The Connecticut General Assembly

The House of Representatives

Monday, May 20, 2019

(The House of Representatives was called to order at 11:11 o'clock a.m., Representative Joe Aresimowicz of the 30th District 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] Will the House please come to order? Will members, staff and guests please rise, direct your attention to the dais where my good friend, Father Jacobs, will lead us in prayer.

Deputy Chaplain Reverend Charles E. Jacobs:

Please bow your heads and pray for God’s blessing. Lord God, bless Your Representatives who continue to convene on behalf of the people of
Connecticut. Bestow your wisdom upon them as they discern through prayer, and in consultation with one another, what is right and just for the people of Connecticut. With Your abiding presence, all things are possible. Amen.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

   Thank you, Father. Would Representative Buckbee of the 67th district, please come to the dais and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

   (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, my friend. Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative O'Neil of the 69th district, sir, you have the floor.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purposes of an announcement and an introduction?
Please proceed, sir.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

The class from Gainfield School in Southbury is here with us today. I believe there are around 50 of them along the back wall. Gainfield, they're visiting here to tour the Capitol and they’ve already been to the Senate, but they’ve had the opportunity to see us enter into session which I think is always something interesting to watch and Gainfield School happens to be, in an earlier incarnation was known as the consolidated School, the school from which I graduated eighth grade a few years ago. So if the House would be able to give them their usual warm welcome, please rise. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Welcome to our Chamber and Representative O'Neil, I know you're a very detailed person and you said a few years ago. Would you care to clarify?

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Well it was in 1966.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Congratulations, Representative, and thank you
for coming to the Chamber.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Good morning. I would like to recognize Matt Ritter of the 1st district. Representative Ritter, you have the floor.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, it's nice to see you this afternoon. It's always good to see a Meriden person up there. I move that we waive the reading of the list of the Reports and the Reports be referred to the Committees indicated.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Without objection. Is there any business on the Clerk's desk? We went out of order.

CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. There is a list of reports to be referred to the Committees indicated.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Ritter, you now have the floor.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, I move that we waive the reading of the House Favorable Reports and the bills be tabled
for the calendar and printing.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Favorable Reports House bills to be tabled for the calendar and printing. If there is no objection, so ordered. [Gavel]

CLERK:

And the last piece is the daily calendar.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Mr. Clerk and Madam Clerk. Will the Clerk please call Calendar 610?

CLERK:


ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Vargas of the 6th district, you have the floor, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in concurrence
with the Committee's Favorable Report and for adoption of the Resolution.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Please proceed, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution would appoint Karen E. Welch to the position of the advisory member of the Worker's Compensation Board. This is a non-paid position, voluntary position and Ms. Welch brings a world of experience in occupational safety. Most recently, she is working, currently working for Hartford Healthcare precisely doing employee health and absence management. Previous to that, she worked for Hartford Hospital where she was also director of occupational health services and her experience goes back a number of years in similar positions of occupational health with St. Francis, Signa, Lego Systems in Enfield and her educational background includes a Bachelor's degree from Valparaiso University in Indiana and a Master's Degree in Public
Health from Tulane University in New Orleans. She's eminently qualified and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Vargas. Further on this Resolution? Representative Yaccarino of the 87th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Good morning, [clears throat], excuse me.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Good morning.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. I second the good Chair of Executive Nom's good words for Ms. Welch. She will serve our Boards well and she's done a very good job and thank you. I support her. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Yaccarino. Further on this Resolution? Further on this Resolution? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:
Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Opposed? The ayes have it and the Resolution is adopted. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar 101?

CLERK:


ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan of the 103rd, you have the floor, madam. That's the bedding plant capital of Connecticut I believe.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

That's right, the bedding plant capital. Thank you for knowing that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance
of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report. Please proceed, madam.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment, LCO 7077 and I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 7077, which shall be designated House Amendment Schedule A.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 7077, offered by Representative Linehan and Representative Green.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? If not, please proceed, madam.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What this amendment does is it takes the entire bill and it makes it a may instead of a shall so that the DCF has discretion in how they proceed. Just to give a quick
background before we go into the bill, what this is, is the ability to allow DCF to notify certain employers of the placement of an employment on the Child Abuse or Neglect Registry and after the adoption of the amendment, I will further go into the bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you very much. Further on House A.

Further on House A? Representative Green of the 55th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. GREEN (55TH):

Yes, I would like to support the amendment and it oughta go.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you very much, madam. Further on this amendment? Representative Fishbein of the 90th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Besides this being a horrible bill which I'll speak about in the underlying bill, the amendment, I just had a few questions for the proponent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):
Please proceed, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Am I to understand that in line 116, we would be changing a mandatory reporting to a discretionary reporting in a case where a child may be impacted by somebody who has been arrested for a serious crime involving a child?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Through you, you are correct that in line 116 it changes a shall to a may, but I am unsure of what the good Representative meant by the rest of his question.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That was the entirety of the question. Knowing that, why would we not give direction to the department when it's been established
that DCF has made a finding of neglect or abuse against this individual and then that they may be employed in such a capacity that requires such a person to have regular and direct contact with children. Why would we not make that mandatory?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Because situations such as these aren’t always a black and white issue and we believe that DCF having some discretion as to whether or not to contact the employer is the best way to proceed.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And them contacting the employer, I’m just trying, you know protecting children is something that’s important to me. Why would we leave it in the discretion of the
commissioner to determine when that call is to be made as opposed to us as a legislative body giving specific direction?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, because of the vagueness of the employer, the vagueness of each situation, we are unable to put that completely in statute and we believe that the commissioner will have all the information at her fingertips and be able to do the appropriate thing.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

And does the good Representative know the disparity of people of minority, the minority population that are actually put on this registry without the ability to have counsel to defend them?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I do know the breakdown of the race and ethnicity, but I do not have the information at my fingertips as to the amount of people who do not have someone to represent them.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Am I incorrect in representing in someone who goes through this process does not have a legal right to have counsel as protected by our Constitution, federally as well as state?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Everybody has the right to retain counsel.

