The House of Representatives was called to order at 1:20 o'clock p.m., Speaker Joe Aresimowicz in the Chair.

Clerk:
The House of Representatives will convene immediately. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives will convene immediately. Members to the Chamber.

Speaker Aresimowicz (30th):
(Gavel) The House come to order. Will members, staff and guests please rise and direct your attention to the dais where Rabbi Alan Lefkowitz will lead us in prayer.

Rabbi Alan Lefkowitz:
Good afternoon. In one of the first prayers somebody had asked me about for shorter hours, so consider that one done. In scripture, God says,
"You shall not profane My holy name that I may be sanctified in the midst of the people." Life presents us with a simple choice. How we live our lives can either heighten a sense of God in the world or it can diminish it. There is no neutral or middle ground. By treating our fellow human beings with generosity, we bear witness to God's generosity. Acts of greed and selfishness make that bounty harder to perceive.

By speaking out against oppression and bigotry, we affirm God as the righteous judge as the one passionate about justice. To remain silent in the face of such suffering is to eclipse God's justice. By extending a basic trust to our fellow human beings, we make it easier for them to feel God's willingness to trust them, to affirm the goodness of creation.

In everything we do be it at work, on the road, or at play, right here; we can help other people know that there is God. We can bring credit to God. Far more than simply arguing about rules, the essence of piety is the compassion and love that the
As a great nineteenth century rabbi said, "Compassion is the foundation of belief. For a person who isn't compassionate, even the belief in God is a kind of idolatry. In hell itself, Robert Cover noted, there will be only rules, and they will be strictly enforced.

We make heaven on Earth. We sanctify God's name by using it to express God's value of love, compassion, holiness and justice. We are what we do, and to be a holy people we must live each moment as an opportunity to serve God. God, please be with each of us as we do so. We say, Amen.

ALL:

Amen.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, Rabbi. Would Representative Carpino of the 32nd District please come to the dais and lead us in Pledge?

REP. CARPINO (32ND):

(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, Representative. Is there any business on the Clerk's desk?

CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. There are Favorable Reports House Bills to be tabled for the calendar and printing.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWIC (30TH):

Representative Ritter of the 1st District, Sir you have the floor.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good afternoon, Sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

I move that we waive the reading of the House Favorable Reports and the Bills be tabled for the calendar and printing. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Without objection, so ordered.
Last piece of business is the daily calendar.

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. Representative Steinberg of the 137th -- 36th, you have the floor, Sir.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker for getting that correct. I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

Please proceed.

Thank you. As a graduate of Yale University, I'm particularly proud to introduce one of the great enduring traditions of my alma mater, the Whiffenpoofs of Yale.

Yes, Yale may have been around for over 300 years, but the Whiffenpoofs are also pretty venerable in their own right having been founded in 1909 and celebrating their 110th anniversary this year. The Whiffenpoofs could be argued as the granddaddies of collegiate acapella singing in this
country. They were the first and now there are literally hundreds spread across colleges all across the country. The Whiffenpoofs have been around so long that Cole Porter was a Whiffenpoof. You know who Cole Porter was? If not, go Google it.

The current group, they're all seniors from Yale, travel the globe during what is now a year off from school, often singing for both royalty and small communities. We are indeed fortunate to be treated to their presence today and their singing. Allow me to quickly introduce them, Mr. Speak. Just wave your hand when I announce your name. Emil Beckford, Dustin Zhao, Sofia Campoamor, Isaac Scobey-Thal, Jacob Miller, the Pitchpipe, the musical director, Daniel Rudin, Mohit Sani, David Washington, Isaac Young, James Nydam, Sen Huang, not to be confused with Senator Hwang from upstairs. (Laughing) And last but not least Nick Massoud. Now Nick and I have a special connection. Nick has hails from Westport, Connecticut. Yes, there actually people from Westport who come up to the Capital, and equally importantly Nick is the
Popocatapetyl, affectionately as Popo to his group. That stands for the business manager who has the responsibility not merely for singing but for arranging the amazing schedule they have all year round. And that's particularly important because 41 years ago there was another Whiffenpoof from Westport, another Popocatapetyl from Westport; that was me. (Applause) So without further ado, I give you the Wiffenpoofs of Yale.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Ladies and gentleman, if we could please direct your attention to the Well of the House for a song by Representative Steinberg and our guests, the Yale Wiffenpoofs in honor of New Haven Day. The floor is yours.

WIFFENPOOIFS:

(Singing) (Applause)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Incredible job. Thank you very much. Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Comey of the 102nd. You have the floor.
REP. COMEY (102ND):

Thank you very much. I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. COMEY (102ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In honor -- I'm just going to sing. No. (Laughing) In honor of Food Allergy Awareness Week, I just wanted to introduce some food allergy advocates that have been working up here for several years to make sure that our 32 million Americans that are diagnosed with food allergies are safe in our state and taken care of. We have a table in the concourse and we're teaching folks how to use epinephrine to save lives. So as legislators it's our -- it's important to consider policies that improve access. So I'd like to introduce Patricia Donovan and Jamie Ruszkowski and given them a warm welcome. (Applause)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam.

REP. COMEY (102ND):
Thank you very much.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Zawistowski of the 61st District. Madam, you have the floor.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purposes of introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

And I see Representative Ackert over there with you. You can proceed, Madam.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you. I am here with, as you observed, Representative Tim Ackert from Coventry. We're here today with Joe Blake who was recently name Principal of the Year by the Connecticut Association of Schools. Now Joe has a more distinct honor too because in 2014 he was -- he was named Assistant Principal of the Year and he's one of only three administrators in the state ever to get both honors. Joe teaches -- Joe teaches, well he is an administrator; he also teaches at Coventry High
School and he's from Suffield. I have with him today; I have his family. If you want to wave, Valentina, Bobby, and Lexie. They're up in the gallery, and the Superintendent of the Coventry Public High School System, Dr. David Patrone. If you want to stand up and wave? And did you have anything you would like to say, Jim or?

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Just saying I'm a little Coventry proud right now, that's all. So congratulations to Principal Blake. (Applause)

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

And thank you for the opportunity.

Congratulations Joe.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Joe, congratulations. I personally didn't spend much time with the Principals -- no I'm lying. I spent a lot of time with them so I hope you are equally as passionate with your students, so thank you. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Zupkus of the 89th. Madam, you now have the floor. And you have a
Senator on the floor with you too I see.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise for an introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you. I am standing here with Senator Logan. We're glad to have you in the House. And we're standing here, we're so excited to introduce you all to Paula Cofrancesco. Paula -- Bethany just had their elections a couple of weeks ago. They're one of the few towns that have them in May and Paula and her team swept the whole town. So we're thrilled to have Paula as the first Selectman here and we congratulate you. (Applause)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Paula, congratulations. Now the work begins and just remember, you asked for this position. (Laughing) Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Rebimbas of the 70th District. Madam, you have the floor.
REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon. I have the distinct honor and pleasure to welcome students, 7th graders from City Hill Middle School located in Naugatuck along with my fellow colleague, Senator George Logan and Representative Linehan. And also I'd like to take an opportunity to acknowledge each student that's here with us.

Luke Deitelboun, Sahirah Rivera, Ciana Chirkout, Sean Dovino, Amy Morrissey and Emily Fine. And accompanying them we have two wonderful teachers from the borough of Naugatuck. We have teacher Katrina Spino, teacher Holly Raymond and also accompanying them is Loraine Wechtler. And Mr. Speaker I just want to take this opportunity to not only thank you but also the Minority Leader and the Governor for meeting with these students because what they're here is with the assistance of Representative Linehan, they had an opportunity to draft legislation specifically an ACT PROHIBING THE SALE OF ENERGY DRINKS TO PERSONS UNDER 16 YEARS OF AGE. Unfortunately it did not make out of the Kids
Committee but they're still here learning the lobbying process so if they happen to stop you in the hallway, I hope you'll take an opportunity and speak with them. And most importantly I just want to give them a lot of credit because a lot of time in this Chamber we talk about education. Well they put a pamphlet together that they're going to be able to distribute to all the pediatrician offices and nurses -- nurse offices in all of the schools because education is so important. So we just want to have the opportunity to thank them for all of their hard work and if the Chamber would join me in giving them a warm welcome as well. (Applause)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I for one was inspired by all of you as I know the Minority Leader was. Thank you so much for what you're doing for the State. Representative Porter. You look quite busy up there. Madam, you now have the floor.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of introduction.
REP. PORTER (94TH):

I have with me today the wonderful students from our Harris and Tucker Daycare in Newhallville New Haven, Connecticut. And we have the -- she's running away but she's a teacher and co-owner Cameron Tucker. We have Spirit, Faith, Anese, Jaden, Eli, Karen and we also have with us today, Alder Clyburn, Alder Evelyn Rodriguez; and I'd ask that you all please give them a warm welcome. Thank you. (Applause) Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Cummings. You've got half the Chamber over there with you.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

I see that they finally came to the right side. (Laughing)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Actually it's the left side the way I see it. (Laughing)

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):
Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed, Madam.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Mr. Speaker, in 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed a proclamation designating today, May 15 Peace Officers Memorial Day and it falls on National Police Week. Currently tens of thousands of law enforcement officers around the world are in Washington, DC to honor our men and women in uniform. This legislature has a long history of current and retired law enforcement officers serving with those in the Chamber. There are many of us here who have loved ones who are also serving and to protect our communities.

Connecticut currently has 162 police departments with over 7,600 police officers. Mr. Speaker, I along with the entire Waterbury delegation, Representative Reyes, Representative D'Amelio, Representative Napoli and Representative Butler would like to introduce Officer Jon Krchnavy
who is Waterbury's Officer of the Year. He was born in Bridgeport, Connecticut and moved to Monroe and enlisted in the Waterbury Police Department after a long service in the Marine Corps. In April of 2018, he joined the Response -- Emergency Response Team and in August of 2019 he became part of the K9 Unit with his German Shepard, Bane.

Officer Krchnavy is the 2019 Waterbury Officer of the Year. He is respected by his peers and supervisors and his community alike and I would please ask my colleagues to give him a warm welcome to the Chamber. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. (Applause)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam. Representative Hall of the 59th District. You now have the floor, Madam.

REP. HALL (59TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I regret my husband was supposed to be standing here today who is Deputy Chief of my fair town, Enfield. Unfortunately or fortunately, we have our Police Awards Ceremony so he got held up with that. So I want to say just a
little bit in honor of his service, my son's service, who is also a police officer in Massachusetts, my future daughter-in-law at the beginning of June; I'm hoping session is done on time, who is also a police officer in Holyoke, Massachusetts.

For many years I think Stephanie did a great job summarizing why we -- we honor them, the best of the best of us this week. It is Police Week from May 12 to the 18th. If anybody has not had the wonderful opportunity to visit the Police Memorial in Washington D.C., I strongly urge you next time you're in our beautiful capital, to please take a moment. And it's not where all the other monuments and memorials are. You have to go a little bit out of your way to find it, but it's certainly worth seeing.

A little bit about that memorial. There are 21,183 names on that memorial. I don't think a lot of people realize how many good men and women we've lost protecting our lives. There's another 371 being added this year and last year we did lose 144
men and women in blue. So today I just want to say a few words about my experience as a police officer's wife and a mother of my family members that serve.

My husband started off in the Patrol Division 31 years ago. He was promoted to Sergeant and then Lieutenant and in that time he served on the SWAT team, the State Narcotics Task Force, and then was promoted to Detective of our Division. Over the course of the years it's been interesting because as many of you know, our men and women in blue don't make too many holidays home, too many birthdays; and when he was finally promoted to Captain I said to him, well maybe you'll be home for Christmas or New Years this year. He turned to me and said, no honey, there's families in the department now so I'll be going in to cover for my Patrol Division so they can have Christmas with their families.

This is the type of people that serve us and go in every day and make the daily sacrifice. He was one of the men that went into the brewery in Manchester during the shooting and I can't tell you
what that does when you're sitting at home watching it on TV wondering if your loved one is coming home to you. I want to thank all of the men and women in blue that go in every day and serve. I want to make a special thanks to our Capital Police who are many retired police officers that serve us and protect us in this Chamber in this building every single day, so I want to thank them today. And I want a special shout-out to my son, Zach who serves in Mass along with my future daughter-in-law, Melissa. So thank you, Mr. Speaker for the moment here. I wish he was standing here but I'm kind of use to standing alone after 32 years. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (3OTH):

Well -- well Representative in Chamber, I'd like to give her family a round of applause for all their service even though they're not here, please. (Applause) Representative Klarides-Ditria in the back of the Chamber. Madam, you now have the floor.

REP. KLARIDES-DITRIA (105TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for an introduction.
Thank you. As we celebrate National Police Week we say thank you to those local, state and federal law enforcement officers who protect and serve us every day with courage and dedication. I'd like to thank the police department of my town, Seymour, Beacon Falls and Derby for protecting and their service to the residents every day. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of being married to one of those great people, my husband Detective Stephen Ditria has been on the Seymour Police Force for 22 years, the same amount of time that we've been married, 22 years. So Mr. Speaker, here he is. Thank you. (Applause)

Representative, as usual every time you get to speak and I appreciate the introduction, but he's also the proud father of a pretty good football player too so we appreciate that here in this Chamber. (Applause) Minority Leader,
Representative Klarides, you now have the floor.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But she's also a proud mother of a pretty good football player. Why's it always about the father?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I see her all the time. I've told her that repeatedly.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

Whatever! (Laughing) Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank all of our law enforcement during Police Week. I know we all talk about this on a regular basis but I think it can't be said enough that we have to say thank you more often to the police -- people who keep us safe every day. And you know I've -- I've often said that we do a lot of scary things every day and I'm sure you hear the same as I do; I don't know how you guys do what you do at this job, but as much of a -- this is more of a mental risk job. Their job is a mental and a physical risk and I could never do what they do, but I'm thankful to all of our police officers in this state and in this
country, and all of our law enforcement for keeping us safe every day, especially in this day and age when they are under a lot of scrutiny and are not appreciated as much as I -- as we all believe they should be. I want to give a special thank you to my brother-in-law and -- for being -- doing what he does and dealing with my sister on a daily basis. So thank you Mr. Speaker. (Laughing) (Applause)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Klarides, I think he believed you were jealous of the amount of time that he got to spend with her so he worked with her to make sure she's here with you on a daily basis now.

(Laughing) Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Sredzinski of the 112th. Sir, you now have the floor.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we know today is Peace Office Memorial Day. It's a National Observance recognizing the local, state and federal law enforcement officials that have died in the line of duty protecting our communities. As someone who
works in the public safety field, I know firsthand the dangers that these men and women encounter on a day-to-day basis. It's a dangerous job, it's a stressful job and it's one that doesn't stop. As was already mentioned, it's 24/7, 365. As a police dispatcher, as a 911 dispatcher I've had the responsibility to send these brave men and women into situations that I knew were dangerous. Several years ago we had a caller who said that he was threatening suicide by cop. We knew that was a dangerous situation but we knew he was a danger to himself and to others. I had to send officers to that scene to secure it and make sure that he didn't harm himself or others. The seconds that they arrived on scene before they communicated with us felt like hours. He clearly stated he was armed. He clearly stated he was motivated by gun violence and this was an issue that was very dangerous.

