7023,
offered by Representative Linehan and Representative Green.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? I’m hearing none. Representative Sanchez, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, what this amendment does basically is to clarify the role of the State Department of Education and the role that the -- the judicial branch and the Victim Services would have in order to provide the information to the local Board of Education so that they can distribute this information on their website. [Pause] I move for adoption. I’m sorry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. will you remark on the amendment? Representative McCarty.
REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and a quick question on the amendment please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, to the proponent, could you just tell me the basic change to the amendment? Does that mean that the State Department of Ed would only be in consultation now with the office of Victim Services?

Thank you. To the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, what the amendment will do is the bill presently had the State Department of Education come up with the information and place it on their website and also get the services from the consultation with the Victim Services at the judicial branch, but now,
it’s the judicial branch who has this information already. They can provide this information directly to the State Department of Education and to the local Boards of Education, and they can place that on their websites, publish it, and at the same time if a family has an issue with domestic violence and comes in and will ask for their records or their information, what the Board of Education -- the local Board of Education is going to do is hand them that information about the resources and services that are available in the state of Connecticut.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and if I may just make a comment on the bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

We need to adopt the amendment first, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do
support the amendment. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

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

(All) Aye.

All those opposed, nay. The amendment is adopted. (Gavel). Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. On the bill as amended, I do rise in full support of the bill. I think it’s an excellent bill that will certainly help individuals that may be confronting domestic
violence to have more information about the services and the programs available. I think there is no fiscal note on the bill for the Boards of Education. It came out of the Children’s Committee unanimously and out of the Education Committee unanimously. I think it’s a good bill. We need to keep in mind that today 1 in 4 women are still victims of domestic violence as men are 1 in 7 men, and we have children in the schools with teen dating violence, so I think this is an excellent bill that will go a long way in helping provide education on the referrals and services available.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Madam Speaker, it is a good bill. It ought to pass.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Will 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 COOK (65TH):

Have all the members voted? Representative Arconti, have all the members voted?

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

[Laughing].

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Will all the members please check the board to determine if your vote has been properly cast? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked. Will the clerk please announce the tally?
House Bill No. 6997 as amended by House A

Total number Voting 148
Necessary for Passage 75
Those voting Yea 148
Those voting Nay 0
Absent not Voting 2

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The bill as amended is passed. (Gavel).

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 47?

CLERK:

On page 4, House Calendar 47, the substitute House Bill No. 6643, AN ACT CONCERNING REGIONAL ANIMAL CONTROL SHELTERS. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Environment.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative D’Agostino of the 21st District, you have the pleasure of bringing out the last bill of the day. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):
Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could defer to Representative D’Agostino, but I prefer to do the bill myself.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Ladies and gentlemen, as we know, Representative Demicco speaks softly, so let’s keep the Chamber quiet, we can get through this last bill, and we can go home. Representative Demicco, please repeat yourself.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the joint committee’s favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Demicco, you have the floor.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a
relatively simple bill. It changes the current statute, and will allow more municipalities to open regional animal shelters otherwise known as dog pound facilities. Under current statute, towns are allowed to regionalize this service provided that the towns are -- the populations of towns are 25,000 or less and that the towns are contiguous. The two changes that this legislation would effectuate are to change that so that towns with a population of under 50,000 will be able to regionalize this service, and also the towns are not required to be contiguous, and -- and as in current statute the towns legislative bodies have to -- have to approve this arrangement, and that is what the bill does, and I urge passage.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative Demicco. Representative Harding of the 107th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good bill. It ought
to pass. Have a good night, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further? Representative Davis of the 57th District.

    (All) Ahh.

    Ahh.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do have one question for the proponent of the bill, if I may?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    He looks prepared. Please proceed.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

    And, one thing I’ve never been accused of is having a soft voice, so -- but Mr. Speaker through you to the proponent. Is there a reason why we even have the 50,000-person cap and why not just allow any town to regionalize these services and reduce cost?

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Demicco.
REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any particular reason. I would say that this is -- by making this change, we are going to allow several more towns to be able to -- to enter into this arrangement, and I’d be happy to increase it to an even greater number next year.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that answer. I look forward to those discussions moving forward.

Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the bill before us? If not, staff an guests to the Well the of 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 ensure your vote’s been properly cast. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked. The clerk will take a tally. And, the clerk will announce that tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 6643

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel). Are there any
announcements or introductions? Representative Currey of the 11th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the clerk is in possession of a list of referrals, and I move that we refer the referrals to the committees indicated.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Is there objection? Is there objection? I’m hearing none. So, ordered. Any announcements or introductions? Representative Reyes of the 75th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. REYES (75TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of Journal notation, Representative Palm, family matter. Business district, Representative Butler, Representative Lemar. Funeral, Representative Stallworth. Personal, Representative Meskers. Business outside Chambers, Representative Simms, Representative Gibson, and Representative Michel.
Medical, Representative Orange, and personal, Representative Vargas.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Journal will so note. Representative McGee of the 5th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand for the purpose of -- I was going to say introduction [Laughing], but an announcement.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

We’re having a Housing meeting tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. in the hall of the Chambers.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Housing meeting tomorrow in the hall of the Chambers. Thank you very much, Representative. Any other announcements or introductions?

Representative Dathan of the 142nd, you have the floor, madam.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is just an announcement. I just want to let everyone know that the Insurance and Real Estate Committee will be convening tomorrow morning at 11:30 outside the hall of the House.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Insurance and Real Estate, 11:30 outside the Chamber.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Yep.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, ma’am.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Any other announcements or introductions?

Representative Hughes of the 135th, madam, you have the floor.

REP. HUGHES (135TH):

There we go. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make an announcement. The
progressive caucus will be having a press conference tomorrow at 11:00 on the North steps on criminal justice reform. Yay.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Betts. You all were -- you’re good. All right. With there being no further announcements or introductions, the moment we’ve all been waiting for. Representative Currey of the 11th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Without objection, so ordered. We are adjourned subject to the Call of the Chair.

(Gavel).

(On motion of Representative Currey of the 11th
District, the House adjourned at 3:40 o'clock p.m., to meet again at the Call of the Chair.)
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