Through you.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But in a criminal matter, which many of these cases emanate, from a criminal matter, one would have the right to have counsel appointed for them as opposed to this matter unless I'm to be educated by the Representative as to the right to have counsel appointed for them.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I am unaware if they have someone appointed for them.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And under the language of this amendment taking this risk or harm to be discretionary reporting, is there notice under this
that the department may contact the employer? What is contemplated by this amendment?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Could the good Representative rephrase that question and actually speak up because it's hard for me to hear him?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

[Gavel] Thank you very much. Representative Fishbein, would you care to repeat the question? Representative Linehan could not hear you because there is too much noise.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So understanding that there's been some finding of DCF of neglect or abuse and the department determines that this person more than likely would have direct contact with children, what is the notice contemplated by this amendment to say? Is it we may contact the employer, we will?
What is contemplated by this change in the amendment?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. They are required to let the person know that they may be notified. They do that within five days of the finding.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And perhaps that's getting to the underlying bill. What portion of the bill requires that notice because I don't see that anywhere in here?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is already in the regulations and is current law, that the Department of
Children and Families must notify someone of the placement on the registry. They will then explain to them during the review process that they have five days, within five days to tell them that they may be, their employer may be notified.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well if the good Representative could please point me to that statute because presently we don’t have discretionary reporting to the employer so if we're creating it, it would have to be part of this bill. So if I may, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the good Representative, where is that notice to the employer that is being created by this bill mandated presently?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is not currently
in the bill, but it will be addressed within the internal regulations of the Department of Children and Families.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I mean I haven't been here that long, but I know that usually we direct the department. The department works for us; we don't work for it so we have to direct the department to promulgate regulations to provide for this notice. It's not in this language so am I to understand that we're to just, it's trust?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the good Representative is discussing the underlying bill and we are simply on the amendment at this time. I'd be more than happy to answer that question once the
amendment is adopted.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well that, I was addressing the amendment when I asked my underlying question. The underlying question had to do with they are amending it from being mandatory to discretionary so I was asking about the notice that is contemplated by virtue of this amendment so perhaps I'll ask the question again. What notice is anticipated to go to the employee who now DCF may call with regard to their rights and whether or not this is going to happen, now that we're making it discretionary?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under 17a-101k, it is noted that there needs to be specific notification given to the person before they are placed on the
Abuse and Neglect Registry. It is at that time that DCF will also alert them to this change, that they be notify, that they may be notifying their employer.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was a little difficult to hear, but I think I heard that 17a-101k requires that noticed to the employee, that their employer may be contacted? Is that what I'm to understand?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That, 17a-101k actually is the notice that they have, that will be given to the employee that they are on the registry. DCF at that point will include information in the notice that says that they may contact their employer.

Through you.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I guess after that three or four minutes, we find out there is no statute that mandates that present so then I have to get to where we were before. What direction or where is it in the bill that we are directing DCF to promulgate a regulation with regard to notifying the employer in the content of that situation with discretionary reporting?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, it is not in the bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, uh, Madam Speaker, sorry.
When you guys shift on me, [laughs]. Then my followup question is why would we not make that part of this bill?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein, we're keeping you on your toes. Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The bill as written requires that there is some discretion used. Within that discretion, I believe that the commissioner has said that they will in fact alert them to this and that changing the regulations to do so is easy enough and it does not necessarily need to be required in statute.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So am I to understand that this, in the amendment, making this change to discretionary because I can understand when it's
mandated, that an employer is called, we make it discretionary, that there is no direction being given as to when the department is supposed to employ that discretion, not employ that discretion, use it for political purposes, we are not giving any direction?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. The commissioner has stated numerous times that they, their interest is really in protecting children. I do not believe that something like this would be used for political purposes. The intent of this is absolutely to protect children from predators. In addition to that, in order to use discretion, it's usually because the intended, the unintended consequences. So the commissioner, in speaking with all of their staff, would know the story because not everything is a black and white issue and by allowing discretion, we would ensure that there are no unintended consequences and that the bottom line is that we are protecting
children.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and protecting children is at the very heart of many of the things that we do such as with this. I'm going to save my other remarks for the underlying bill but I'm against the amendment. If we feel we need to go down this road and make this discretionary after we've already made a finding that a child may be impacted, I shudder to think what else is coming this session. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

All those opposed, nay.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The ayes have it. [Gavel] The amendment passes. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This bill essentially, as we have started to discuss, allows the Department of Children and Families to contact an employer if they’ve been added to the Child Abuse and Neglect Registry. This is done after an investigation and to be included on the registry, these are only the most egregious crimes including substantiated sexual abuse, the death of a child, and numerous other crimes against a child.

This bill requires the commissioner, after making such a recommendation to the registry, to determine whether the individual's employment requires him or her to have regular contact with and provide services to on behalf of children. If so, the commissioner must notify the individual's, or may notify the
individual's employer of his or her placement on the registry. By law, individuals placed on the registry do have a right to request an internal investigation and appeal the investigation's result in an administrative hearing, the result of which may also be appealed up to superior and Supreme Court and with that, I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Now that we're to the underlying bill, some questions for the proponent if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

The Child Abuse and Neglect Registry, is that a registry that this legislature created or was that by DCF itself?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Uh, thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker, statutory in 1996.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. In 1996, I believe that we directed the department to come up with regulations to protect children, I get that, but I don't believe in 1996 that we directed DCF to maintain a private, secret list of those that they’ve internally adjudicated to be neglectful or abusive of children.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, in 1996, it spoke to the possible creation of a registry and I believe it was in 2000 when that registry came
to be.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I believe that registry came to be through a regulation and not through a statute.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

I'm sorry, I cannot hear the good Representative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

[Gavel] Our colleagues are having difficulty hearing each other. If we could please take our conversations outside? Representative Fishbein, could you please repeat your question?

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Sure and was the creation of the registry by regulation or direction in statute?

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, it was created by statute and regulations were adopted.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and when somebody gets arrested for a crime, let's say risk of injury to a minor, the standard of, the burden of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt?

Through you, Madam Speaker to the good Representative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you. through you, Madam Speaker, that is not in my purview, but I believe the good Representative is correct.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And the burden of proof to get on the Neglect or Abuse Registry, is it at the same level as that for that crime?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I don't know what the actual terminology used is, but I believe it's something like the preponderance of evidence.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and yes, that is correct, a much lower burden to prove internally by DCF that you're gonna be on this list. So am I to understand that one could be found not guilty of a crime and go on with their life and yet still be on
this neglect or abuse registry although they proved themselves to be not guilty in the underlying criminal matter?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. If someone is placed on the registry and then is found not guilty in a court of law, they have the ability to go back to the Department of Children and Families and get themselves off of that list and they do so through a variety of different ways and they are notified of their rights to do so.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. In my experience, that's not totally true in that a criminal matter, you have a certain, well, let's go back. What is the amount of time through which one has to appeal the
placement on the DCF negligence, abuse or negligent registry? What is that period of time?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. What happens is that within five days of their placement of their registry, they are notified of their appeal process. Each step in the appeal process is allowed 30 days so that within 30 days of receiving the notification, they can then contact the Department of Children and Families with their, with their desire to appeal and then there are multiple appeal steps. If they appeal and the abuse continues to be substantiated, it is then at that time that they have another 30 days to appeal again and that goes on for, I'm looking at this now, and it's about 11 different steps.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. And what happens if one does not file their appeal within that 30 days of notice of being placed on the registry?