It is this duty by these men and women that we honor today. Mr. Speaker, across this nation since January 2000 -- 2018, we have lost 205 law enforcement officers in the line of duty. In
Connecticut we have lost two. Trooper First Class
Walter Green, Jr. end of watch May 31, 2018.
Trooper First Class Kevin Michael Miller, end of
watch March 29, 2018. Today on this Peace Officer
Memorial Day we honor their sacrifice. Mr. Speaker,
I humbly request that this Chamber honor these men
and women of law enforcement that we have lost with
a moment of silence.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Chamber will observe a moment of silence.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In honor of Police
Week I felt the need to stand up and just mention
the history of law enforcement in my family. My
father served the Danbury, the City of Danbury and
Police Force for 30 years. 20 -- 15 to 20 of those
years he worked as a detective. He missed many of
basketball and baseball games, missed many family
dinners with us but growing up, watching him serve our city is one of the biggest reasons why I pursued this legislative seat in 2012. It was my way to serve our city the way he honorably served our city for 30 years and I just wanted to say a few words about that, and in honor of all the sacrifices our men and women in blue make on a daily basis. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

And thank you. We share your appreciation for service. Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like Representative Arconti, I just want to quickly rise and recognize my own family members. I am the only man in my family that is not a police officer. My dad, brother and brother-in-law are all police officers and I obviously have seen firsthand the sacrifices that they've made internally in my own family and am very grateful for their service and want to honor them for all that they do and recognize those who we have lost in the line of duty as police officers to
keep our community safe. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you and we actually join you in recognizing your family as well, Sir.

Representative Phipps.

REP. PHIPPS (100TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for an announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed.

REP. PHIPPS (100TH):

I first wanted to thank especially my colleagues yesterday for the compassion that they shared when I was having a fairly rough day. This month is National Mental Health Awareness Month and it's incredibly particular right now because yesterday for one of the reasons why I was dressed a little different than I normally was, was I was at my -- I'm sorry, my nephew's funeral who fought a valent fight against bipolar disorder for 24 years and lost it about a week ago -- a little over a week ago. And I -- I try not to think of his last
moments of who he really was, but he was a poet. He was an educator. He was an awesome juggler and he— he taught me a lot. So for the rest of this month as we're thinking about health and healthcare and we're thinking about taking care of one another I would just like to do that in the spirit of my nephew, Evan. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

We all share in your loss, Sir. Representative Godfrey.

REP. GODFREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too wanted to join my colleagues to just honor the members of my family who have been a police officer. My father's brother, John Godfrey was for many years actually the Chief of Police at the Great Danbury State Fair. But inspired his son, Jay, my cousin to make a career as a professional police officer. Many of time we worried about the situations of course any police officer can get him or herself into, that we thank him for his many years of service. He just—he's retired now. But knowing what all the families
across the state of Connecticut and around the United States do as they worry about one of their loved ones leaving for work, praying that they're going to come back. I fully understand and I just -- but I just wanted to join in recognizing my cousin, Jay Godfrey as one of the police officers who have served this state so well for so many years. Thank you, Senator.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you. We join you in recognizing your family member and all of the officers that have served in the State of Connecticut. We're going to take a break at this moment to issue some -- to take care of some technical problems we have up here. Should be brief. The Chamber will -- about three minutes. The Chamber will stand at ease.

The Chamber will come back to session. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 79?

CLERK:

On page 6, House Calendar 79. House Bill No. 7093, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

You have the floor, ma'am.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative Abercrombie, you have the floor Ma'am.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker this puts together a task force to look at findings and recommendations for people with disabilities around employment. Mr. Speaker, I do have an Amendment. I
would like the Clerk to call LCO 8075 and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 8075, which will be designated House Amendment A.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 8075 offered by Representative Abercrombie, Representative Case and Representative Carpino.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, all the Amendment does is made some technical changes in language. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great Amendment. It ought to pass.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Carpino. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying Aye.

ALL:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Oppose? The Ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. (Gavel) Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just thank my colleague, Representative Carpino for her work on this. You know we understand as a state that individuals with disabilities offer so much to any employment and through this task force we're hoping that as a state
we can find more employment for those individuals.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'd just like to echo the words of the good Chairwoman and Representative Carpino who brought this forward to us. You know we've had a task force in the past that was going to -- going to work on that and bring stuff out. That task force has since no longer, so with Representative Carpino bringing this forward to the Human Services Committee we thought it was proper to look at it as a task force and see what we could do as the good Chairwoman said, to help such a great population. So I urge all my colleagues to move this very difficult Bill through. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Carpino.

REP. CARPINO (32ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Meaningful employment
is important to everybody in our community. It's financial stability, it's meaningful social interactions and in same cases it's important self-worth. But the statistics are alarming and those with disabilities, physical disabilities, intellectual disabilities and with disabilities that you can't always see; they have so much to offer and sometimes so few paths. So I know times are tough in the state but this task force is going to give us some real concrete suggestions that this Chamber can act on in February so that we can make sure that these folks have the ability to give us all that they can. Thank you to everybody who helped get this Bill forward. Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, ma'am. Representative Candelora, you have the floor sir.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, just a question of the proponent of the -- of the Bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed, sir.
REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under this Bill I -- I see obviously that the task force will be charged to be able to study the increase of employment opportunities for our individuals with disabilities and expand their existing employment assistance as well as providing financial incentives. Since this Bill has moved through the process and with our recent Bill that got through this Chamber with its eminent passage in the Senate on minimum wage, would this task force be able to look at the impact of minimum wage and its -- on the employment of persons with disabilities? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, I assume that that would be part of this also. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that
answer because I do feel that it's certainly an important aspect that we need to look at in this Bill being somebody that employers individuals with disabilities. I know from my business going forward it's going to be much more difficult for us to employee these individuals so I'm glad that this task force could take a look at the impacts that that Bill may have on this community. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you. Will you remark further on this Bill? Will you remark further on this Bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats. The machine will be opened.

(Ringing)

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Have all the members voted? Would 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 7093 as amended by House A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Voting</th>
<th>146</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Bill as amended is passed. (Gavel) Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 362?

CLERK:

On page 31, Calendar 362, House Bill No. 5267, AN ACT CONCERNING FAIR REIMBURSEMENT TO RETAIL DEALERS OF POWER EQUIPMENT. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on General Law.

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

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Question of acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

Representative D'Agostino, you have the floor sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill seeks to address the perceived imbalance between power equipment dealers and manufacturers who supply power equipment to them. What we're hearing is that a number of these smaller dealers are required to do repair work on equipment under warranty you know, for example lawn mowers and snow blowers, etc. and they weren't being adequately compensated by the manufacturers and this Bill seeks to address that. It's the product of a long history of negotiations between the power equipment dealers and the manufacturers and this represents their arrival at a
compromise that they all could live with and the Committee could live with. I do have an Amendment. I believe it's LCO 8694. I would ask that that be called and granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 8694, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8694, designated House Amendment Schedule A and offered by Representatives D'Agostino and Orange.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, this Amendment is a strike all but it just makes some minor tweaks to the original Bill -- Bill language
that again reflects the compromise arrived at between the dealers and the manufacturers and just to summarize; it sets an 18 percent reimbursement rate off of the net price for any parts as well as they're able to recover their posted hourly labor rate for charges for work that they do, and then just set some requirements about the timing of that as well. Again, this is the product of compromise between both sides of the industry and both of them were -- I should say were very stubborn. They didn't want to move, and it took a Representative of the caliber of Linda Orange to put them all together, beat their heads together in a room, including my own, and get this deal done. So she's not here, but in absently I want to thank Representative Orange for finally getting this Bill done and I'd move adoption of the Amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):
Thank you -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. And yes, I want to commend the Chair for his work and everyone else on this. I will add that this was also a request from one of my members, Representative Petit. It appears the Amendment resolves the issues before us so I would support the Amendment. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Yaccarino, you have the floor sir.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good to see you up there. I have a couple of questions. I was just reading the Amendment and the good Chair of General Law district and in my district -- well, there's Whitney Hardware -- or Spring Glen Hardware and in North Haven we have G&H Equipment and they sell a lot of power equipment. How will this effect -- if they sell lawn tractor in good faith or a chain saw or a leaf blower or a lawnmower, their -- their sales? Through you Mr. Speaker.

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

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you. So a number of those smaller hardware stores obviously sell the equipment. A number of them don't. This Bill doesn't address their sales. They're able to still contract with different manufacturers, have arrangements to sell whatever types they want; Toro, Honda, etc., Stanley Black and Decker, whatever they want to sell they have arrangements with those manufacturers and they can sell whatever products they want. The issue becomes actually with the warranty work when they may not even sell the product, or they don't sell that particular line of products. Let's say you just sell the snow blowers but because of your contract with Honda, you are required to work on the snow blowers and the leaf blowers and the lawnmowers even if you didn't sell them and that was the issue that was presented to us. That somebody goes and buys it at a big box store for a discount maybe, it breaks down. Big box stores don't do the warranty repair work and they
come to Spring Glen Hardware or other smaller stores in our various constituencies neighborhoods and they say, do the work. Well these deal -- these power equipment dealers may not have sold the product but they are required by the manufacturer who they have arrangements with to do the work and this makes sure that they're compensated at an adequate rate for that work that they do on equipment that they might not even sell.

So in terms of their sales, that is separate from what this Bill addresses. This is -- this is respect to the warranty work that they do on the various equipment that they sell or don't sell. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you. I appreciate that answer and clarification. So if I own G&H Equipment or Spring Glen Hardware and I have a contract with John Deere or Toro and somebody buys a piece of equipment somewhere else but they want me to fix it; like Home
Depot or the big boxers, they don't fix anything themselves; they contract everything out. And I think that's what this Bill is addressing, I'm not sure. But if that small retailer, Spring Glen Hardware, like I said Goody's Hardware in East Haven or G&H in North Haven, if they didn't sell that are they still obligated to repair that and will they get reimbursed fully? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It's our understanding that the manufacturers do require the sellers to do the warranty repair work except apparently for the big box stores who have got some sort of negotiating power where they don't have to do it. So it's going to depend on a contract by contract basis between the power equipment dealer and the manufacturer but most of them came and told us that when they are engaged with a manufacturer like John Deere to sell the product, they are required to repair it. But whether they do or not is going to depend on the fine print of those particular contracts, but to the extent that they do
have to do that work whether they sell the product or not, this Bill will put more money in their pockets. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

No, I get that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you to the good proponent. But it says 30 days and if I'm a John Deere dealer in any of these surrounding towns and I'm backed up for 45 days, I didn't sell that equipment to you, yeah I'll fix it but I can't fix it for 60 days. What happens then? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Whatever the warranty is on that particular product; it might be a year, it might be 30 days, it might be 60 days, 90 days; the warranty on the particular product is going to attach to the product and that's going to dictate what the power equipment dealer -- the window for the repair work if you will. After obviously outside of warranty there will be no work
required. This Bill does not impose upon the power equipment dealers any additional requirement to do additional work beyond the warranty period. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and again thank you for that answer. So I just want to be on the record to clarify that. A local dealer is not going to be penalized. They could repair the equipment when they're -- when it's on their schedule. They're not going to be fined at any -- at any level and I don't know if anybody consulted with Spring Glen Hardware or G&H Equipment or any of these others. Many of these pieces of equipment are sold at in-town retailers. Most of our towns have something like this. I just don't want them to be harmed in any way. When they're trying to do a good job, they provide a great service at a -- I think many times a better product than the box stores. So I just want to make sure they're protected and I don't know if
there's any protection. I don't really see much protection in here for those retailers. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think I can allay those concerns to Representative Yaccarino by saying that this actually -- this Bill was proposed by precisely those small power equipment dealers. They are the ones who actually wanted this. Some of them approached Representative Orange, Representative Petit, some other Representatives but principally Representatives Orange and Petit and they are the ones who said, we need some help. We have an imbalance. We can't negotiate with the Hondas and the John Deere of the world. They're actually dictating to us here's how much you will get for warranty work. This Bill -- I should note this is not unique across the states. There are other states that have sort of a minimum threshold reimbursement for those dealers because we want to
incentivize people to do that repair work and we want them to be able to still obviously be engaged with the manufacturers. This sets a minimum. But this actually came from them and so I think that should -- I hope allay the Representative’s concerns. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

It does, and I really appreciate that and we all want to support our local business so thank you, and thank you for the clarification through you, Mr. Speaker to the good Chair of General Law. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BERGER (73RD):

Please proceed.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you. I -- my first question would be why do we need this Bill? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I wish Representative Orange was here. I appreciate that question and honestly when this was first proposed a couple of years ago I had the exact same reaction, I did. Because the gut -- my gut instinct was, well you know, you've got one business on one side, you've got another business on the other side. They're contracting parties. They can figure out what kind of contracting terms they want. If you don't want to do repair work, don't sell John Deere equipment. And that from a free market perspective -- honestly that was my gut reaction as well. But we did hear from the -- a number of these smaller dealers and I think what swayed the Committee was the perception of some unequal bargaining power on their part. And particularly hearing also about how the Home Depots and Lowes of the world are not
required to do repair work even though they do sell the equipment, so they, because of economies of scale and size, are able to sit down with a John Deere and a Honda and say, we'll sell your equipment but we're not doing repair work. And they can actually bargain that. The smaller guys apparently cannot. And I don't -- I can't tell you what smaller means in that context except just to compare it to the larger stores versus the -- the smaller hardware stores that we were talking about with Representative Yaccarino. So that is where this is coming from, to address that imbalance. Where the smaller dealers are saying, look if I want to sell John Deere and I've got to sell John Deere and I've got to sell Honda and I've got to sell these things to be competitive; they actually require in the contract that in order to sell my equipment -- that equipment I've got to do the repair work. And not only do I have to do the repair work, here's what we're going to pay you to do the repair work and it's sign on the line or you're not selling our equipment. And they say hey, I can't negotiate
that. I'm not Lowes, I'm not Home Depot. And so they came to us and the response from the Committee in a partisan way was to come up with these terms that say look, here's a minimum price threshold that you can recover.