Through you, Madam Speaker. I'm good. Want me to ask it again?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If they do not appeal within 30 days, they are placed on the registry, but then they have the ability to appeal any time thereafter. As a matter of fact, there have been appeals for multiple people that have happened five, ten, fifteen years after being placed on the registry so while there is a 30-day process, if they don’t appeal within that 30 days they are put on the registry, they still have the ability to appeal to get off of the registry at any time.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
And by what statute is that open appeal period established?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am unsure of what statute but I will have, I will look into that and get back to the good Representative on it.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Because it's my understanding that you have the 30 days and then the department can say that you did not file an appeal within the appropriate time and dismiss your appeal. That's my experience but anyway, moving forward from there, we were talking about the disposition of a criminal case and then filing an appeal. So if I'm to understand that the appeal initially has to be filed within 30 days, am I to further understand that most
of these criminal cases go to trial and somebody is found not guilty within 30 days also?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, I am not an attorney involved in cases so I don't have the ability to speak to how long any of these cases take to be adjudicated.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And let's just take a case where someone isn't arrested but they're investigated for risk of injury and there is no arrest because the police cannot determine probable cause, yet DCF places the individual on the registry. With regard to defense filing an appeal of that registry, is that person afforded the right to counsel, the appointment of counsel?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, there are two points to that question that I will answer. The first is that risk of injury does not get you on the Abuse and Neglect Registry, and the second is that DCF often waits for completion of the criminal process.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And so am I to understand that one is investigated for risk of injury to a minor, that DCF never places those individuals on the registry?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):
Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, the charge of risk of injury to a minor is actually, from my understanding, sometimes a secondary charge. The things that can actually get you on this registry are as follows: One, the child abuse or neglect resulted in or involves the death of a child, the risk of serious physical injury of a child or the serious or emotional harm of a child and the substantiation is for sexually abstinent and the individual responsible is over 16 years of age. There is a physical or emotional abuse when the person is entrusted with the care of the child with the, within DCF which means a foster child, and the individual responsible is arrested for the act of abuse or neglect that is substantiated, or a petition alleging that the child is neglected or uncared for, or a petition alleging grounds for the termination of parental rights pursuant to section 46b-129 or section 17a-112 of the Connecticut General Statutes responsibility and based at least in part on allegations that form the basis of the substantiation is pending in the Superior Court or on appeal.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I enjoy the recitation from the statute but we just want to focus on one portion of that and that was that it causes serious physical or emotional harm to the child. Can I just hear from the good Representative what that means?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

I'm sorry, could, uh, through you, Madam Speaker, could the good Representative repeat the question?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The good Representative mentioned that one of the things by
which somebody can appear on this registry is if they are accused of serious physical or emotional harm to a child and I'm just wondering what that means to the good Representative? Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and through you, there is subjectivity due to the nature of the work and I don't believe that would be up to me, but that would be up the Department of Children and Families and they look at each case on a case-by-case basis and they will make that decision.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well I heard before that risk of injury to a minor would not get somebody on this list so risk of injury to a minor could be you're driving down the road and you’ve got a 5-year-
old on the hood of your car. Not a good thing.
That's risk of injury to a minor. Am I to hear that one does not go on this list if they're arrested for that crime?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Uh, the representative has mischaracterized my words and I apologize if he didn’t quite understand, but just the charge alone is not an automatic placement on the registry. What I had said was is that each case is looked at individually so for instance, if someone is arrested for shoplifting in the presence of a child,
perhaps that might also be determined to be risk of injury to a minor. That itself would not be placement on the registry. However, if somebody was to place an infant on the roof of a car purposefully and drive 60 miles an hour on the highway, I believe that we would all agree that that certainly would warrant placement on the registry.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Now that we have that clear, let's go back to where we were because my scenario was that somebody is investigated for risk of injury to a minor and it doesn't rise to the level of probably cause so there's an arrest. The question was whether DCF could place the person on the registry based upon their internal investigation?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):
Thank you, and through you, Madam Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And am I to, and this is the question that was asked before, with regard to that, the adjudication, the appeal and all of that stuff, is the individual who is accused and now placed on the registry given the right to counsel as protected by our state and federal constitution to deal with the DCF situation?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Through what process is that individual allegedly given, a person who has not been arrested and is just
being investigated for risk of injury, has found to be appropriate for the list, but has not been arrested, through what vehicle are they given appointed counsel?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, they have the right to retain counsel at any time.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well thank you, Madam Speaker. You know we're not talking about hiring counsel. We're talking about people that are indigent, people that are, and I wish somebody would actually find out the racial makeup of this list, but people who can't afford counsel, my word was appointed so that's one who, they go to court, they can't afford a lawyer and the state gives them a lawyer to defend them and I got an answer to the affirmative before, and I'm just trying to figure
out through what process the good Representative thinks that happens.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If these cases rise to such level that they are heard in court, then they will absolutely be appointed an attorney.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So is there a requirement that a case that calls for you to be on the Abuse and Neglect Registry ever go to court?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, if they remove the child, then the answer is yes.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well under that very laborious list that the good Representative read off, I think one of the last ones was taking a child away but certainly we have this serious physical or mutual harm to the child which could end up with one on the registry. Am I to understand that those cases go to court?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

I'm sorry, thank you, Madam Speaker, I am hard of hearing and so I'm having a difficult time. If the good Representative could look at me so I might have a better chance to be able to hear and read some lips and understand?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Fishbein, if you could please repeat your question, that would be fabulous. Thank you.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you. Perhaps I'll formulate it in a different manner. Am I to understand that cases in which these matters result, without an arrest, but on the Abuse and Neglect Registry ever go to court? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, thank you very much for repeating that. Yes, absolutely, they can go to court on appeal. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So on appeal, so my understanding is that somebody is found to be on the abuse registry, they file an appeal within the 30
days, that appeal is heard internally by DCF, then they can file under 4-183 to the Superior Court, an appeal of that finding. Am I to understand through the good Representative that during those proceedings, the person can be appointed an attorney to defend?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I am told yes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through what process? So we have something that's already been heard by a worker, their supervisor, determined to be on the registry. We have an appeal of that. There's not right to counsel up to that point and now all of a sudden it gets to court and we're appointing lawyers under 4-183 to fight the AG's office? Is that what I'm to understand?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, as I've stated previously, when cases rise to the point of a child being removed, they are appointed an attorney.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So am I to understand it's just when there's removal of a child? Of all of those things the good Representative read, the only time that we are allowing these individuals the appointment of counsel to defend themselves is when there is removal of a child?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, yes.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And does the good Representative know what percentage of the individuals that are on the Abuse and Neglect Registry are there involving a proceeding involving the removal of a child?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Does the good Representative know how many times a year DCF is involved in removal of child proceedings in this state?

Through you, Madam Speaker.
Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, not at this time.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So let's get back to where we were and just to clarify, because I've heard a lot of answers here, one who is not arrested and yet, because it doesn't rise to that level, but DCF determines them to be neglectful or abusive using their internal proceedings, and not removal of a child, those individuals are not appointed counsel by the state?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe so.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So now we have the issue of calling the employer and what this bill would do is once they, the department makes the finding, and the department determines that the individual is employed in a capacity that requires the person to have regular direct contact with children, then the commissioner may call the employer. At that point, the person is on the list?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. If the 30 days have passed and there has been no process in which to appeal, yes they are. Even if they do appeal then yes, they are still placed on the list but can continue to go through the process.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.
REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Am I to understand that the good Representative recognizes a stay in the placement on the registry so they aren’t, although they have notice of placement, they are not placed on there until 30 days has passed? Is that what I’m to understand?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. The person is placed on the registry after that 30 days, even if there is an appeal process continuing, yes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. That wasn’t the question, however. The question is once the department makes the determination, are they placed on the list then or are they placed on the list after the
30 days has passed?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. They are placed on the list when a determination is made.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So the 30 days doesn’t matter at this point. Once the department makes that determination, they place the individual on the list. Now what this bill would have one do is now the commissioner has the discretion to call the employer. This person's on the list and what information is DCF going to be telling the employer?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):
Through you, Madam Speaker. That the individual has been placed on the Abuse and Neglect Registry.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I would think that the natural followup question by the employer in doing their due diligence, well what were they accused of doing or what did they do and what is DCF going to tell the employer?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. They do not give details of the reasoning that they are put on the registry, just simply the fact that they are on there.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. They aren’t going to tell the employer that it's subject to an appeal?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I am unsure of that actually.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And that's one of the just horrible things about this bill and you know it's unfortunate that it's being rammed down throats but that being said, what happens when the employer fires that individual and yet, they are successful in their appeal? Through you, Madam Speaker, what, is the state going to be sued? What's the remedy?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.
REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to address the good Representative's question prior that I didn’t have the answer to. We would be, sorry, DCF would notify the employer through a letter and they would include the fact that there is an appeal process. Through you, Madam Speaker. Oh, my apologies, Madam Speaker. I'll answer the second half of his question. It is the employer's discretion on whether or not they keep the person on.

 Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So just to deal with the two-part question, what direction are we giving to DCF to put in their letter with regard to the appeal process? I don’t see it anywhere in here, maybe I'm missing it.

 Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.
REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That is not located in the bill; however, it is involved in their regulations.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

I'm going to have to look it up afterwards, but if I could know what regular specifically dictates that the letter shall notify the employer of the appeal process.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. It currently does not simply because this law has not passed at this point. Once that does happen, they will change their internal process to include that.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well thank you, Madam Speaker. I thought I heard that it was already in the language, but I guess trust, but verify. So to go back, the employer now knows we have no direction the employer knows about an appeal. As far as we know, their layperson knows nothing about this process and all they know is that their employee has DCF on their back for something bad involving a child or children and they fire that individual and then there's an appeal and the person is taken off of the list. Are we going to protect employers from doing their due diligence, to save children, protect children, but at the same time protect due process rights? I don’t see that in here either. Through you, Madam Speaker, is that in here?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. It is not in the bill; however, current law says that if someone is a
school employee, we do the same thing. Current law says that their employer, the school district, needs to be notified if they're a school employer and then it is up to the school's discretion. This would be essentially the same thing where it would be up to the employer's discretion.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I'm glad the good Representative brought up the school employer because I don't believe it's any part of the school employee procedure where the employer is notified of the appeal process so proving the point that we need to give the direction here cause it's not going to happen. Is there a process that's contemplated if the person files their 30-day appeal period, and files their appeal, they're successful in their appeal, is there followup with the employer contemplated by this language as far as perhaps massaging that situation? Notifying them that they are now off the list?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, it is my belief that there will be a letter that would be given to the employee to let them know, or rather I shouldn’t say the employee, but the person who was once on the registry that they’ve now successfully appealed and will be taken off the registry, and I believe that that letter could be shared as that person sees fit.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well thank you, Madam Speaker. I just, it's very interesting. My understanding is that the commissioner is going to be empowered to call one's employer about the placement on the registry, and yet we're not empowering the commissioner to make a followup call in this legislation. Is that what I'm hearing?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Not in this legislature; however, we are checking to see if DCF would actually do that through their process and regulations.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And that's exactly the problem here, is that this body doesn't give direction. We cross our fingers, we hope that something will happen, we have faith that something will happen, but it doesn't happen. I hope it does happen. Madam Speaker, I think I'm done with questions at this point. I look forward to hearing the rest of the debate and I just, this is another bill that's just going to put people out of work. I understand that children need to be protected but we
do have appeal rights here also and the fact that the burden of proof is so much lower for the Abuse and Neglect Registry, you know individuals that can't afford to hire counsel to defend themselves are on this list. They don't know that they can file an appeal. This thing about you can file an appeal at any time in your life. If that's true, there's no notice of that and I just intend to vote against this bill. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Green, the good ranking member, my apologies for earlier.

REP. GREEN (55TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, I appreciate that. This bill has the support of DCF. It has the support of the Child Advocacy and the Commission of Women and Children. I do have a few questions for the proponent.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. GREEN (55TH):
I know some of these questions have already been asked and answered, but I just thought we would go over them again. Who's asking for this bill?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you for that question and through you, Madam Speaker, this is a combination between the Department of Children and Families and the office of the Child Advocate and the Committee on Children.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Green. Thank you for your answer.

How does one get on the list?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

REP. GREEN (55TH):

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, to the good Representative, thank you so very much for that
question. Someone would be placed on the registry if there is a substantiated case of the most egregious crimes against children including things like death of a child, substantiated sexually abuse of a child.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Green.

REP. GREEN (55TH):

So you're telling me if one gets on the list, they can appeal the process and there's a couple of processes that they do go through?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, thank you for that question and I will enumerate for you, for the good Representative. First a call would come into the Care Line and then secondly, triage would determine if DCF should move forward with that investigation. Then it is transferred to the Regional Office Investigation's Unit and assigned to a worker
or an investigator. From there, the investigation will encompass many facets and be comprehensive and thorough. They would contact police, they would contact family, school, therapists, etc., and then they'll make a determination of the allegation. Is it substantiated or is it not substantiated. If it is, then the question is asked, is this egregious enough to be put on the registry and if so, then they're placed on the registry and a notice to appeal is sent within five days and the person has 30 days to appeal. After that, if they choose to appeal, they would be an administrative appeal which would be an internal review within 30 days of the ask of the appeal. From then, it goes, if that is still substantiated, they have yet another process to appeal and that will go to the central office and if the central office upholds the regional request, then the request would go to an administrative hearing and another notice would go out, another 30 days. If the individual still would like to further appeal, then they would go to a DCF hearing officer where they would have 30 days and at that moment, then someone could introduce evidence and
witnesses and put things on the record. If that is still substantiated at that time, then they would be notified and would have another 30 days to bring it to superior court. If at that time it is still substantiated, then they have the ability to appeal to the Supreme Court.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Green.

REP. GREEN (55TH):

Thank you for your good answer. So there is quite a process that someone does go through in order to get on the DCF registry list so it's not just all of a sudden it's been substantiated and you're on the list, so there are checks and balances in the system.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, absolutely, and I appreciate you pointing that out. Thank you.