And I guess the other thing I'd say that gave me some comfort with this is the fact that it was -- this is the third time this Bill I think, in one form or the other has come through the House. This time they all sat down in a room. The power equipment dealers, the small guys, their representatives and the manufacturers and hammered out this particular language that they all said they could live with. And I'll be honest with you, I told them; we're not running anything unless you all can agree. And they knew that and this is what they came up with so for those reasons I'm able -- I was able to overcome my initial gut reaction, which is the same Representative -- that Representative Dubitsky had and I hope that provides him some comfort in terms of why we need the Bill. Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- I -- I'm trying to get my mind around which dealers are -- and which type of companies are being adversely affected and which ones will be adversely affected by the Bill. So I'm -- I understand the small hardware stores and you know, maybe competing against Lowes and Home Depot. But then I'm thinking about -- what about the big tractor dealers that they sell -- they sell Massey Ferguson, they sell John Deere, they sell you know, some of the bigger farm tractors that you -- you can't buy a 150 horsepower farm tractor at Home Depot. So this would -- seems to affect those dealers that are not -- not in -- in any competition or not being affected by those things that are being sold at Home Depot. So how does this Bill help or hurt those dealers? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to a specialized farm equipment dealer and I confess, I don't know how many we have in the state; but if you are -- I'm assuming we have several who specialize in that kind of farm equipment, if you are selling that product in Connecticut; you're a -- you're an outpost. You've got an agreement with I think some of those manufacturers are internationally based; you've got agreements with these manufacturers who are national or international to sell that equipment in Connecticut. I don't know if those specialized dealers also do warrantee work or not. Presumably they do. Somebody would have to do that on that kind of specialized equipment. If they do what this Bill is benefit them. It says look, if you're selling that equipment and you're required to do warranty work on that specialized farm equipment you will get a minimum of this return, the 18 percent net on parts plus your posted hourly rate. Now I don't know if those specialized dealers are getting less or more than that and presumably they can -- they can always negotiate more, but this at least
sets a floor for those specialized dealers in Connecticut. I don't believe -- the Representative may know better than I, whether we have any of those manufacturers in Connecticut. I don't believe we do. But to the extent you are a dealer of that specialized farm equipment in Connecticut and are required to do the warrantee work, this Bill will benefit you. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask in these negotiations with all parties, were any of the representatives from the major farm equipment dealers involved in any of those discussions? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I confess, I don't know the particular farm equipment specialists, if it's Husqvarna or Deere. I believe Deere was. I
don't think Husqvarna was. They may have been. There was an industry representative who had a number of them and I could check. And certainly if the Representative wants to give me -- he's going to know better than I am, some of the specialized equipment manufacturers, I can -- I can check that. We did have a number of them though. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- my real concern is were any of the dealers that sell farm equipment, that sell the -- the big tractors, that sell the big equipment, the Haros, the -- the manure spreaders. There are quite a few of them in Connecticut. Were any of them involved in the negotiations of this Bill? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Chamber will stand at ease for a moment.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

I'm sorry. Could I get the question again, thank you.
Representative Dubitsky, would you care to repeat your question please?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question was, in the negotiation of this Bill were any of the large farm tractor and farm equipment dealers involved in those negotiations? Through you.

Representative D'Agostino.

Through you Mr. Speaker. You know there was -- there was an industry representative who represented a number of them and I don't have the complete slate of everybody who was involved in that group. I know there were a number of them. But again I'm happy to check if I'm provided with particular specialized farm equipment dealers to make sure that they were represented or consulted on it. Through you Mr. Speaker.

Representative Dubitsky.
REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the -- I'm a little confused about subsection, section 1(b) where it indicates that the warranty that the supplier will pay the dealer, the current net price plus 18 percent for any parts. I -- I'm a little confused about that. My understanding is when a dealer repairs a piece of equipment, they would actually get the parts from the manufacturer or the supplier. How is it that the supplier is paying the dealer the price of the parts plus 18 percent? I'm not -- I don't understand that. Would you please explain? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker. Yeah, what we learned is they -- the dealers, again the people selling the equipment and doing the repair work are actually required to -- to actually get -- get the parts form the manufacturer. And you know, you don't just give that for free, you don't just get that part for
free. So you're going to get that from the manufacturer and there's a cost involved with that. And what we heard is that this is a term of art. It's not a wholesale price, it's not a retail price, it's really -- the net price is really retail. I think it's minus any industry discounts that they have with relationship to that dealer and so that's the payment that's made by the manufacturer to the dealer for that piece of equipment. Because obviously the -- the dealer has to get that equipment somehow and then be compensated not only for the equipment that it's getting but also the work that it's doing. That's why the second part deals with the hourly rate. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Chamber will stand at ease please.

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I understand the wrong Amendment was called. I'll come off the board, thank you.

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

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to withdraw the current Amendment which is 8694 and call 8730 and be granted leave to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

If there are no objections so ordered.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you. Again, I apologize to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Go ahead and call the Amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Clerk will call LCO No. 8730 and will designate it House Schedule Amendment B.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8730, designated House Amendment Schedule B and offered by Representatives D'Agostino and Orange.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Representative seeks leave of Chamber to
summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to the summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative D'Agostino. You may proceed with summarization.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I apologize. There have been a number of Amendments to this Bill, which I'll be very happy when it's finally voted on. And it -- it doesn't change anything with respect to the discussion I was just having with Representative Dubitsky and I look forward to continuing that with him in terms of the net price plus 18 percent for any parts to posted hourly rates, provided its been made previously known to the supplier. It just adds some language about the terms being reasonable and a reasonable deadline for it to be done. That was the only change. I'm assured that this is the final version of this Bill and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule B. Will you remark further
on the Amendment? Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I -- I appreciate the good proponents putting in the other Amendment. I do see the differences. As he indicated, it does not -- the change -- the difference does not affect the discussion that we were having so I would just like to go back to the discussion we were having for a moment. My question is about the price that a dealer need -- will be paid for the parts. So it appears to me that when a dealer provides warranty work and gets parts from the supplier, the supplier will not only provide the -- the part at the net price but also an 18 percent profit to the dealer. Am I interpreting that correctly? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I -- I hesitate to use the word profit just because I don't know the particular economics of a particular store, but I think the way I would frame is, that is the -- that
is the markup if you will, over the net price that 
the dealer will receive for the -- from the 
manufacturer for that part. Now I don't know what 
the acquisition cost is for that part. I don't know 
if there's a -- if there's any kind of delta between 
that but to the extent that that is a profit -- it 
is a profit -- you know what we heard from a number 
of these dealers is they lose money on this work 
because of the time involved in doing it. This 
obviously sets a compensation level both for the 
part and the hourly rate that is supposed to make 
them whole for the work that they do. How much of a 
profit margin that actually generates, I don't know. 
But it does set a floor in terms of the -- the price 
delta. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- I think I'll 
listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative MacLachlan, you have the floor
REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A -- a few comments and questions for the proponent if I might?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last year I recall this Bill did come through the House, either last session or the session before and I know there was some concern from the window -- high-tech window and door manufacturers in the state of Connecticut. I don't recall if their industries were specifically called out in the language of those Bills for legislative intent Mr. Speaker, through you, does -- will this Bill cover or impact particularly the high-tech window and door manufacturers in the state of Connecticut? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker. My understanding is
that it would not. That does not qualify as the power equipment that this is meant to encompass. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative MacLachlan.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the good good Chairman for his responses -- his response. My understanding on current practices regarding warrantees, equipment warrantees in particular is -- is rather shallow. I was hoping if the -- if the good Chairman could help me understand how this Amendment differs from current market practices as it pertains to equipment warranties in the state of Connecticut and current market practices regarding equipment warranties. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you. I'm -- I'm not sure if my knowledge is any deeper than the Representatives but I can tell you based on the testimony that what we
heard was that the current practices that we're hearing about is that the work is simply being dictated by the manufacturers in some cases with either no reimbursement for parts or drastic reductions in the hourly rate, 50 percent off, etc. Or just a negotiated flat rate dictated in the contract of the manufacturer. So as I mentioned earlier, I agree to sell that John Deere tractor and John Deere says that's great. If it breaks within a year you've got to fix it and here is how much we're going to pay you to fix it, because obviously the consumer isn't charged; it's warrantee work. And that rate that they're paid; let's say it's $50 an hour, might be half of what a non-warrantee claim for equipment might be on a piece of equipment out of -- out of warranty. And so that practice I think varies depending on where you are in the state, whose the manufacturer, what the equipment is. And so with respect to this kind of power equipment, this just sort of sets a baseline of both equipment reimbursement rate and hourly rate. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative MacLachlan.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I do thank the Chairman for his -- for his response. It's very helpful. So if I'm understanding correctly, we're not talking about pervasive market standard that's being corrected as the terms of a warranty are subject to what both parties agree upon but rather specific cases I'm sure that came up during the public hearing of equipment warranty -- or equipment suppliers and equipment dealers, particularly equipment dealers I'm assuming, feeling like they're kind of getting the short end of the stick. Is that -- am I on the right track here, Mr. Speaker through you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

I think that's perfectly. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative MacLachlan.
REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the Chairman. You know reading through some of the equipment -- or I'm sorry, some of the public hearing testimony I was looking at the -- I was reading through the testimony of the Association of Equipment Manufacturers submitted to try to just get up to speed. You know they talked about you know warranties being you know mutually agreed upon in order to share the responsibilities and duties between supplier and dealer. Through you Mr. Speaker, would the good Chairman help me understand what those duties and responsibilities, those shared duties and responsibilities between dealer and manufacturer are and the way they impact the consumer. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the idea is obviously to make this as seamless as possible to the consumer who doesn't see any of this work, just
wants their equipment fixed. The manufacturer
obviously has to supply the right parts for the --
for the warranty work being done. And you know this
-- whether it's a specific part that's a one-off
breakage or a more systemic issue that a
manufacturer might have, that is the manufacturer's
responsibility with respect to those core equipment
-- pieces. And then obviously the dealer's
responsibility in doing the dealer work is to be the
front face to the consumer, intake the product, make
sure that's done on a timely manner and then of
course make sure that it's -- it's adequately fixed
using the product -- the equipment provided by the
manufacturer. So the two are supposed to work hand
in glove so this is a seamless process for the
consumer so they get their piece of equipment back
up and running. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative MacLachlan.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I -- and I do
appreciate that. I do appreciate that -- that
response. It certainly helps me in my understanding on where I think this -- this Bill is going and the ends that it looks to achieve. So should I -- is it safe to assume then that -- that the Amendment that we have before us does reflect the suggestions or at least in part, some of the suggestions that the manufacturers have made reflective in some of their public hearing testimony? Do you know that the -- the Association of Equipment Manufacturers did put forward some sort of sample legislation as part of a proposed compromise, without having read through that proposed compromise, is it safe to say that their -- their feedback has been taken into account in whatever compromises have been made? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you. I can promise the Representative that that is indeed the case. The instructions to all the parties here was, if even one manufacturer had an issue we weren't going to be moving forward
with this. So this represents a compromise for all the parties, the dealers and the manufacturers who were at the -- at the table. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative MacLachlan.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate and I want to thank the Chairman for his patience and entertaining my questions and helping me understand the aim of this Amendment and how it will impact the underlying Bill -- becoming the underlying Bill and I just think it's really important that we continue to listen very closely and intently to the manufacturing community and the -- the key to Connecticut's economic growth will be high-tech -- in the high-tech world and that includes high-tech manufacturing. And so I would encourage us to continue taking their -- taking their feedback into account. I want to thank Representative Orange for obviously her efforts. She certainly is a force of nature in this body and -- and I appreciate the opportunity to speak and better understand better
understand this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will you remark further? Will you remark further on Amendment before us? If not I will try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying Aye.

ALL:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Opposed, nay. The Ayes have it and the Amendment is adopted. (Gavel) Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I just want to echo what the Chairman of General Law said, the -- and with regard to Representative MacLachlan's question. The proposed legislation very closely follows that compromise suggested by the Association of Equipment Manufacturers. In fact it is not quite verbatim and I can attest to the many, many hours spent between these small supply -- small retailers and the
equipment manufacturers to reach this compromise. I do have one question about the Bill as amended. I understand part of the Bill as amended relates to also some input from the Department of Consumer Protection who wanted to make sure we were doing this appropriately. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker. Yes, the DCP has also reviewed this and was comfortable with the language. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you. So again, I -- I also through you, Mr. Speaker. In our discussions we do actually set a definition of what power equipment is? I know Representative Dubitsky asked about did it apply to large farm machinery and as a sort of Noves at this, I would not have classed large tractors as in the same category as snow blowers or lawnmowers.
Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker. We -- we do not. I think we'll leave that to DCP to figure out if there's a reg that's necessary or not to carve that out. I'm happy to have that discussion going forward. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I welcome the questions from my colleagues. I want to thank the Chairman for his work on this and that the two parties were willing to create a compromise that they seem happy with. And as I said, it was also a request from a member of my caucus, Representative Petit who had been approached by his dealers. So I would urge my members to support this Bill as amended. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats. The machine will be open. (Ringing)

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

CLERK:

House Bill 5267 as amended by House B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those Voting Nay 5
Those Absent not Voting 4

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Bill as amended is passed. (Gavel) Are there any announcements or introductions?

Representative Genga.

REP. GENGA (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I have the honor today to have some guests here who are Adult Education Award winners from the State of Connecticut. Along with them from East Hartford, please raise your hand: Anthony Mangiafico, Director of Adult Ed in East Hartford. The Teacher of the Year from East Hartford is Carmen Goals, Carmen. Student of the Year who’s from East Hartford, Hala Mashour along with her family and also from New London, Betty Alnbroise and from East Connecticut Regional Adult Education Evan Donlon. And I’d ask the House to please give them its normal warm welcome. (Applause)

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you very much and welcome to the People's
House. Are there any further announcements or introductions? Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise for the purpose of an introduction. Over here some more adult learners. Behind me, Tom Oxman from Manchester Adult Ed; Tom a 27-year actuary at Aetna, retired and has given his time. He is being recognized as the Educator of the Year for Manchester Adult Ed. With him, his student Afansi Abeniniganidrissou who is from the country of Toga and is also a student at Manchester Adult Ed. I'd also like to recognize Lorraine Ouellette of Wallingford who is the Educator of the Year. And we also have Jody Huzina from Danbury who is the Program Facilitator there in Danbury and is being recognized for the Leadership Award from the Western Connecticut Regional Adult and Continuing Education. So if you can give them all please a warm welcome to the House today. (Applause)

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

We'd like to welcome you as well for visiting
the People's House. Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise the purposes of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

    Please proceed, ma'am.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very honored and proud today to have my dad visiting the State House and my dad and my mom were both an inspiration for me to get involved in public service. My dad was in public service for a number of years, worked in the White House under President Jimmy Carter and then also served on the Broadcasting Board of Governors overseeing radio for Europe under George W. Bush, so has served in both parties. And as we're standing here in the middle today I have to say; he was a democrat when he was younger and switched to become a republican; we lost him for a few years (laughing) and now he's back in the middle and independent. So I want to welcome him to the Capital today.

(Applause)
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

We're very glad to welcome such a distinguished gentleman and a family member. And beyond that, just a father. And we know how important that is. Thank you for visiting with us today. And -- that's right, and a grandfather. Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a Point of Personal Privilege?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Mr. Speaker I'd like to give this Chamber an update. Public Act 17-2 that we passed a couple of years ago is coming to fruition and that is repairing and replacing people's crumbling foundation. Today Representative Kurt Vail and I were at the home when the family was able to move back into that home after the foundation was replaced. This is the first one of that landmark legislation that we -- that we passed and the McClouskey family asked if we -- Kurt Vail and I --
Representative Vail and I would pass along the thanks for restoring their home and restoring their lives, to this body. So I bring that message to this body and the first one through the CFSIC fund, the Crumbling Foundations Securities and Indemnity Company has replaced the very -- the very first foundation. As we know, there's going to be thousands replaced through the good work of this body and the signature by Governor Malloy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. (Applause)

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you for the update, Representative Ackert. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 477?