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Green.

REP. GREEN (55TH):

One last question for you. Could you give me a couple of examples of the types of jobs and compare someone working with children or someone who just happens to be around children?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker. Thank you so much for that question cause it's such an important point. So an example that I often use is someone who works at McDonald's. If they are simply selling hamburgers to children, yes, they come in contact, direct regular contact with children, but that is not something the department believes would require notification. If, however, their job at McDonald's is to dress up as the clown and be in close contact with children and sitting on their lap and they've been substantiated to have committed child sexual abuse,
then that ultimately would be something that they
would consider something that requires notification to
the employer.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Green.

REP. GREEN (55TH):

Thank you for your answer. So this bill passed
out of Committee with full support. I urge my
colleagues to support this bill. It's very important
for our children and we want to make sure that our
children don’t fall through the cracks and that a
predator isn’t going after our children in a job like
you described, the clown at McDonald's so thank you
for your answers and I urge everyone to support this
bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Will the Chamber stand at ease for one moment,
please? Representative O'Neill, for what do you rise,
sir?

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for purposes of an
introduction. Representative Labriola and I have some third grade students from the Gainfield School in Southbury. We both represent the town of Southbury and they are here visiting us in the Hall of the House and very opportunely I guess we are discussing a bill that would be something that's designed to protect them and their future and so I would hope that the House would give them a warm welcome in our customary style. [Applause] And if I could just add one more point which I forgot to say originally, and that is that I am also a graduate of the Gainfield School back in 1966 when it was called the Consolidated School so my alma mater is here.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Well thank you, Representative for inviting your alma mater and their class in here and to the students and their families, welcome to our Chamber. We hope you enjoy your stay. Back to the business at hand, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. A few questions for the proponent if I may?
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan, please prepare yourself.

Representative Dubitsky, please proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you. During the discussion with Representative Fishbein, there was, the good proponent indicated that a person accused of child abuse that would be placed on the registry would be given an attorney and provided an attorney by the State and I would just ask, is that a public defender or some civil attorney? Where does that attorney come from?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and through you, it would be in the case of a, when a child is removed from the home. They are provided an attorney. I am unsure of the process.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.
REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would that be a criminal attorney or a civil attorney? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I do not know. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay. Thank you. I do think it's important to know that answer. A couple of questions about the investigation. So we've got a, an individual who is accused of some type of abuse or neglect and DCF is going to conduct an investigation to determine whether or not that person has a sufficient level of contact with children at their employment so I would ask the good proponent to describe what that investigation into this individual's employment looks like. Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you and through you, that would be a matter of looking into their employment, as I had stated before, and talking with police and family and asking where they are employed so it would require disclosure that way.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would ask, the good proponent just said that would require disclosure. Disclosure by whom?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, it is an exhaustive process that includes interviewing the person to be placed on the registry and one of the
questions that they ask would be where are they employed.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Is the individual required to participate in that interview?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I don’t have that answer.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So I would ask, what if the person decided that they did not want to talk to the investigator? What then?

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I have confirmed that they do not have to partake in the process and they would speak to other people in the household.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So would this investigation include contacting the employer?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. The person who is being investigated to have placement on the Abuse and Neglect Registry, they can obstruct the process and DCF would still proceed with the info at hand and DCF can consult their employer with a signed release.

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Where I'm going with this is that I'm wondering if the investigation in determining what the individual's employment responsibilities are will be contacting the employer to ask about that?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. With a signed release.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. So if the individual does not provide a signed release, the DCF would not contact the employer as part of the investigation?

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So I'm wondering then, let's say for example that an individual does not want their employer contacted as part of this investigation and indicates as much, how then does DCF determine what this person's job is and where they work and what responsibilities they have?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker, they, DCF would work with the information that they have obtained through the investigatory process including whether it would be the individual who could possibly be placed on the registry, their family members or
anyone else that would be part of the investigation.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and obviously, the concern is that the detriment to an individual would be when DCF contacts their employer and indicates that they are now on the registry. That obviously would be, under this bill, at the end of the investigation so it would thwart that whole idea if they contacted the employer during the investigation to determine whether or not to notify the employer. So it would only make sense to notify the employer after the investigation was completed, not during the investigation. I'm also concerned and I guess the proponent has allayed that concern that the individual would be required to participate and I would ask, if DCF cannot determine what job the individual has, where they're employed, whether or not they have any contact with children, would DCF draw any conclusions from that and what would they do if they couldn't make
that determination?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I understand the good Representative's correctly, I believe it was what would the Department of Children and Families do if they are unable to find out where they work and if that is the case, the answer is they would proceed with possibly placement on the registry with the information that they have.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, are the investigators who are looking at, who are trying to determine what this person does, do those investigators have access to the individual?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, they do if the individual so decides. They have the right to not answer those questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So if the investigators have access to the individual, presumably the investigators would know if that person, what the ethnicity of that person would be?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and under the bill as
amended, that investigator now has discretion whether or not to notify the person's employer; is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So are there any protections in place to prevent DCF investigators from exercising their discretion to notify the employers of people based on their race?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, there is an exhaustive process when determining this. There is a
chain of command that they have to follow. A worker will not just be notifying every employer. It has to go all the way up through the chain of command and this, they will be alerting employers if the person placed on the registry has committed some of the most egregious acts including death of a child or sexual abuse of a child and as we know, those things happen across all races.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So again, is there, if we've got two scenarios where two individuals have committed a similar offense and the investigation reveals that both of them have some marginal contact with children at their employment, what is to prevent DCF from exercising its discretion to recommend contacting the employer of the African American and not of the Caucasian?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, thank you very much for that question. Again, as I had said earlier, there are many people that this information will go through. So it starts with the case worker who makes the determination and then it would go to a supervisor and then if that is, if it's continued, then it would go to an area manager and then if it is still continued, it would go to the bureau chief and professional ethics and morals are what actually would keep someone from alerting their employer simply based upon race.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would also ask on this registry, do we have any statistics as to how many, what percentage of the people on this registry are African American?

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):
Through you, Madam Speaker, yes.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. What is the percentage?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):
Through you, Madam Speaker, 21.9 percent in 2018.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. Now, is there currently any discretion in DCF in placing people on the registry?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and what is the African American, the percentage of African Americans in the population in Connecticut?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I don’t have that information.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. Is the Child Abuse and Neglect Registry a tiered system or is there one single registry regardless of offense?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. it is my understanding that it is one registry; however, that there are certain cases that have been substantiated that do not rise to the level of being placed on the registry.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So just to be clear what a non-tiered registry means, somebody could be on the registry for, for example having a dangerous household that would be dangerous for a child to live in and not giving the child sufficient access to food?

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. When I'm looking at the current statute, whether or not that would fall under substantial physical abuse which is a reason to be placed on the registry, I'm not sure, but once again, it needs to rise to the level of DCF's discretion in order to place them on that registry. So for example, if someone doesn’t give their child food for a few days and that is seeming to be neglectful, it's very different than someone who does not give their child food for weeks, months on end which are some cases that we have seen right here in the State of Connecticut which resulted in a child's death.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. But any offense that would be sufficient for a, for DCF to recommend that a
child be removed from the household for abuse or neglect would be sufficient to put the parent or guardian on the registry; is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, that is on a case by case basis and it is subjective and the Department of Children and Families would make that determination.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've been involved in abuse and neglect cases and there are certainly instances where a parent is simply incapable of caring for their children. Perhaps they are a hoarder. Perhaps they have very little income. Perhaps they have no training in childcare, perhaps they are drug abusers, perhaps a combination of all of those things and my concern is that a parent in that situation,
even if they have their child removed from them, would be in a very, very different situation than if they were for example a child rapist and my concern is that because we have a single registry the two are not distinguished in any way and when an employer gets a phone call from DCF, they have no way to know which of those two situations or something in between this parent or guardian might fall into. So I'm concerned about that especially when the, when DCF has this kind of discretion to notify the employer that the person is a registry, I think in most cases, the natural instinct of the employer is just going to be to terminate the employment. Whether it's appropriate or not, most employers are just not going to take the risk and I think that allowing the, allowing DCF to make contacts, even with the employer during the investigation just adds to that possibility. We here in the legislature have been trying for a number of years, and this year in particular to find a way to make sure that formerly incarcerated people have a way to get reintroduced into society. We have tried to, there are a number of bills up here this year, to try
to make sure that once somebody has served their sentence, they can get a job, they can get housing, they can get reincorporated into society and I think this bill as written and as amended goes directly against that and makes it more difficult for people, even people who apparently were not incarcerated, to hold a job, to get themselves back on their feet and to try to start a life where perhaps they can get their kids back. I'm concerned that this bill relegates people in this situation to second-class citizens where even if it's a fairly minor violation, that they may not be able to work anymore. They may not be able to get back on their feet and I think that, I think that's, that's the wrong approach for the legislature. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Good afternoon, sir.
REP. CABELLOR (86TH):

If I may, just a couple of questions to the proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Yes, you may. Please proceed.

REP. CABELLOR (86TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. In this provision that requires the commissioner to make a reasonable effort for individuals that are placed on the list, is the intention of this bill that they do that research at the time that an immediate investigation has occurred and a finding has occurred, or does this provision allow for the commissioner to say annually review the entire registry list and make notifications say on a cyclical basis, or is the intent of this to only deal with a pending investigation, the person is put on that list, then the employer is notified?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, this
is actually, the intent of this is for when a person is currently employed in a youth serving capacity because if they're going to be hired for another position and they have to go through the background check, that information would come up in a background check so it's in the cases of whether during the investigation and also if it comes to light that they are working somewhere that doesn’t have a background check, but puts these children in harm's way.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And then you know I envision the situation where say the person could be working in a school system and obviously, if the report was made in the context of work, the employer would find out so these are situations where it might occur at home and the employer has no way of knowing. If DCF makes a determination, do they have the ability to share any details of the event with the employer?

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, thank you very much for that question. No, they do not.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And then finally, if, I know it says here the commissioner has to make reasonable efforts of determining their employment. Because the state has, you know, sovereign immunity generally, we could have situations where names are similar and we're not sure if, you know, it's, you know, Tom Smith and that person, there could be multiple people employed throughout the State of Connecticut. In those type of situations, what if the commissioner makes an error in making a notification? Is there information like the person's address that could be shared with the employer so they can ascertain that they are taking about the same
individual?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker, thank you very much for that question. It is my understanding that the Department of Children and Families receives information from all places during, I shouldn’t say all, but from a great many places during the investigation and it is my understanding that they would ensure that it is in fact the same person whether it be through an address or the like.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I guess those are my only questions and I understand the intention of the bill. I think the intentions are good; however, I think this is a bill where the devil does get caught up in the details and the details are important. You
know, on the one hand, you know the abuse registry certainly is an important tool in order for employers to make sure that if they are interacting with children, they don’t want to be hiring individuals that might have been found to be on the Abuse and Neglect Registry. I think that from the discussions that I've heard, opponents have good points, you know one, making sure that we exhaust administrative remedies so that individuals aren’t harmed and I get a bit skeptical because in dealing with DCF in some of these situations, I'm just concerned about their ability to garner this information and appropriately act in the best interest of all the parties involved.

I think there are times that we've seen through various newspaper stories and stories from constituents where I just don’t believe that DCF acts in the best interest of the children or in the best of interest of the family and it's difficult enough for a family that might have an abuse allegation that might not really be justified and the turmoil sometimes that the state puts them through, they have very deep pockets with very little accountability that now we're
potentially allow them to disrupt an individual's employment as well through this process. So I'm torn about it. I think if it was a different agency, I might have a little bit more faith, but I just don't have faith with this broad language that the commissioner would be able to ascertain somebody's employment and contact them, in particular when these individuals might be going through the efforts of trying to keep their family together, of appealing a case to the Superior Court. To think that the commissioner then could disrupt that whole process by contacting the person's employer and then potentially causing them to become unemployed which could only, which could exacerbate their personal situation so I see the intent certainly if there is a bonafide issue that could impact an individual that's been found to be on the registry, that the employer would want to find out about and I think that's sort of what the intent of the bill is trying to get to, but I think the language is very broad.

I'm going to continue to listen to the discussion, but I just, in my experience with the
department, I think we have a long way to go before we continue to give them more tools in their toolbox because I just don’t think they always do good for the children and the families in the State of Connecticut. We've just heard too many bad things about this agency. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Good afternoon. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

If I may, a few questions to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Yes, you may.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Who is it, actually let me rephrase, how is it that DCF would determine whether or not an individual, in the case of their employment, would come in contact with children?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):
Thank you, and through you, Madam Speaker, as we've said earlier, it would be through the course of their investigation.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. And what would that investigation entail?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):
Thank you, and through you, Madam Speaker. The investigation encompasses conversations and interviews with many people including the person themselves, their family, police, and anyone that would have knowledge of the situation at hand.