CLERK:

On page 67, Calendar No. 477, Substitute House Joint Resolution No. 77. RESOLUTION GRANTING THE CLAIMS COMMISSIONER AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO DISPOSE OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE STATE PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 53 OF THE GENERAL STATUTES. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Blumenthal, you have the floor.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution. Representative Blumenthal, you have the floor.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is our annual Bill considering the request for extension of the Claims Commissioner. This Resolution deals with 80 claims. The Judiciary Committee recommends that an extension be granted for consideration of all of them. So I urge this Chamber to support the Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you very much. Would you care to remark further? Representative Cummings of the 74th from
In the great city of Waterbury, you have the floor ma'am.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I also urge my colleagues to vote in support of this to give an extension to the 80 claims that still need to be heard by the Claims Commissioner. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you. Will you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the Resolution before us? Representative Smith, you have the floor sir.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Mr. Speaker, thank you. Just a quick question through you to the proponent of the Resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Thank you. I know in the years past we've had a request like this for extensions of time and certainly times they're reasonable and needed and I
I suppose that would be the case here. I'm just -- I know the Judiciary Committee has tried to get a hold on these claims to make sure that they're actually heard in a timely fashion because it benefits all parties, the states and the claimants as well and I'm just wondering what the cause of the delay is and why so many claims are being delayed. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Blumenthal.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, and I -- I appreciate the good Representative's question. The backlog was caused by a number of structural factors in the Claims Commissioner's office, specifically with regards to her authorities and her abilities to dispose of claims. We actually passed a Bill out of this Chamber earlier this session that will allow her to streamline some of those processes and hopefully have less of a need to request such extensions in the future. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

And just one final question. Is the -- is the backlog the result of a lack of personnel or is there a need for additional counsel to handle these claims? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Blumenthal.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, there is of yet no need for additional personnel. With regard to the personnel, one of the causes of the backlog was that although the Commissioner employees Magistrate, she was the sole authority in making decisions on these claims. So the Magistrates could make a recommendation to her but then she had to essentially go through the claims by herself over and over again for each one. So one of the reforms we've made is to the Claims Commissioner's authority through the Bill that we passed out in this Chamber earlier in the session is that those Magistrate -- Magistrates have the authority to make those
decisions based on her delegated authority. And while she can intervene and correct them, she does not have to individually decide and deliberate on each case.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

I thank the good Vice-Chair for the explanation. It certainly makes sense and hopefully the reforms that we passed earlier in the session will help this backlog. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Resolution before us? If not, the staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take their seats. The machine will be open. (Ringing)

CLERK:

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

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

CLERK:

House Joint Resolution 77.

Total Number Voting 147
Necessary for Passage 74
Those Voting Yea 147
Those Voting Nay 0
Absent not Voting 4

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Resolution is adopted. (Gavel) Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 197?

CLERK:
On page 15, Calendar No. 197, Substitute House Bill No. 7221, AN ACT CONCERNING WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS. Favorable Report of Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Public Employees.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Hall.

REP. J. HALL (7TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of Bill. Representative Hall, you have the floor sir.

REP. J. HALL (7TH):

Yes. The Bill which requires the Labor Department in conjunction with the State's Workforce Investment Boards to conduct a study of programs for Connecticut's job seekers. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative -- Will you remark further on
the Bill? Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. How are you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Great, great.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Good to see you up there.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Good to see you as well.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Through you, just a few questions for the proponent of the Bill. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. Does this Bill have a fiscal note attached to it? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Hall.

REP. J. HALL (7TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. No, it does not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Thank you to the good Vice-Chair and through you, Mr. Speaker. Does -- does this Bill require any additional services through workforce development heads in the state? Any you know, exhaustion of resources or extra funding needed to complete this study? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Hall.

REP. J. HALL (7TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. No, it does not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Thank you. And through you, was there any testimony opposed?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Hall.

REP. J. HALL (7TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. No, there was not.
Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

And I thank the good Representative for his answers to my questions. I will be voting in the affirmative. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Betts. You have the floor sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Good afternoon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have one question, through you to the -- to the proponent. Is there any reason why we have to pass a law to have this worked done? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Hall.

REP. J. HALL (7TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. It seems that the -- currently under federal audits through the Department of Labor that some of this work is required, however, not all of it is and so this Bill was aimed to capture all of that information. Through you Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much. I certainly support it, so am I to understand that administratively the parts that are not currently required could not be done administratively without the passage of this law? 'Cause I would think that the Department of Labor has the ability or the capacity to be able to capture everything that's in this Bill. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Hall.

REP. J. HALL (7TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. That may be possible.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Okay, thank you very much for that answer. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will you remark further on the Bill. Will you
remark further on the Bill? If not, will staff and
guests please come to the well of the House? Will
the members please take your seats. The machine
will be open. (Ringing)

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

CLERK:

House Bill 7221.

<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>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Absent not Voting

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
The Bill passes. (Gavel) Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative McGee.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):
Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
And for what purpose do you rise?

REP. MCGEE (5TH):
I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Please proceed, sir.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):
Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I am delighted to stand here with my colleague, Representative Josh Hall. He's kind of short behind all of these young people and the rest of the Hartford delegation to welcome Mothers Against Violence United. I probably said that wrong. Mothers United Against Violence, there we go. And
they also have their Youth Impact Students that represent thousands of young people in the City of Hartford. We also have my little cousin here. He's a part of this group, Mr. Travis Terry. He is here for the summer from Clark Atlanta University with a 4.0 and I'm extremely proud of him. But if this -- this August body, if you would be so kind to please stand and give my guests -- our guests a round of applause. Thank you so much. (Applause)

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Always good to have guests visit and especially when they're family. We hope that you enjoy your visit here. Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed, ma'am.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, behind me are young women, men and women from the Boys and Girls Club. They are the Youth of the Year. Since
1947 Youth of the Year has been the Boys and Girls Club of Americas Primary Recognition Program -- Prime -- I'm sorry, Premier celebrating extraordinary achievements of club members. The Youth of the Year members embody the values of leadership and service, academic excellence, and healthy lifestyles. They are examples of the critical impact that the Boys & Girls Clubs have on the lives of young people.

I would like to introduce the 15 Youth of the Year from the birthplace of the Boys & Girls Club movement, our very own State of Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the Chamber to be quiet so that I can introduce these young people, young men and women.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

(Gavel) Can we please take any unnecessary conversations outside the Chamber? Representative Miller is about to introduce some very important guests, members of the Boys and Girls Club, which are going to be our future leaders. You may proceed, ma'am.
REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So behind me I have Tyrese Gallant. He's from the Boys & Girls Club of Waterbury. Michael Rincon from Greenwich. Xavier Arocho from Meriden, Joseph Marchionni from Milford, Marez Manuel Benitez IV New Britain, Jesse Campbell from New Haven, Maureen Ferrer from Stamford. Yay Stamford! Nevaeh Sorrentino from Lower Naugatuck Valley, Aracelis Figuero from Hartford, Stanley Cardona from Bristol, Kelsey Lynn Morales from Naval Submarine Base; yes Kelsey, Renee Cauchon of Ridgefield, Caitlin Trutnau from Ulbrich. I don't know where that is Caitlin. Rory Smith from Wakeman, Colin Holm-Hansen from Redding-Easton. Will the Chamber please rise and welcome our young future leaders of tomorrow. (Applause)

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you. We always like to welcome the future leaders from the Boys and Girls Club. Would the Clerk please call Calendar No. 526?

CLERK:

On page 50, House Calendar 526, Substitute
House Bill No. 7222, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DUTIES OF
THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL. Favorable
Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom. We're trying to
continue with business here. Can you please take
any of those conversations outside while we plan to
go forward? Thank you. Representative Stafstrom,
you have the floor.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Clerk
should be in procession of an Amendment, LCO 8794.
I ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and I
be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 8794, which is designated House Amendment Schedule A.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 8794, offered by Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, this is a strike-all Amendment which will become the Bill. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to -- no. The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark further on the -- on the Amendment?

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that comes to us from the Office of the Attorney General after significant discussions with all stakeholders including our business community, municipalities, members and leadership of the
various Chambers. And what the Bill seeks to do is to clarify and to codify into Connecticut law the authority and the duties the Attorney General has with respect to prosecuting civil, not criminal, just civil, civil rights, hate crime and bigotry offenses within our state. The Bill as mentioned has gone through several iterations and redrafting thanks to input during the Committee process as well as before us today and the latest Amendment I believe incorporates feedback we've heard from various stakeholders on this.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this Bill in today's society I think should be evident that as we continue to see a prevalence of bigotry, hate crimes, patterns and practice of violations of civil rights within our society it is important that Connecticut join the 22 other states in the country that allow their Attorney General some type of ability to bring civil actions and seek redress for these violations; and particularly the most serious violations when they are brought to the Attorney General's attention and the full weight and
authority of the State of Connecticut and the Office of the Attorney General be used to bring those actions. I urge support.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will you remark on the Amendment?

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a few questions through you to the good Chairman regarding the Amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed, ma'am.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Even before I start with my questions, I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank the good Chairman as well as the Attorney General's office and as the good Chairman had indicated, all the stakeholders for their input in the product that we have before us. So through you Mr. Speaker to the good Chairman, I believe the good Chairman had indicate -- had indicated that there are several states in the
United States that does allow similar powers to the Attorney General in statute. Does the good Chairman know approximately how many? Through you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the amount and particulars of the authority vary but my understanding is there's somewhere in the neighborhood of 22 states that allow some sort of civil, civil rights enforcement by the Attorney General in those particular states. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, Mr. Speaker out of those say, let's say approximately 20 or so states that have through statute allowed the Attorney General to have these civil actions, do we have any idea whether or not those states have a department that we have, CHRO? Through you Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Report Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. Every state in the union either has some equivalent to the CHRO or has the Federal EEOC, which is responsible for adjudicating individual -- generally individual claims that are brought against particular actors. So I guess that's a long way of saying, through you Mr. Speaker, that I believe all of those states would have something comparable to the CHRO. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you Mr. Speaker, why is it that we have this proposal before us? What's the purpose? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think
there's several purposes. I think first and foremost we have seen certainly -- if not a heightened number of instances of bigoted and bias actions and patterns of practice of civil rights violations. We certainly have seen an increased focus and emphasis in public awareness on those types of incidences occurring in Connecticut and elsewhere. As the Ranking Member probably recalls about two years ago this body took a significant step forward in beefing up our hate crimes laws and so this Bill before us would allow some sort of mechanism for the Attorney General's office to enforce some of those laws.

I think the other primary reason we have this before us is depending on who you ask, this is either new authority for the Attorney General, it's a codification of the authority the Attorney General already has or some might even suggest it's a limiting of the authority that the Attorney General has by specifically setting forth in statute what the bounds of the Attorney General, civil, civil rights enforcement is. And so for that reason, I
think it's an important Bill so that we set those parameters in the statute. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you Mr. Speaker. Under normal circumstances if an individual felt that their civil rights were violated typically they would contact CHRO for that. Is there any change in the process in the proposal before us? Would that individual still be able to contact CHRO? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Report Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker through you. They absolutely would be and in fact having sat in discussions with the Attorney General's office as well as the CHRO on this Bill, there's some specific language in this Bill and some specific protections for CHRO that are built into the Bill specifically at their suggestion and with the blessing of the Attorney General's office. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you Mr. Speaker, if an individual were to go on the Attorney General's website and I believe under this proposal there's a requirement providing information regarding CHRO on the Attorney General's website. Through you Mr. Speaker, if the good Chairman could just highlight, what is the requirement that the Attorney General has to do regarding information on CHRO on its website? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Report Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I would direct the good Ranking Member to lines 82 through 86 of the Bill that specifies the Attorney General shall post on its website information on the proper filing of a complaint with the CHRO. I would also note that certainly if an individual were to call into the Attorney General's office and say you know, I believe I have a claim against my employer or some
other actor for deprivation of my civil rights or
discrimination or the like, certainly it -- what's
represented to us during the hearing process and as
well as the negotiation of this Bill, that the
Attorney General's office will inform its
constituent management staff that when those calls
come in, that while the Attorney General's office
may look at that claim and decide whether its
something it wants to act on given the filing
requirements for CHRO, they will advise that person
to make sure to reach out to CHRO as well. And so I
think actually as public awareness of this mechanism
by the Attorney General's office grows and the
Attorney General's office fields some of these
calls, they could be a good funnel of proper claims
to the CHRO under the mechanisms set forth here.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

    Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you Mr.
Speaker, in the scenario you just provided that
someone would initially contact the Attorney's General office opposed to first contacting CHRO and the Attorney General's office initially looks into it and they may encourage them to contact CHRO, is it conceivable that we would have the Attorney General's office as well as CHRO investigating the same complaint? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While that may in fact be conceivable, I believe certainly there's -- there will be a level of coordination and communication between CHRO and the Attorney General's office. Certainly the Attorney General's office under this Bill is looking at only the most severe, pervasive, systematic abuses and those would be the types of cases the Attorney General's office would focus on as opposed to CHRO focusing on the individual complaints. But certainly based on conversations we've had and suggestions that have been made by stakeholders on this, we've built some safeguards
into this Bill regarding making sure there's not two pending matters proceeding at the same time and delineating that if CHRO has a matter pending before it, that the Attorney General's office will not layer on a second suit on the same -- against the same parties, based on the same conduct. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you Mr. Speaker, is there anything in the proposal before us that would allow the Attorney General upon receiving a civil rights complaint to make the sole unilateral decision that the Attorney General's office would pursue the investigation and the prosecution of it without consulting or having a discussion regarding -- with CHRO regarding the alleged complaint. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Mr. Speaker, I'm not entirely sure I understand the question. If the question is, does the Attorney General in each and every instance have to consult with CHRO as a mandate of the Bill, no. But I suspect certainly in -- before the Attorney General's office is going to expend significant resources on a particular case, they're going to check in with CHRO and keep an open line of communication to make sure they're not duplicating efforts. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the flip side of that question, is there is complaints, civil rights related that an individual can file with CHRO and CHRO make the unilateral decision, well we're going to maintain this, investigate and prosecute if necessary without informing the Attorney General's office. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess my answer to that question will be the same that conceivably, yes CHFR could continue on. I would certainly expect and hope that if CHRO discovered a large scale pattern or practice of a particular actor depriving a set of individuals of their civil rights or otherwise engaging in some sort of bigotry or bias that it did not feel its office had the capacity or the where withal to take on, that they would call in the Attorney General to assist in that action as they could under existing law. But no, there's not a -- there's not a straight prohibition in the Bill. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly we are well aware that the Attorney General's office is a very busy office and you know, as time goes by we learn of new lawsuits that are either -- the Attorney General joins or
initiates. Regarding the proposal before us specifically, do we have any knowledge from the Attorney General's office or any knowledge whatsoever that this would require additional staff or funding to the Attorney General's office. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General was grilled on this question during the public hearing on this Bill and he represented to the Committee that he's not requesting any additional staff on this, that as folks probably know, the Attorney General's office is the largest law firm in the state of Connecticut. They have a bevy of lawyers over there and they will devote the resources they can based on their other case work to these types of matters. Certainly it is well understood I believe, that the Attorney General is not going to be able to take on every single claim where somebody claims that their civil rights have
been violated, that they will have to necessarily focus on sort of the most significant, most pervasive cases and devote the time and attention that they can within the existing staff and with the lawyers they have to that work. But the short answer to the Ranking Member's question is no, the Attorney General has not asked for additional resources resulting from this Bill. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker. The proposal before us, what type of investigative powers would the Attorney General have in the investigation of civil right allegations for complaints? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General under this Bill has subpoena power and investigatory power that is identical to the power it currently
has under our anti-trust statutes and those powers and duties are specifically set forth in the general statutes already in Section 35-42, so it is a mechanism and a discovery procedure which the office is already familiar with. We're not recreating a new subpoena or investigatory authority; we're merely extending the existing authority the AG has under the Anti-Trust Act to bigotry, bias and civil rights violation cases. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker. As the good Chairman had highlighted, certainly they can issue subpoenas and written interrogatories and appropriately in his introduction of the proposal before us, it was highlighted this was a civil action and not a criminal action. However, if the Attorney General's office in its investigation determines that they may actually have been provided with evidence or have knowledge, that there may be some type of criminal violation. Do they have the ability to share that information that they receive during discovery with
another department that may pursue criminal action through the same bad actor that's being investigated? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. No, they cannot under existing statutory and Constitutional authority, we have a split in our state where the Attorney General has civil duties. The States Attorney's office for the various geographical areas has criminal duties. There are prohibitions about what type of information they can share back and forth. We've actually sort of just out of an abundance of caution written into this Bill provisions that the information obtained pursuant to a subpoena or investigatory discovery cannot be shared with the State's Attorney. Certainly if the States Attorney discovers that information on their own, through their own investigations that would be allowable and you know, subject to the regular rules of evidence but here under the Bill the Attorney General cannot
simply turn over its file to the States Attorney. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker, while the Attorney General's office is in the, let's say the discovery investigative state and receiving all of the information, responses based on the subpoenas or the interrogatories that are issued; is there anything that precludes the States Attorney's office from at the same time doing their own investigation into any potential criminal violation? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And in fact, that's
current law. There's nothing again in this proposal that changes that. Just for clarification, is that correct? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. It is.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you Mr. Speaker, if the good Chairman wouldn't mind highlighting Section C regarding what type of damages the Attorney General can seek. I believe we had enumerated treble damages as well as a certain cap if the good Chairman wouldn't mind highlighting that? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Section 1(c) lines 16 through 25 of the Bill set forth the type
of damages that the Attorney General may recover. This particular section refers to the bias and bigotry crimes section. But under that section the Attorney General can recover any relief to which an individual in their own right may be entitled by law and that would include treble damages for those types of cases, which is already allowed under Connecticut General Statute 52-571(c) for private right of action. The Attorney General could also recover a civil penalty not to exceed $2,500 but he must establish such a violation by clear and convincing evidence, which is a higher evidentiary standard than -- than the normal civil standard. The normal civil standard is preponderance of the evidence. This is more the criminal standard of clear and convincing evidence. And in addition to that the Attorney General can also seek declaratory or injunctive or other equitable remedies. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you Mr. Speaker, just highlighting again the non-financial, non-monetary damages. The good Chairman had indicated equitable or declarative injunctive relief. In that regard are we also essentially saying that the Attorney General has the ability not to pursue monetary damages and maybe potentially could provide a warning or some other type of relief again that would not be monetary? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yeah, Mr. Speaker that's correct. Certainly there could be instances where they're not seeking a specific dollar payout. Let me, if I could let me give the type of example. Recently there was a case, California's Attorney General has a similar statutory power to what we're seeking here. And in the California example the Attorney General -- it was brought to the Attorney General of California's attention that the University of Southern
California, which is a private research university, was not providing campus transportation that was totally accessible for individuals with disabilities and that was out of compliance with both state and federal law in the California example. So the Attorney General there reached out, entered into a settlement agreement with the university that said, you need to take a certain number of steps in order to bring your campus-wide transportation system up to an acceptable level so that students with disabilities can properly access the system. In that case, it's my understanding there was no monetary request, there was no payout by the University of Southern California for the fact that it was engaging -- it wasn't living up to its statutory mandates but the Attorney General of California took a settlement agreement and said, if you come into compliance with any certain period of time based on taking these steps, then we will not pursue any further action. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.
REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General's office were certainly to investigate and then pursue an action and was successful in reaching a clear and convincing evidence standard and did find someone in violation and in fact there was a monetary damages that were pursued and certainly then successfully obtained by the Attorney General, what would happen to those funds? Where exactly do those funds go to? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. They would be deposited into the general fund.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And is that the legislative's general fund or the state general fund? Through you Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, yes. (Laughing)

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Touché. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you to the good Chairman. You know, a lot of people when we talk about the Attorney General's office investigating something on behalf of someone who filed a complaint, is the Attorney General's office actually representing that individual in a court of law or is the Attorney General bringing an action on behalf of the state? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. In that instance, the Attorney General is acting as the State of Connecticut, the plaintiff is the State of
Connecticut. I guess the -- the best example I could give would be not so dissimilar to a criminal action where a criminal action is brought in the name of the State of Connecticut against a particular actor. Certainly the victim of that crime is consulted by the States Attorney's office and the like, but the States Attorney's client in that instance is the actual State of Connecticut. Similar scenario here where the actual client would be the State of Connecticut bringing the action but certainly the grieved individuals would -- would be necessary component and be involved with the action based on the Attorney General having communications with them through the course of litigation. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

   Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker, I believe in our dialogue we did determine that it is possible that the Attorney General's office as well as CHRO may at least in the
investigative stages be preliminarily doing both the same work in the sense of investigating an issue probably in order to better determine who's going to handle it moving forward. Is there any possibility based on the same allegations of facts and circumstances that both the Attorney General and the CHRO can jointly bring an action? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, I guess could they both be the plaintiff in the same action? I don't know if it would work that way. I think the -- they could coordinate efforts and work together and share resources and share lawyers but I suspect at some point there would be a decision made, when the CHRO released jurisdiction on a claim and brings a claim in Superior Court, they usually bring it in the name of the Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities. That would be the named plaintiff. Here I believe the named plaintiff would be the
State of Connecticut. Could you have an instance where it's two plaintiffs? I supposed, but I think there would have to be a lead plaintiff in the case be that the State of Connecticut through the office of the Attorney General or the CHRO through its legal department. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker. Regarding the proposal that's before us, is there anything that prevents a private right of action that currently exists without this proposal? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

No. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker. Specifically in Section 2, it talks about the Attorney General's ability to investigate,
intervene and/or bring a civil or administrative action in any matter. If the good Chairman can highlight what that may look like? Is it possible then if CHRO decides to pursue something, would the Attorney General still have this ability to intervene if CHRO is bringing the action? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, through you Mr. Speaker. They would have the right to intervene in those types of actions pursuant to normal standing requirements and other - - whatever other intervention they would need to do within the Superior Court. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker. I believe in the proposal before us again there is a cap per defendant for any violation. If the good Chairman can highlight what they would be
monetarily? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

The cap, Mr. Speaker is she referring to the cap on the civil penalty? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The cap for a civil penalty is 200 -- 200 -- $2,500. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker. For example, if the Attorney General were not to pursue monetary damages and certainly let's say, some other type of relief, if that individual
again violates the request of the Attorney General; let's say if it was to discontinue doing something and then the Attorney General finds out that that individual continues to be in violation of what they've determined and engages in that action again; is there -- what could the Attorney General go? Is there another standard that's going to be looked at as a result of having already been found in violation by the Attorney General and instructed, could have been based on an agreement for example, to discontinue that action? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

   Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

   Yes, through you Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to lines 62 through 68 of the Bill, if the Attorney General investigates and finds a particular violation, reaches out to the violator and says you need to discontinue that type of activity; go back -- go back to my example of the ADA case in California against the University, if the University
had made promises to do certain things and the Attorney General had accepted an assurance that those things would be corrected that would be reduced to writing some type of settlement agreement or somethings the word we hear around here with other agencies is consent order; that -- that document would then be used to enforce that. If the violator then violated that agreement then it would prim facia evidence that the underlying violation had occurred in the first instance. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you Mr. Speaker. Based on the proposal before us is the Attorney General still under the obligation to follow the statute of limitations in the state of Connecticut? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, through you Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned
at the outset there is -- this Bill before us creates no new statutory mandates or requirements with respect to civil rights or bigotry or bias. It merely creates an enforcement mechanism and allows the Attorney General to be the enforcer. So there needs to be an underlying statutory violation in which the Attorney General is pursuing a cause of action on. Whatever that underlying cause of action is, the statute of limitations for that underlying cause of action is the statute of limitations that governs an action that would be brought by the Attorney General pursuant to this Bill. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker. If a civil rights complaint is brought and the individual making the allegation is a state employee, who exactly would that be handled by the Attorney General's office?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. It depends whether the state employee is acting within the scope and authority of their duties. Under existing law, I believe it's Connecticut General Statute 5-141, the Attorney General has a duty and an obligation to defend and indemnify state employees when they're acting within their official capacity, acting within the scope and authority of their office. If an employee is acting within the scope of its office, they're entitled to defense and indemnification by the Attorney General. In that instance they are a client of the Attorney General and as such, the Attorney General could not bring an action against them in the name of the state pursuant to this Bill. The only actions that could be brought would be those brought by the Attorney General against a state employee acting outside of their capacity or office. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.
REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker. Certainly for a layman thinking common sense, if an individual state employee, even in an action outside of the scope of their work and the Attorney General has the ability to bring that action, wouldn't there be still a conflict of interest that the Attorney General may have information already previously regarding that state employee that may certainly put the Attorney Generals at an advantage in the prosecution and an example can certainly even be an employee that works within the Attorney General's office. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I believe those are case by case situations and the Attorney General's office would be bound by the rules of professional conduct with respect to those types of instances and there would need to be an analysis undertaking of
whether the Attorney General can be on both sides of the case or not pursuant to rules of professional conduction, particularly rules 1.7 and 1.8. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker. And would that analysis also be similar if it was within this scope and certainly again using the same hypothetical that it's someone within the Attorney General's office? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The analysis would be similar although I would submit that certainly someone who is acting within their official capacity and was to be sued for acting within their official capacity would be a current client of the Attorney General's office and pursuant to rule 1.7, I can't see a situation where the Attorney General would be
allowed pursuant to the language of this Bill because they're suing in the name of the state, to bring that action against that individual acting within the scope of their office. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr. Speaker. Just for purposes again of clarification. Currently, if we didn't have this proposal before us and there was an allegation of a civil rights complaint, would the Attorney General's office still have the ability right now to investigate and pursue an action? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That -- the answer to that question is unclear to me and I believe that's part of the impetus for this Bill before us is what are the bounds of the Attorney General's authority with respect to investigating those types of
activities and if and when can the Attorney General bring suit in its own right. So I would submit part -- as I mentioned, part of the rationale for this Bill is to make that authority crystal clear and set the bounds of that authority in our statutes. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to thank the good Chairman for all of his responses and I think you know the point of the fact that there is not a sense of clarity and certainly some people actually say the Attorney General already has the ability, others say maybe, maybe not or maybe it might be restricted in some way; there has been request to make essentially carve-outs. Exclude people that would be subject to an investigation based on the proposal before us. There's been discussions of excluding state employees, excluding municipalities, excluding police officer, law enforcement and again it's not that any one of those
individuals think in their mind, well it's okay if I were to act badly. It's just you know, unfortunately when you look at the big picture and you do know that it's the Attorney General's office that's pursuing something and as the good Chairman had indicated, it's the largest law firm in the state of Connecticut. It certainly has the resources of the state of Connecticut financially to pursue something, that there is a sense of whether -- an actual sense or a psychological sense that this is a disadvantaged individual that will be going up against the Attorney General's office. So essentially for right reasons, the wrong reasons, someone just may decide, listen I'm not going to go down this road because even the investigative process could take years. And without even finding me guilty, if I'm going to take it upon myself to have to defend myself even in the discovery process, I'm going to go bankrupt.

And then in a situation regarding municipality, that essentially any bankruptcy is going to be as a result of obviously it's going to go back on the
Residents of the state of Connecticut to have to fund that money for the defense. So there's a sense of pressure and again, whether unduly or appropriately, of I better settle. The consequence there is whether or not individuals making that decision based on actual guilt or the fact that they actually want to maintain some type of financial stability and not have to defend themselves on what they believe is a fraudulent claim, but one that would be costly none the less.

So again, there are some concerns regarding the proposal before us and there are people on both sides that say, well the Attorney General could have done this already. No, they couldn't. The CHRO had this ability and again, the CHRO as strong in rules and regulations that they have, it's certainly very different than having the Attorney General's office involved in the case. So there are still some concerns and unanswered questions in that regard. So certainly I hope that everyone would still maintain an open mind during the dialogue. None the less one thing is for certain, Mr. Speaker and I
just want to be able to again highlight that I appreciate all of the individuals including the Attorney General's office that had discussions prior to this and that lead to the Amendment that's before us and I want to take the opportunity to thank them for that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you Representative Rebimbas. Representative O'Dea. Okay. We're going to call on Representative Smith. You have the floor, sir.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know I sat through the Judiciary hearings and the Committee meetings so I'm somewhat versed in this area and somewhat knowledgeable. I've listened to the discourse and the exchange that just took place and I just have a few questions left that are unclear in my mind if I could ask those? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

So I understand this is a codification of the
existing law, at least that's what being represented to us. I'm just wondering, has anybody challenged the Attorney General's right to actually bring these actions? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to be clear. I'm not representing that this is a codification of existing law. What I'm suggesting is I think reasonable minds can disagree as to where the limits of the Attorney General's authority are in this area. So this could be, as I think I said, this could be a codification, it could be an expansion or it could be seen by some as restricting the Attorney General's authority but I think what we are doing here is setting -- setting into statute exactly what the Attorney General's authority in this type of preceding is, so I don't want -- I don't want the Representative to misunderstand me as representing that this is a codification. It may well could be, but I think certainly many folks could differ and
certainly depending on the Attorney General in office and how they view their authority and the like it could be anywhere in that gamut. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Just to followup and I appreciate the clarification. Has the Attorney General then -- office -- has his office been challenged on his ability to bring these types of claims? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I'm not aware of any instances like that. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

And just finally, I see in the various sections of the Bill, some of the awards if the Attorney
General's office is successful would go to the claimant. Some of the awards would go to the Attorney General's office. Well it would actually go back to the general fund. And I'm just wondering why there is a difference in the -- in the two different scenarios. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I think there's two different monetary penalties allowed. I think one is the recovery of damages, whatever those damages may be to the individual effected and double or treble if those are allowed by statute. And then in addition to that there's a type of civil penalty or I guess you -- I hesitate to use the word punitive damage but a civil penalty in addition to the actual damages suffered that would -- could be recovered by the Attorney General and that amount would go back to the general fund. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Smith.
REP. SMITH (108TH):

So I'm looking at Subsection 3 and I know the Ranking Member and you've discussed this section and it talks about treble damages with the possibility of the awarded Treble damages, which is certainly the -- it's not unusual in these types of claims to be awarded Treble damages but I see in that Subsection C it does go back to the general fund. So I'm thinking to myself, if -- if an individual has been the victim of these types of claims, I would much rather see the victim receive those Treble damages as opposed to the money going to the general fund. I'm just wondering if we could clarify why that is. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. That's not how I read the language of this. I see in lines 18 to 19 that the persons affected by the violation would be -- would be eligible for any relief to which that person may be entitled that law including Treble
damages, treble damages going to the person affected; a civil penalty not to exceed $250,000 and then the clarification later on in that section that that civil penalty would be deposited into the general fund. So if it's not clear in the statute, hopefully it will be clear in the Bill and hopefully it will be abundantly clear in the legislative history that the Treble damages would go back to the person effected, the victim and the amount that would go into the general fund would be limited to the civil penalty. And I believe in fact the fiscal note that's been put forward on this Bill by the Office of Fiscal Analysis recognizes that distinction as well. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

I thank the good Chairman for the clarification. So the civil penalty we're talking about would be the $2500; am I correct? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. That's correct.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

And lastly --

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Yes? You may proceed.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you. Just gathering my thoughts, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes I wander in my thoughts and I'm just trying to bring them back. (Laughter) Just lastly, through you Mr. Speaker. Can an individual -- private individual bring a claim under our current statutes at the same time that the Attorney General is bringing an identical claim? I think it was talked about between the Chairman and the Ranking Member, but I just want to clarify that. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. If the question is can an individual pursue their own claim while an Attorney General's claim is simultaneously proceeding, conceivably they could under the language of the Bill. There's no prohibition against an individual pursuing their own claim, however, if they're basically receiving free legal assistance from the Office of the Attorney General, I suspect that they would avail themselves of that opportunity. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

I know I would. You know how those lawyers charge. (Laughing) Anyway, I know the -- I think we have to adopt the Amendment so I'll reserve any further questions until later on. Thank you and thank you for the answers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

ALL:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Opposed, nay? The Ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. (Gavel) Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to thank the -- the Chair and the Ranking for the bipartisan work on this. It took a lot of effort and I greatly appreciate it. A couple of questions. I want to focus on lines 62 to 68 on the bill as amended. To the good proponent, through you Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding the intent of this section is not for the AG to use this assurance letter or agreement as a way to track employers but rather as a way to avoid litigation and take corrective action for the employer short of litigation. Is that correct? Through you Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. That's correct. The analogy I gave before and that the question you may be familiar with would be similar to the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection entering into a consent order or consent decree where somebody is agreeing not to do something, assuming there's no violation of that agreement and that assurance then there would be no need for any further action by the Attorney General's office. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I can't let that go on the legislature rec without stating how opposed I am to the DEEP being able to pull out unilateral of consent orders. I've been working on this for years in trying to eliminate the caveats but I understand the good little needle there was well played. (Laughing) And just for the record, I
envision a case where say, an employer has an employment practice on their application that the AG's office or some individual who tried to get employed, wasn't employed, brings a claim against -- with the CHRO and it's a disparate impact type case where the employer says, I did nothing wrong. This is our normal form that we have for propose -- potential employees. The AG steps in because there have been numerous employees -- potential employers involved. In that scenario where you've got both the CHRO and the AG's office involved, is it fair to say that if you're negotiating as an employer, the AG's office would take the lead in that negotiation process? Through you Mr. Speaker.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

(Crosstalk)

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

My apologies, Mr. Speaker. Through you, yes. It would be my expectation that certainly in that case based on the -- the sheer magnitude and volume
of attorneys and where with all the Attorney General's office that they would be the ones to take the lead in that type of instance. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And in a disparate impact type case like we've talked about, say the employer agrees to take that question out of their - - their employment application. In line 62 to 68 I envision a situation where that employer might say, listen we want to avoid litigation but I'm not going to agree that we taking this out should be a Prima facie proof of a violation. I've seen not consent order agreements with DEEP, but consent order agreements with others where you've got parties that you can carve out certain situations and would you foresee the ability to carve out the -- the Constitution of Prima facie in a type of letter agreement where the employer says, look I don't believe that there was a disparate impact but I'll agree to take this out but I don't want you to be
able to use the fact that I'm taking this out in this scenario as Prima facie proof of the disparate impact. Do you foresee that being able to be done, you know in the negotiating process? Through you Mr. Speaker. If my question -- if my question makes sense. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yeah, thank you Mr. Speaker. Let me try to break down and reassure the question or -- in the following ways. First, I -- I was joking. I don't foresee of this as being in any way similar to how DEEP currently uses consent orders. I think that if there's an assurance given by the Attorney General's office that that is a -- that is a bicameral or two party agreement and then neither party would be able to pull out unilaterally, so let me give that assurance to begin with.

But second of all, I think obviously the terms of that assurance would be documented and would be understood and in the situation that the questioner
gave, that if the -- you know if the employer said you know what, we'll remove question 17 from our employment application, we won't use it again; if that question didn't show up on future employment applications then there wouldn't be an issue. I think the only issue would be -- would arise is if six months later after giving the assurance to the Attorney General, that employer then came back and put the -- employee -- put that question 17 back onto its application intentionally then in that instance then -- then yes, certainly the Attorney General could bring an enforcement action under that scenario. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Fair enough. Not to peel the onion further but -- but let's suppose a supervisor accidentally uses an old form in the employment application; obviously there was no intent there to deceive the AG's office. It was an old form that some supervisor improperly utilized. My point is simply, I want to
make sure or clarify that in one of these assurance letters parties agreeing with the AG's office can say, look I want to avoid -- I'll take out this question but I don't want the fact that I'm taking this question out to be utilized at a later date of prima facie proof of a violation. So if the AG office agrees, okay -- I guess my question is, is it possible that this section, the AG's office might way and say, okay I understand what you're saying. We won't use this as prima facie evidence in this kind of disparate impact case because you dispute it -- I'm not saying the AG's office is going to do this all the time but it's a possibility going forward in negotiations that this section could be carved out in any agreement. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative O'Dea.
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That's all the questions I have. I want to thank again the good Chair and the Ranking Member for their hard work on this compromise Bill and I plan on voting for it at the conclusion of this discussion. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Candelora, you have the floor sir.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And good afternoon.

Good afternoon.

I'm -- I guess my first general question if I may through you, is we heard dialogue of the underlying premises of this Bill is to investigate sort of the severe and pervasive cases of various civil rights violations. Can the proponent point to me where that intent is encompassed in this Bill? Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I would direct the questioner to -- first to lines 37 and 38 where it specifically refers to a person has engaged in a pattern, any practice or pattern of conduct thus necessarily indicating there's been more than one instance, it's a pattern or -- or pract -- practice or pattern of conduct and not an isolated incident. I would also point the proponent to lines 39 and to 43, which use the term persons in the plural indicating that the person -- that there needs to e more than one person who has been subjected to this pattern or practice of unlawful conduct. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so that language which enables the Attorney General to bring you know actions, does it therefore then relate back to
Section 1 which sort of seems to be the enabling language for subpoenas to be issued and for an actual civil action to be brought? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. No, I actually read Sections 1 and Section 2 of the Bill as almost separable from each other. I believe under Section 1 there needs to be a specific violation of one -- of one specific statute and that being at 53a-181j which talks about crimes of bigotry and bias. This is our Hate Crime Statute. And if -- in various degrees. The three statutes enumerated there in line 5 are basically hate crime in the first degree, the second degree and the third degree. If someone commits what is -- what can be categorized as a hate crime, that could be one instance against one person. In that instance the Attorney General absolutely has the right to bring a civil action in the name of the State of Connecticut based on that one instance and that one episode that constitutes a
hate crime and I would certainly submit that -- that the Attorney General should have that authority. You know I'm thinking of unfortunately perhaps the tragic example that just happened in New Haven a couple of days ago.

Section 2 I believe has -- is a little broader in the terms of which kind of cases can be brought. Under Section 2, sort of any underlying civil rights case, any other cause of action that might constitute a right privilege or immunity guaranteed by state or federal law or the Constitution can be brought, but it can't be for one discreet violation of those laws. It needs to be a pattern of practice of violation of any of those laws against multiple people. So I guess that's a long way of saying Mr. Speaker, under Section 1 of the Bill it could be one discreet act against one discreet person but the circumstances in which the case can be brought are extremely narrow. Under Section 2, it's a little broader. There needs to be a clear pattern or practice against multiple people. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so I want to focus a little bit on Section 1 then. Under our current law, if there's an individual who is a victim of a hate crime, do they currently have a private cause of action if there's a violation against them under the laws that are enumerated in lines 5? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, if the questioner could just rephrase that question. I missed the beginning of it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Sure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is that if an individual -- if a victim, if someone has been a victim of violations that are outline or enumerated, I guess it would be lines like 17
through 18, those statutory provisions dealing with the hate crimes. Under current law does an individual have a right to bring a civil action for damages on their own if they are a victim? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker through you. Just -- just to be clear. So the -- if the questioner looks at lines 17 to 18, Connecticut General Statutes 53a-181j, k and l are actually criminal statutes and criminal violations of our hate crimes laws.

Currently under law, Connecticut General Statute 52-571c provides a private right of action for an individual to bring a civil claim where there has been a criminal violation under one of those statutes. What Section 1 of this Bill does is merely allow the Attorney General with -- in the name of the State of Connecticut to bring that civil action where there has been an underlying violation of criminal law under one of those three statutes.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I also read this section that the Attorney General in line 16 and 17 could actually sort of bring the action for the benefit of that person and I think Representative Smith had pointed out or talked about the issue of getting relief for that individual, you know potentially with treble damages, etc. So in this situation -- in this paragraph 16-25, are we effectively then not only allowing the Attorney General to bring a cause of action on behalf of the state but area they also bringing a cause of action on behalf of that individual as well? And my question specifically is, trying to understand the distinction of, for the benefit of the person versus representing that person. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you Mr. Speaker. The -- as I mentioned, the client is the State of Connecticut. The state is ultimately bringing the action and the Attorney General's client is the people of the State of Connecticut in that instance. But they are seeking redress on behalf of a particular individual or individuals who have been subject to a particular hate crime and are seeking redress and vindication for that offense. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I ask the question because I just imagine there could be some circumstances where the State is represent -- the Attorney General is representing the interest of the State of Connecticut and generally the overall public. And I think Section 2 sort of speaks to the more global issues where incidence could arise that impact the public and therefore the Attorney General should get involved. You know, going back to laws like our Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices or our
anti-trust laws. What I sort of question in Section 2 is we seem to be dancing very close to providing client services -- attorney client services on behalf of the State of Connecticut through the Attorney General's office to these individuals. And in this section, the state is not only seeking redress from a public policy perspective, but they do also have the ability to obtain a civil penalty, up to $2500 and I'm wondering in this situation, is this made clear or are we creating a problem for ourselves where the State of Connecticut is bringing a cause of action against somebody who has committed a crime. It may be something that rises to the level that they, as a matter of public policy they would want to bring. In the course of doing that they're sort of -- it's sort of vague here. They're bringing on behalf of the individuals as well. Is the State of Connecticut then in the position of negotiating settlements for victims of these potential crimes on a -- on a civil level? At the same time they're a party to this action where they could receive a civil penalty. My concern is there
could be times where the State of Connecticut may be in a position that they want to set the public policy and make a public statement, settle the case for the $2500 penalty and the victims may not want to accomplish -- that they may have different interests? How does this language deal with this issue or make it clear, and when is the State bringing the action for the benefit of the person to recover these treble damages, and when is the State acting on the people's behalf focusing on sort of the public policy aspect where they're recovering a civil penalty. How -- how do we distinguish that through this -- this statute and how do we make it clear for those individuals? And I'm just thinking from an attorney/client perspective. Are appearances being filed? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

  Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

  Through you Mr. Speaker. Yes. The Attorney General would be filing an appearance and the action on behalf of the State of Connecticut. I believe
this type of situation occurs quite frequently currently with respect to the CHRO. If somebody brings an action -- brings a claim with the CHRO and says, gee I was discriminated against in the terms of condition of house, Mr. Speaker, something near and dear to your heart. I was discriminated against in the terms and conditions of housing. The CHRO conducts a fact finding and says you know what? Yes, there's probable cause to believe that you were discriminated against in the terms and conditions of housing. The claimant then decides at the end of the investigation, you know what? I want to release the jurisdiction. We're going to go to Superior Court. The CHRO files a -- an action in Superior Court in its own name, in the name of the Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, against that actor be it a landlord, be it a condo complex, be it whoever the actor may be. In that instance the CHRO is the client. The CHRO has final call in terms of settlement discussions, has final call in terms of litigation strategy or the like, but certainly they will do so
in consultation with the individual who they are bringing the claim on behalf of.

Another example could be as I said the before, the criminal context. Where in a criminal proceeding there can be times the States Attorney decides you know what? We're going to plead this matter down and we're going to take a plea deal because we don't think we have the evidence to try the case and to win the case in trial so -- or at least that's questionable. So the States Attorney has the final authority to make that decision. The victim of the particular crime certainly would have some weigh in and some say, and the States Attorney would consult but at the end of the day it's the States Attorney that makes the final call. I envision a very similar scenario here where it's the Attorney General's office that makes the final call and they need to look not just at the interest of winning a case but also under their own mandates within their office and the Rules of Professional Conduction, the gov -- government lawyers look out for the interest of justice and they could make a
call on litigation strategy and settlement but I would assume they will do so with the heavy, heavy involvement and buy-in of the individual affected. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

   Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I guess under the next Section D, the individual could still bring a CHRO complaint on the -- under the same fact pattern dealing with the same violations collaterally through CHRO regardless of how this other action proceeds? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