Through you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And what if in the case of that investigation, DCF is not able to determine who the employer is?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, then DCF needs to go off of the information that they have to substantiate whether or not something has occurred and that they need to be placed on the registry.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you. I appreciate that, but it doesn’t answer the question. What if DCF through its investigation is not able to determine who the employer is? What is DCF's next step in determining who the employer is?
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, I apologize if the good Representative didn’t understand my answer. Basically, they would have to continue on with the investigation in a manner that does not include whether or not they could contact the employer.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I appreciate the Representative's concern. I will say, though, I did understand her answer, it just didn’t answer my question. If I could further, let's assume that the folks at DCF are able to actually determine who the employer is. How then would they be able to determine whether or not in the course of that employment with that employer that the individual works with children?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.
REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, through the course of the investigation, they would determine where the person is employed, and they could tell from where they're employed and what their job description is whether or not they come in close contact with, close contact with children.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Followup question. So let's say that the certainly is in doubt, that the employer could be one where the individual works with children, the job description, if indeed they were able to actually obtain that, I'm not sure how they would, but the job description is ambiguous as well. Would DCF be able to contact the employer to get further information about what the individual's job actually entails?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.
REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, and through you, Madam Speaker, this question was answered previously, but I'll repeat it for the good Representative. They make, DCF will make all reasonable efforts to find out that information and if the person that is under investigation does not want to sign a release to allow them to talk to their employer, then DCF cannot do that.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, and I appreciate the answer to that question. That's actually very helpful this time. If I could, another question. What if, what if DCF is wrong? What if they go through that determination process, they determine that you know the individual works at, I'll give a bad example, Toys R Us which obviously might raise a flag. Uh, they ask some questions, you know they do a little digging and they say, oh, let's call Toys R Us. What happens then if that individual works in the accounting office at Toys
R Us, but now DCF has notified the employer. Would there be a cause of action? Would the individual have any sort of recourse at all against DCF given that perhaps the employer was contacted inappropriately?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, and through you, Madam Speaker, all of this information would hopefully come out during the course of the investigation and this, DCF would use their discretion. DCF is not interested in contacting an employer if they work in the accounting office. This is just regarding people who come in close regular contact with children.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I think the Representative used a very important word there and
that word is hopefully that this information would come out during the course of the investigation. I don't think that we expect DCF to get it right every time. We can't expect them to, through the course of their investigation get the exact information and I just worry what would happen if DCF, acting in the best faith, were in a situation where they actually notified an employer when in fact they should not have and if that were to happen, what recourse the individual would have? Now perhaps their job is in jeopardy. They're in a situation where they're not dealing with children, but now their employer knows and has been notified by DCF so I wonder if in some way we are doing some folks a disservice.

Obviously the intent of this bill is, this is a very well-intended bill and I think everybody in here would agree that we want to make sure that children are in a safe environment, that any adults that they come in contact with are the right adult, the right kind of adult, an adult who's not going to go out of their way to give them, you know, put them in harm's way. I just worry about the practicality of making
sure that we don’t make mistakes. This is not something that we can take lightly. This is not something that DCF should view lightly and you know it's been mentioned a few times that the language in here is quite broad which leads me to another point and it runs through the reasons why DCF could determine that they need to notify an employer and one of them, in fact it's marked Item 4, it's the arrest of a person due to abuse or neglect and I know some questions have been, have been asked about this, but what if DCF recognizes that an individual has been arrested, and on that information they notify the employer. And what if it's later determined that the individual is actually innocent? That the arrest occurred but that the crime did not? What would happen then?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, this question was asked earlier so I will repeat the answer again that
this person has the ability to then appeal, be taken off the list, and that the Department of Children and Families would then allow, would then issue a letter stating that they’ve been taken off of the list and that letter can be shared as the person sees fit. Additionally, I received word that the Department of Children and Families would adopt regulations that would allow them to give information to that employer.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So just to clarify and if the Representative would clarify my understanding. So an individual is arrested, DCF notifies the employer of the arrest. It's later determined that indeed the individual was innocent. DCF then has the ability to write a letter basically saying oops, the individual didn’t do what we thought maybe they did, but I hope everything’s okay now. Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe the terminology would be quite different. However, currently, that is in their regulations as they provide that information to school districts, that the person has not had a substantiated reason to be on the Abuse and Neglect Registry and to answer the good Representative's question from earlier, what recourse would someone have if they did in fact work in a department other than one that is in a close proximity to children and the answer is that people can file a lawsuit against the Department of Children and Families and go through the Claim's Commissioner process.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I guess my concern here is that you can't put the genie back in the bottle. There are obviously going to be unfortunately
many circumstances where this information is, it's important that it needs to be communicated and that the information is accurate and that the employer needs to know. Those situations are going to occur and like I said, it's unfortunate. I just worry about those situations where an employer is notified about a situation that is either unfounded or where they shouldn’t have been notified in the first place and like I said, you can't put the genie back in the bottle, you can't unring that bell.

I wish the language of this bill were a little bit tighter. I wish, quite frankly, that it was spelled out what would happen to DCF if individuals were actually wrongly reported to the employer. That's not here. That's quite a lot that's not here that I wish were here but I appreciate the answers to my questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Kokoruda.

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I'm on
the Children's Committee and this bill did come out of the Children's Committee unanimously and I've listened to the debate and I understand both sides. We certainly want to protect our workers from being wrongly accused, but if we're worried about the benefit of the doubt, I think everyone here has to put the children first. When you look at the issues we're talking about, we're talking about for placement on this registry, a person that has caused the death of a child, sexually abused a child, or showed grave indifference to their safety and wellbeing.

When we voted for the bill in Committee, it was obviously before the amendment. Through you, Madam Speaker, may I ask, and I'm sorry if I wasn't here for the first part, why was the amendment put on to change the shall to may?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Thank you so much to the good Representative for that question. The bill
was changed from a "shall" to a "may" to ensure that the Department of Children and Families can exercise discretion and make sure that there aren't any of unintended consequences that some of the people who oppose this bill were speaking about. If we had kept the shall in, then it would require any time someone is placed on the registry for DCF to notify their employer. This is absolutely not the case that they wanted. Essentially, they want to make sure that if they do notify someone it is A, in the case of the most egregious cases and B, because the situation warrants it. When working with the Department of Children and Families and in cases involving abuse and neglect of children, things aren't always black and white. It's not always right and wrong. There are situations that many of the good Representatives today have brought up and in those situations, it requires discretion and it requires a chain of command to ask the questions as to whether or not this would -- notifying someone's employer would be in the best of interest of children and only then, when it is in the best interest of the safety of children, would an
employer be notified. So I do appreciate tax rate asking that question and I hope that answers that.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Kokoruda.

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do think that makes the bill better. You know, we've heard today about the ability of DCF and concerns. I have to admit I've been as loud as anyone about that issue, but it's a new day. We've got issues in our state and I do think if DCF is not going to be on top of this, if we're not going to be on top of this, the problem is our court system is not on top of it. I just heard today that a case that came to DCF, you all heard about, a 17-year-old who starved to death. His mother deprived him of food. Well last week she went to court. She was given five years. Her son died. She went to court five years suspended. That's what we're working with in this state. If we don't start taking child abuse seriously, and we need DCF to be our partner in this, and we should hold their feet to the fire. That's why
I'm happy about the amendment.

I do worry about the disruption of work for people, but when we look at the cases that you’ve all heard about since I've been up here, of children being mistreated, children dying, and then we hear our court system has just given them a pass too often. I don't know any of the details of that five-year suspended sentence but I think we all should find out what happened.