   Madam Speaker, if you could just -- ask the question to flush that out a little further. I'm -- I'm having trouble drawing the analogy under Section 2. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative Candelora.
REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mrs. Speaker. Under -- under Section D as I'm reading it, it appears that the -- the person -- a person still retains the rights under Connecticut law to bring an individual case whether it be -- well it would probably be through a CHRO I would imagine or possibly in Superior Court if there -- if they are a victim of a hate crime for a civil recovery. If the individual chooses to do that, can there be two collateral actions at the same time? Which party would go first? Would the State have a higher interest or -- and then therefore the victim will be foreclosed to pursuing their own remedy, or would the victim's case go first? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I started to address this with Representative Smith. As the -- as the pure language of the Bill reads, yes, two actions could simultaneously proceed
together. Likely the defendant would move to consolidate the two actions and they would be consolidated but conceivably they could proceed on separate courses. As a practical matter I suspect that would not happen for a couple of reasons. First and foremost, presumably the Attorney General is stepping in sort of the most severe cases where somebody is not already taking that action on, if there's a private law firm or an interest group that's taking them on, it's probably not the best use of the Attorney General's resources to step on their toes. In a situation where the individual either can't afford or can't find capable counsel and the Attorney General does decide to take that case on, presumably that person is going to be happy to have the help and assistance of the Attorney General's office and is not going to want to expend legal fees when the -- the Attorney General's office is doing it for them. But conceivably, yes there could be two parallel actions although for a variety of reasons I suspect in practicality that would not happen. Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mrs. Speaker. And if there are two actions, would the Attorney General be required to join the CHRO action under our existing laws rather than bringing their own? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. It depends. As I understand it, there are provisions under existing law where the CHRO would request the assistance of the Attorney General's office, the Attorney General's office can supplement the legal counsel within the CHRO's own office. You know, but I -- as I mentioned, I suspect that even if there were two parallel actions preceding, despite the inefficiency to that the core on emotion from the defendant would likely consolidate the two actions assuming the claims are related and the parties are in privity to one another. Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And in lines 31 through 33 under this Bill I think -- as I do read this, the Attorney General would be prohibited from bringing action if the individual has already filed a matter with -- with CHRO so in that situation they would take president. And I guess I might have sort of already asked this but so -- if the Attorney General is commencing an investigation and filing and action and the individual then files their own CHRO complaint, in that type of a situation we may have two cases running at the same time but if the person files first, that's the only way the Attorney General will be foreclosed? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That's correct as I read this. Through you.
Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And just one final section. In Section 2 of the Bill, I know there's sort of the global public policy section of when a civil rights violation or alleged violation might rise to the level that that Attorney General would want to bring a suit, and in lines 52 through 54, there's actual language here that says that if the Attorney General prevails in a civil action brought pursuant to that section, the court shall order the distribution of any awards of damages to the injured person. And Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering why we don't have that same language in Section 1 versus Section 2? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Madam -- Mr. Speaker, you're changing up on me here. Sorry about that, Mr. Speaker. Through you Mr. Speaker. I believe the intent of the language in both sections is the same.
The actual word choice might be slightly different but as I indicated with Representative Smith, certainly in Section 1 under lines 18 to 19, it's clear that the relief shall go to the person entitled to relief. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And then also in I guess Section 2, what I'm trying to reconcile is I understand in Section 1 we're dealing with a specific hate crime against an individual which would trigger an investigation and the AG might bring a cause of action. In Section 2 we're talking about sort of a broader, you know repetitive claim or deprivation of rights. There's no language here similar in Section 1 where the State is sort of bringing the action on behalf of the person. So I would assume like an anti-trust claim, what is driving Section 2, the Attorney General to bring in a suit is again, it's rising to the level of a public interest where the Attorney General should
get involved. And what I -- what I don't -- what I struggle with is, so if they're representing the state, at what time in that case are the victims identified -- individuals identified where a judge then could order awards or damages to injured persons in lines 54 when it doesn't appear that the State is representing any individuals under Section 2? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I think certainly up front in the complaint in order to put the defendant on notice of course we are -- actually it's higher than notice, we are a fact pleading state in Connecticut despite many practitioners for forgetting that; we are a fact pleading state so certainly in the complaint I suspect that the Attorney General would need to site two specific violations; that you know for example that Mr. Jones was -- well let me give -- let me give -- let me give another example. Case out of New York not too
recently where the New York Attorney General used similar authority to this to reach a settlement with Con Ed over allegations of gender discrimination and sexual harassment against a class of women in their line or field positions. In that instance I suspect that if the State Attorney General were to bring a similar action here in Connecticut they would need to initiate in the complaint up front that you know, Mr. Jones was an employee of -- without using names, electric company and you know, she's been an employee of electric company from 2007 to the present and this is what happened to her. And similarly Mrs. Smith was an employee of the electric company and here's what happened to her. And they would need to lay out those examples in the complaint. Conceivably they could bring it on behalf of an unidentified class of people similar to a class action that would be brought now and at the end of the day, the Attorney General similar to what happened in the New York case where Con Ed agreed to reserve $3.8 million to be distributed among an eligible settlement class to be determined based on
folks making claims against that settlement amount within a specific period of time, no different than we do with any other type of class action law suit that may be brought now. Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I -- I guess that sort of creates a little bit of questions for me. So I just recently as a business owner, I got one of these post cards in the mail. There's apparently a class action lawsuit against one of my old credit card vendors and so I in given this little leaflet and it says that I could be part of the class and I have to fill out the information to be eligible for an award or I have a right if I don't do anything, I sort of waive my right to that award or I could click on it and not waive my rights but preserve my ability to on my own, bring a cause of action. And that sort of makes sense to me because in that class action process, which is you know very lucrative for attorneys, not to slight attorneys at all but it's a
very lucrative process and in that process I think we've gone through great pains to make sure that when class actions are brought individuals are identified and given an opportunity to weigh in or weigh out of a case and preserve their rights. Is there any type of safeguards here, first off that would identify those victims? 'Cause I understand if we bring a complaint in Section 2, there's no requirement that the Attorney General list what individuals might have been a victim to these civil rights and who should be entitled to an award. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. As I indicated before, I think the safeguards don't need to be in this Bill because I believe those safeguards already exist within the rules of civil procedure in our state and also the rules of evidence. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.
REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the intent of this, if a case is ever brought under Section 2 and there was an intent to seek awards for individuals that might be victims of -- of civil rights -- violations, we would envision that the Attorney General would go through the same process that we would go through in class action lawsuit? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yeah. Through you Mr. Speaker. I -- look, as I indicated, I don't believe there's necessarily a need to certify a class. I think the Attorney General in order to be successful in this type of lawsuit would need to up front at the outset, identify individuals who were effected by this pattern or practice of conduct and who are the persons plural that are identified in lines 39 through 43 of the Bill. Certainly you know, in a situation where those folks were unidentified at the
outset there may be a -- an indication of that in the complaint but I think the primary victims would be spelled out very early on in the complaint and the action. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you. If these victims are identified, is there -- is there any requirement to them to be named as parties to that suit? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I can envision where there's a lot of cases where if a lawsuit is brought against say a company that's created some kind of violation and they're in a position where
they realize I made a big mistake. I might have --
you know had I don't know, discriminated on age,
they had something on their application and it ends
up being where you know, we really probably should
settle this case. My concern would be, how would --
how would the company be in a position to settle
that case if there are identified victims that the
State of Connecticut have outlined and damages are
being awarded to them; would they have to therefore
then be brought in the case in order to settle the
case? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I think that's a --
that's a defense strategy for whoever that company's
defense attorney is. Certainly the company would
have access to every individual -- presumably would
have some sort of record as to every individual that
was employed by or interviewed by or during a
particular time period and could proactively I
suppose reach out to those individuals and try to
get them to sign a release agreement and pay out a monetary settlement. Or as happens in any number of cases, where if there's a particular class of people who believe they were discriminated against, there may be a settlement with respect to those folks and the company hopes that they never hear from the other individuals again. I think those -- those types of issues are dealt with by defense attorneys on a day in and day out basis. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I think one final question. You know under our couple laws I think the way it works is that when lawsuits are brought on behalf of private individuals, those cases -- the -- clarify me if I'm wrong, but I think the Attorney General is name in those cases so they get a copy of those complaints which I presume is done so that the State of Connecticut could look at those private causes of action and determine whether it rises to the level of a public interest so that the Attorney
General would intervene if necessary. Was it contemplated that maybe we should structure these procedures in a similar fashion where if individuals are victims of civil rights violations or hate crimes, that if they individually are bringing causes of action against their -- their alleged perpetrators that the State of Connecticut would merely be named so then the Attorney General could sift through those and see if it rises to an interest that they should intervene? Was that contemplated? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure whether I can comment on whether the Attorney General's office contemplated that or not. I can tell you from my own practice and also from conversations with the Attorney General's office over the years I think they and most attorneys in the state find the requirement that a copy of the complaint in a COPPA case be served on the Attorney General's office to
be a -- an unnecessary requirement and burden. I suspect that there are a number of plaintiff's attorneys that do not as a matter of course actually send those. I suspect in the AG's office they have boxes and boxes someplace sitting there but I think certainly as I indicated at the outset, the idea here is not by any means that the Attorney General will intervene and/or prosecute every civil rights violation case that could or is brought in the State of Connecticut but merely that it would be the most egregious cases that are generally brought to its attention by you know, individuals calling in or writing in or newspaper exposure or however else the Attorney General comes upon these cases. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I don't think I have any other questions. And I do appreciate the good Representative's answers. I don't mean to suggest that we would be burdening the Attorney
General's office by maybe reversing this and having the complaints go to the AG's office. I think if the COPPA violations aren't achieving the goal then maybe we should look at that prevision of why the Attorney General's office is served.

But when I think when we're dealing with hate crimes that would be something that the Attorney General could look at those complaints and probably more quickly ascertain if it rises to the level that they should intervene. 'Cause I -- I appreciate the underlying intent of this Bill but I find it highly problematic on so many levels. I feel as if what we're doing is we're treading very closely of creating -- you know turning our Attorney General's office into a private law firm. Because in these provisions, which I don't see anywhere in our statutes, we're allowing the Attorney General to essentially bring a cause of action for the benefit of individuals potentially. But we're really -- we're creating a lot of gray areas here. When we're dealing with the representation of clients we're not only invoking our statutory laws but we're also
implicating Constitutional laws as well. And I'm a little concerned that there could be a hate crime brought against a victim that could be against them -- it could be a family member. One family member against another. That that individual might find sensitive but the Attorney General's office, it's getting a lot of attention, sees need to bring more public attention to it. And so there is that element of -- of bringing the news cycle sort of into these stories. Not to -- not to suggest that the Attorney General would just be looking for good press for himself, but rather these stories are important for the public to hear about because you want to avoid the situations in the future but that's not what this Bill is necessarily doing. We're creating the ability for the AG to be negotiating settlements for victims of crimes that A) may not even want a case brought on their behalf because it could be sensitive to them and they don't want to have their names in the news cycle, which there's no provisions here to say that they would be protected under those circumstances. I'd assume the
AG's office may say, yeah we'll listen to the victim but there's nothing here that says that. So I'm afraid that we're ignoring the victim and potentially victimizing them again because it's their -- you know it's their incident, it's their issue to deal with and what right does the State of Connecticut have to come in and say, we're going to bring a case on your behalf and we're going to make it very public.

The other piece of this is, the case that they're bringing on behalf of ten victims or one victim or five victims or 100 victims, there's no entitlement of representation for these individuals. And that's odd to me. Because I could -- I could believe that there could be a time that the Attorney General's office may be bringing an action for the public's benefit but again, the public's benefit could be very different from the victim's benefit. But there's no provision here saying that the victim is entitled to representation. And so I would imagine they would have to somehow file an intervening complaint if an action is brought.
And I don't think that I'm going down a slippery slope because the language in this Bill talks about recovering damages for the victims. The other concern I have is, you know with our class action laws we're very careful to make sure that individual's rights are not inadvertently waved through a class action lawsuit. And if the Attorney General brings a lawsuit against somebody, and all the victims aren't necessarily notified, I don't know what legal ramifications that has on the ability for those victims to be able to exercise their rights. And so I really -- I don't see this as a -- as a Civil Rights Bill. I potentially do see this as you know, a Public Policy Bill for the State of Connecticut to be asserting what the State of Connecticut thinks is important to them but I think it goes sideways of what the intentions of our civil rights and our hate crime laws are all about. It's about the victims. It's about the individual. It's about their protections, not the State of Connecticut. And I truly believe this Bill is taking away all of those rights and handing it over
to the Attorney General's office.

And so I guess with that I look forward to listening to the rest of the debate. I don't think this Bill should move forward. I think if we contemplate it in future years we should reversing the way this is done like we did with our COPPA claims, where the Attorney General's office can be notified so at that point in time it's the victim making the decision of whether or not they want to bring a civil action. It's the victim making the decision of whether or not they want to recover damages and then the Attorney General can step in if they see fit. But the State of Connecticut should mind its business and let victims make decisions, not the State. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, sir. Representative Vargus, you have the floor sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I usually don't like to weigh in on Bills, especially when these Bills come from a Committee that I don't serve on like the
Judiciary Committee. I have a lot of respect for our House Chair, Representative Stafstrom, and a lot of respect for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle but this is a Bill that I feel is an important Bill. And I've listened carefully to some of the objections to the Bill, but I rise to support this Bill. There's a few points that I've like to make. They've been made over and over again, probably some of them right in the Judiciary Committee and probably some on the floor but I think they require to be stressed again.

It's very frustrating when we're dealing with civil rights issues in the state of Connecticut, especially in certain organizations, some of our municipalities, some departments. There is a culture that is discriminatory. And unfortunately when several individuals in positions of power work together it's very difficult to crack through that discrimination.

What we're looking at with this Bill I believe is another tool in the arsenal in the state of Connecticut to address civil rights issues. Now I
know that when a new law is enacted, there's Constitutional questions. There are questions as to whether certain statutes have certain primacy over other statutes and these issues tend to resolve over time through court judgements, through consent decrees and slowly case law is formed. And I know when you start and embark on a new piece of legislation like this, it will be some time before there's any settled law on many of these issues. That should not prevent us from acting today. We should move forward with this Bill and if down the road future legislatures feel that it has to be fine-tuned and that certain Amendments have to be made, those can be addressed at that time. But I believe, much has been said about CHRO, our Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities but we have to keep in mind that CHRO is an executive branch agency of the state of Connecticut. And our AG's office is an independently-elected office under the Constitution with co-equal rights to the executive branch and I believe that distance is important.
The AG is charged with representing our state agencies and civil issues, which brings me to the Chief States Attorney, which is another issue that's come up. Chief States Attorney deals with criminal issues and we know how high the bar is when we're dealing with civil rights issues, whether they rise to criminal issues. We know that there's also a thing called prosecutorial discretion, which has been mentioned by Representative Candelora as something which allows the Chief States Attorney to decide whether enough evidence exists in a case whether to move with criminal action or not.

The Attorney General deals with civil issues and this is a civil rights matter. So I think it really belongs there. That authority, that tool to deal with discrimination belongs in the AG's office.

Now we may agree or disagree but there's a lot of myths out there and I'd like to dispel one myth, that this Bill is anti-police. I would not support any Bill that is anti-police. I represent the south and the City of Hartford and we have excellent relations with our police department. All of my
neighborhoods are represented a neighborhood revitalization note, an NRZ which is -- which has the participation of a lot of our neighborhood activists and we keep good relationships with most of our city departments, our state agencies, our quasi-public agencies and we try to keep them accountable and keep their feet to the fire with out monthly meetings. We have MARCH, the Maple Avenue Revitalization Group, which represents the neighborhood I live in, the Barry Square Neighborhood. We have the Southwest and Behind the Rocks NRZ and a South NRZ. I try to participate in all of them.

So there's a couple of other myths that I'd like to dispel. And when you think about it, I was recalling recently that we had an issue, a time back with a -- with a fire department in one of our municipalities where some of the minority members of that department felt that they were discriminated against. We've had issues with housing in some of our municipalities. We've had so many different issues that could have been addressed had the
Attorney General had this kind of authority that is granted through this Bill. Ultimately I believe that in most of these issues, there tends to be a lot of mediation and there tends to be a lot of consent agreements. Ultimately I see very few things really wind up being litigated in our court systems when it comes to these kinds of issues. But I do believe it's important that we put a spotlight on the issue of civil rights, especially at this time in history because I'm very frustrated that I think we've been going backward. All my life I've believed we had been making progress on civil rights issues, slowly but surely. But in the last couple of years, I believe that people who violate the civil rights of some of our ethnic, religious or racial minorities; some of these issues have been in Bolden, and I believe that discrimination rather than being on the decline in this particular moment, discrimination is on the rise. That's why even though, like I said earlier I don't like to comment on Bills of Committees that I don't serve on; I have to congratulate the Judiciary Committee for moving
this Bill forward. I believe we should give our Attorney General an opportunity to deal with discrimination issues and civil rights issues. I believe this is one more tool in the arsenal of the State of Connecticut to deal with these issues. Let's give him an opportunity. Let's give our Attorney General an opportunity to address some of these issues. They're not going to go away. Inaction is not going to help to safeguard many of the residents of the state of Connecticut that need the help from our state government.

State government is here to serve all of the residents and all the citizens of the state of Connecticut, not just the majority, not just those that can escape discrimination. When I think about it, very few people can't escape discrimination at some point in their lives so I urge my colleagues on the floor today, especially my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, my Republican colleagues. Let's give the AG; I know he's a Democrat. You know maybe if he were a Republican we might feel a little differently, I don't know. But the fact is that as
I said earlier, time will tell, case law will be created, decisions will be made. If we need to correct them we always have the authority as a legislature to correct any statute that we enact. Let's keep our eye on the ball. I believe all of us are people of good faith and we'd like to see people's rights whether its religious rights, whether it's cultural or ethnic rights, whether it's racial rights preserved. We're all American citizens protected by the US Constitution. If -- If and that's a big if, we believe that this statute is starting to creating more problems than it's solving, we can always repeal it. I don't believe that will be the case. I believe that when you open the window and let the sunshine in on some of the discrimination that happens in some of our municipalities, then it may actually require less action on the State of Connecticut because I notice that when things are visible and are highlighted, those people that would try to discriminate against others tend to retrench when they see the public eye is on them. And the AG has a wonderful pully pulpit
to make sure that we can focus on any abuses that may be occurring. So not to prolong the use on the mic and out of respect, I will relinquish the mic, but I will urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, sir. Representative Dubitsky. You have the floor sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you. I see in lines 8 through 10 and again in lines 49 through 51, there is a prohibition on the use of information obtained during an investigation in a criminal proceeding and I would just ask the good Chair of the Judiciary Committee if he would explain the parameters of that prohibition. Through you.
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DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the intent of this provision is to make it crystal clear that under existing law and as codified again here in this Bill there is a prohibition against the Attorney General sharing the results of subpoenaed documents or documents that it has discovered as part of its investigation with the office -- either the office of the Chief States Attorney or one of the various States Attorneys for the geographical areas within the state. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you Mr. Chairman. So I -- I would ask, is it also prohibited to share this information with any and all law enforcement? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you Mr. Speaker. Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And would it be a Constitutional violation for the Attorney General's office to do so? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. That's a fairly definitive question so I want to leave myself a little -- little leeway because I haven't undertaken that legal analysis but to the best of my knowledge and believe, that would be the case. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now the Bill itself uses the word "used." So it says that it cannot -- that the information obtained may -- no information obtained pursuant to the provisions of this
subsection may be used in a criminal proceeding and I just wanted to make it clear the -- the good Chairman used the word "share," so I want to make sure for the purpose of the record that the AG's office can't share that information with law enforcement even if that information is not actually used. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is absolutely the intent of this language. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So are there -- I would ask, are there any protections, whether in this Bill or in current statute to prevent the AG's office from sharing any of the information obtained in the course of an investigation with law enforcement? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. As the questioner indicated earlier, there could be certain legal or Constitutional violations. There also could likely be some sanction ability based -- if the information turned up in a court proceeding and certainly if the information was shared and then there was an attempt to use that information in a criminal proceeding, certainly the specifics of this language and the reason it's drafted using the word, used is on certainly on a motion in limine or other type of pre-trial motion, a judge would absolutely exclude that evidence from being introduced in that criminal proceeding. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I -- I thank the good Chairman for his answer. So given that that would be a Constitutional violation one would actually presume that -- that the -- the victim of
that Constitutional violation could actually ask the AG to investigate it and prosecute it. That would be a rhetorical question so I won't ask it. The -- but I will ask, would the information obtained -- obtained during the course of an AG investigation be public information in any way? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I believe that would be subject to our existing FOIA laws and I don't profess to be a FOIA expert but it's my understanding that there is an exclusion to FOIA for ongoing investigations. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My concern -- my concern obviously would be that the AG's office would conduct discovery during the course of invest -- of an investigation that information would be in the procession of the AG's office and whether during
the pendency of the investigation or afterwards, somehow that information was -- became public and that public information now first off could be embarrassing or damaging to the person from whom it was obtained or others. And also once it's public I would be concerned that the -- that law enforcement would now have access to it and -- that basically would be circumventing the whole purpose of trying to keep this from law enforcement.

Now the -- I would ask if the -- if the good Chairman has any comment on that? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Through you, as I indicated earlier the investigatory power that is envisioned here under this Bill is the same investigatory power the Attorney General currently has under our Anti-Trust Statutes and it's my understanding that this exact scenario and these exact type of scenarios have come up for years under our Anti-Trust Statute so there is a body of president and course of
conduct and restrictions in those statutes which would be equally applicable to this Bill here. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the -- just to confirm, the authority that the AG would have under this Bill would be the same authority that -- with regard to subpoena power and discovery under Connecticut General Statutes 35-42; is that correct? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative -- Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And all limitations and restrictions of -- that are currently in effect on the AG under Section 35-42 would apply equally to
the powers under this Bill; is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. Is the Attorney General a party to the actions that -- that the Attorney General would bring under this Bill?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

No, Mr. Speaker. The party is the State of Connecticut who is represented by the Office of the Attorney General. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So as a party the State of Connecticut -- would the State of Connecticut be subject to the same discovery requirements and -- as any other party? So for example, would a defendant be able to issue discovery upon the State of Connecticut in the same way that the defendant would be able to issue on any other natural person who is a party to the action? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

   Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

   Yes, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

   Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

   Now when the AG obtains information in the course of his or her investigation, whether through subpoena or interrogatories or other discovery, is that information and documentation now subject to discovery by the defendant? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. Generally yes, subject to certainly the Practice Book Rules of Discovery, and if the information is likely to lead the discovery of other admissible evidence. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are -- are there any -- obviously we -- I'm not talking about our current Attorney General, but future Attorney Generals may -- may use this statute for political purposes. So I'm asking the good Chair of the Judiciary Committee, are there any protections in place, whether in this Bill or current statute to protect against the Attorney General using this new power for political purposes? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you Mr. Speaker. I believe the Attorney General as any lawyer in the State of Connecticut is subject to the Rules of Ethics. I believe there also is a Code of Conduct that is applicable to the Office of the Attorney General and beyond that, just as I am or you are, Mr. Speaker the Attorney Generals ultimately answerable to the people of the State of Connecticut every four years. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now does the -- when deciding whether or not to initiate an action or initiate an investigation, are there any limitations on the Attorney General's discretion? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. My answer to that would be the same as my answer to the last question. Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if the good Chairman of the Judiciary Committee knows, do the attorneys in the Attorney General's office track the time that they incur on each case as they do in the private sector? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I do not know.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- I would just be interested in that because I would like down the road to be able to find out how much time is incurred in -- in these type of cases as opposed to other cases and therefore how much the taxpayers of Connecticut are spending on this type of investigation and enforcement action.
That would -- that's the extent of my questions. I have a few comments I'd like to make and I thank the good Chairman for his answers. I believe that this power that we would bestowing under this Bill is indeed duplicative of the power that we have already given to CHRO and also duplicative of any EEOC enforcement powers. So what we are doing is as the good Chairman indicated when questioned by some of my colleagues, we are risking parallel actions and duplicative actions. And when you have parallel actions you risk inconsistent judgements. You risk inconsistent factual findings. You double the cost to the defendant and you double the cost to the state.

Now when -- when the Attorney General came to the Judiciary Committee and testified on behalf of this Bill he indicated that he would not be seeking any additional appropriation to feed this additional power that we're giving. And I asked him specifically about that and he said, not at this time. I asked, are you looking for additional money down the road to staff up? And again he said, not
at this time. When I asked him why we needed this Bill he indicated to me that, it's good to have two watch dogs. And frankly there becomes a time when just can't feed two watch dogs. We have CHRO. We don't need an additional watch dog that we have to feed.

The fiscal note on this Bill claims that there's a possible gain of about $100,000 but I don't believe that takes into account any additional staff that the Attorney General's office will be hiring. And I don't think anybody believes that they are going to absorb this new power without additional staff. I certainly don't believe it.

CHRO is made up primarily of career public servants. There's obviously some appointees involved, but most of them are long-time public servants. The AG's office on the other hand is a political-elected office with almost unlimited discretion to decide who to investigate and who to bring suit against. I think that brings up the risk of political decisions. When combined with the dup -- duplication, I don't think this Bill is
necessary. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, sir. Representative Candelaria of the 95th District, you have the floor sir.

REP. CANDELARIA (9TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand in -- stand in strong support of this Bill. As I understand the intent of the Bill, this is to provide protections for those individuals whose civil rights have been violated. Recently I read an article in a newspaper about a state agency that has violated worker's rights, has created a hostile environment where individuals have been called spicks, the N word has been used, they're -- they're being retaliated against; and that's currently happening in our state within one of our agencies and that's a fact. My question is, this has been -- this situation has impacted multiple employees and my question to the good gentleman of the Judiciary Committee is, if a group of individuals with a similar situation that I have spoken about comes before the Attorney General's office if this Bill is
passed; would the Attorney General's office address -- how would they address this particular case and how would they ensure transparency and impartiality in a case similar to that which I spoke about? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated early on under this Bill and under existing law the Attorney General is not allowed to bring a suit against a state agency or against an official acting within their official capacity. There are prohibitions against that. The intent of this Bill is not to allow the State of -- the Attorney General to bring an action in the name of the state against a state agency or an official acting within their official capacity. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (9TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. So the recourse for
these individuals would still be the CHRO office; is that correct? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

   Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

   Yes, Mr. Speaker. It would either be the CHRO or a private attorney or some type of interest groups but the Attorney General the -- would be excepted from being able to bring an action in the name of the state against a state agency. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

   Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (9TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to thank the gentleman for his clarifications. I think this, as my good colleague and Representative Vargus said, this is a good tool to ensure that individuals civil rights are protected. There are many situations within our state that -- where a hostile work environment had been created, where people have been retaliated against and they have no other recourse.
And I think this will add the additional resources to these individuals who have lost hope because to acquire a private attorney, there's just a lot of cost involved. Many of them, because of the length of time that this will take, will not take the case. So this measure would ensure that these people have justice. Justice when the due process has failed them completely. So Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support and I encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, sir. Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Mr. Speaker, good evening or good afternoon. I wasn't going to speak on this but I have to ask a question to the good Chairman of the Judiciary because for the previous speaker spoke and it gives me some pause and concern. So all of our rights should always be protected. All civil liberties and all civil rights. So currently if -- in our state statute and I think I know the answer but I want it
clear on the record, are all people's civil rights protected under the law of Connecticut, the law of the United States of America and this Attorney General or any Attorney General? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Um, yes, yes. (Laughing)

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Yaccarvi -- Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Yaccarino, thank you. And those rights are enforced through our Attorney General, through all of our law enforcement or CHRO? Through you Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, the reason I pause is the inclusion of the Attorney General in that. I think as indicated, the purpose of this Bill is to make
clear what authority the Attorney General has and does not have in enforcing civil rights within the State of Connecticut. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

I appreciate that. And I would think currently they -- that person, he or she and in this case he, would have that right as the Attorney General of the State of Connecticut? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure that that's the case or not based on the lack of that language in the statute but I certainly appreciate the good Representative's support for this Bill as it moves forward. (Laughing)

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

I appreciate your comment and all your hard
work. I support all civil rights and civil liberties for everybody but I don't want it to be represented that people don't have that right today. And unfortunately we don't live in a perfect world and the Attorney General of the federal government or the state government, no matter who it is, should always enforce those laws and protect the rights of people. So I just want to make it clear that no matter how I vote on this Bill, I think those rights should be enforced and people should have their civil rights protect. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the good Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, sir. Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just one clarification. I -- and you may have answered this and if you did, I apologize for the repetitive question but in a couple places it states that the Attorney General cannot bring a claim during the pendency of a matter currently under CHRO and I was
wondering if you could define that as far as when a matter that's currently with CHRO would be considered finalized so that way the AG could bring an action? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker as I understand and interpret that language the intent is that if the CHRO is currently conducting a fact finding or there is an administrative hearing before the CHRO then the Attorney General would be barred from jumping forward and going to Superior Court. Once there's been a release of jurisdiction by the CHRO and the matter is in Superior Court, at that point the CHRO -- the Attorney General could inquire into the action should it so choose. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

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

And so you are saying that CHRO would have to issue a written release in order for the AG to then
be able to take up the complaint? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I assume that would be the most likely scenario in which the AG would do that. I guess the other option is the CHRO could deny the claim but presumably if the CHRO has denied the claim, I suspect the Attorney General would not be interested in pursuing the claim further. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

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

And in the case when -- if CHRO didn't deny the claim but let's say there was some type of decision made and one of the parties appealed that decision, would the AG have to wait to -- after the appeal period before he would -- he or she would be able to then file their own claim? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker. I -- I'm not sure what the gentlelady means by appeal the decision of the CHRO. Generally the CHRO decision, once it has either gone through the fact finding or the administrative process, there's a release of jurisdiction or finding which then goes to the Superior Court. At that point the matter is no longer pending before -- before the CHRO and an act could be instituted, but that's the CHRO process. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

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

I'm actually referring to Section 46(a)-94(a) when there is something filed in Superior Court, during that appeal period. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, that's sort of my point is once the matter is in Superior Court, it's no longer
pending before the CHRO and at that point the
Attorney General could implied into the Superior
Court action. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato

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

And that's all my questions. Thank you for the
clarifications.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Will the members please take your seats? The
machine will be open. (Ringing)

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

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

CLERK:

House Bill 7222 as amended by House A.

- Total Number Voting: 145
- Necessary for Passage: 73
- Those Voting Yea: 82
- Those Voting Nay: 63
- Absent not Voting: 6

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The Bill as amended is passed. (Gavel) Are there any announcements or introductions?

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand for an announcement. I wanted to let my colleagues know that the Boys and Girls Club Youth Members of the Year and they have invited legislators to come down if you want to speak or take a picture. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

Representative Reyes.

REP. REYES (75TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purpose of journal
notation, Representative Baker, Rose and Orange are all out sick, sir. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

The journal will be noted. Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of journal entry, Representative Fishbein and Camillo; Representative Fishbein was out due to work commitments. Representative Camillo was back in the district and for the transcript Representative Zullo was out of the Chamber. Thank you so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

It will be noted in the journal.

Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will begin Session beginning at 10:30 a.m. and there being no further business on the Clerk's desk I move that we adjourn subject to the call of the Chair.
DEPUTY SPEAKER BUTLER (72ND):

No objection, so ordered. The House will be in recess. Excuse me, the House will be adjourned subject to the call of the Chair. (Gavel)

(On motion of Representative Currey of the 11th District, the House adjourned at 5:58 o'clock p.m., sine die.)
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