But I'm here today to support this bill. Again, I'm going to give the benefit of the doubt to protecting our children. These are the most egregious crimes we're talking about and I'm happy to see the amendment open the door to let DCF have some discretion on taking it to the next step through calling an employer so thank you. I want to thank the proponent of the bill and I will be supporting it.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good afternoon and
through you, Madam Speaker, I have a few questions for the proponent of the bill I hope have not been asked yet.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

So my understanding this would apply in the case where DCF can ascertain whom the employer is and if this case rises to the level of notification. Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That is correct and in addition, it would need to be known whether or not this person comes in regular close contact with children through the course of their employment.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):
Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, would this apply to all forms of employment both full-time and part-time?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

So I have a particular interest in this. As you know, I run a small children's museum. I have a number of both full-time and part-time employees, some of whom have other jobs so in theory, were one of my employees, God forbid, to be subject to this, as a part time employer, I would be notified?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. if the person who is
placed on the Abuse and Neglect Registry has been substantiated to have committed one of these most egregious acts and that person works for you in whether a full-time, part time or even volunteer capacity, that comes in close regular contact with children, yes.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and it's a bit difficult to work for me without coming in close regular contact with children but thank you. So there's been so much talk about this and again, I am seeing both sides. I know how much we need to protect our children, but I also know how frightening the power of the State can be in the case of someone who has been incorrectly accused. I was made aware recently by my superintendent of schools of a case in which a mother and father at home, the child was on medication. The mother gave the child medication, left for work, the father not knowing the mother had given the child medication,
gave another dose, sent the child off to school, realized what had happened, called the school to say please be aware in case there's some untoward symptoms. The superintendent told me that was reportable to DCF because the child had been overdosed. It's in those situations that I hope the much-touted discretion of DCF would come into place. This was an honest mistake, but someone could say, you had seriously endangered the health of a child.

I know every person whom I employ who works on a volunteer basis over the age of 18 at the museum is subject to a full background check and that includes an examination of the sexual abuse registry. In fact, I recently received an additional rider on my insurance policy saying that we would be covered in cases of sexual abuse by employees provided we had instituted that policy. So I share the concerns for protecting children, but I also share my colleagues' concerns for the power of the State against a possibly innocent person. So I thank the good proponent for her answers. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will listen if there are any further questions. Thank you so
much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

    Thank you, Representative. Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

    Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

    Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

    Through you, Madam Speaker.

    Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

    Thank you, Representative. Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

    Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I can, a question for the proponent of the bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

    Please proceed, sir.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

    Through you, if it were to be determined that someone is wrongfully accused and put on this list, would they have the ability to sue the State for damages?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Okay. I certainly, I think there's a lot of holes in this legislation. I understand its intent but I will definitely be voting against it today.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Linehan for the second time.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I appreciate all of the questions today and I am glad that the Representatives here understand the intent of this legislation. There is one thing that I wanted to
address. The good Representative used the term you can't put the genie back in the bottle. You can't put the genie back in the bottle. So we have the opportunity to make sure that a child is not further abused. We have the opportunity to keep predators away from children because I submit to you that we have the need to ensure that the genie is staying in the bottle by not allowing a predator to come in close contact with children. When we think about whether or not someone, if their employer will be contacted, I also want every Representative here to think about what happens if we don’t? Because once a child is abused, those effects last forever. We all here know someone or represent someone who was abused as a child and it is incumbent upon this body to ensure we do everything we can to keep those children safe. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and with that, I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff
and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7001 as amended by House A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Voting</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel]

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise for an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

I'm honored today to have fourth graders from Highland Park School, the Highland Park Huskies. Very special for me, both of my sons are graduates, my younger son just last year and his fourth-grade teacher, Ms. Narducci, is here and Ms. Ruff as well and I'd like to extend a good, hearty welcome to the people's House to the Highland Park Huskies today. Please join me. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative, and welcome to all the Huskies and we hope that you enjoy your stay here at the Capitol. Any more announcements or introductions? Announcements or introductions? Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 221?
On page 67, Calendar 221, Substitute House Bill No. 7125, AN ACT CONCERNING MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER BENEFITS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.

Representative Scanlon.

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

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

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. There is an amendment before us. The Clerk has amendment LCO 8773. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.
Will the Clerk please call LCO 8773 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A LCO 8773 offered by Representative Scanlon and Senator Lesser.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This amendment makes some changes that my ranking member and I have been working on along with some of our other colleagues for several weeks since the Committee had JF'd this bill and the Committee went through Appropriations and I would move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato from the 77th
district.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to actually not speak on the amendment and save my comments for the underlying bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you very much and good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good afternoon, sir.
REP. SCANLON (98TH):

What this bill does is very, very simple. It tries to make sure that from now on, if we pass this bill, that diseases of the brain are treated equally to diseases of the body when it comes to insurance companies in the State of Connecticut. In 2008, Congress passed the Federal Mental Health Parity Law that tried to guarantee that that very simple concept is the law of the land. The problem with that bill was that it didn’t have a mechanism to report whether or not states were complying and insurance companies were complying with that Federal Mental Health Parody Law and so over the course of the last ten years, former Congressman Patrick Kennedy has been traveling this country to try and get states to pass laws to require their insurance departments to certify whether or not insurance companies in states are complying with the Federal Mental Health Parity Law.

This bill is something that I worked on last year with Representative Kupchick, my friend on the other side of the aisle, and Senator Ted Kennedy who is Representative Patrick Kennedy's brother and this
year, we're trying to do it again and I'm very confident that we have tried to find a good balance here to make sure that we are finding all the information we need.

Why this is so important, Mr. Speaker, is because in December 2017, the Millman Group, a very well respected nonpartisan think tank put out a study that showed that Connecticut is the worst state in the entire United States of America when it comes to parity compliance and they found after reviewing 42 million claims over three years from across this country that Connecticut, again had the worst mental health parity compliance in the United States of America. And the best example of that is in one sobering statistic which is that 34 percent of all mental health claims were deemed out of network, compared to only 3 percent for physical health; 34 percent out of network for behavioral health, 3 percent for physical health. That is a staggering statistic and one that compelled Representative Kupchick and Senator Kennedy and myself to introduce this bill last year, and when that didn’t get across
the finish line, to do it again this year and I think that we can do a really important thing for the people of Connecticut today to make sure that again, diseases of the brain are treated no differently than diseases of the body and I'm really glad that this has been a bipartisan bill and I look forward to the discussion ahead. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Scanlon. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? From the 132nd district, Representative Kupchick. Would you rather go? We'll go to Representative Pavalock-D'Amato instead. Thank you.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of brief questions and then I am actually going to hand it over to the Representative from the 132nd district when you introduce her.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Very good. Please proceed.

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

Thank you. Can you explain what a non-
quantitative treatment limitation is?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. A non-quantitative treatment limitation is anything that cannot be quantified or expressed numerically.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

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

And can you explain what information you're looking for when you ask the healthcare to provide the comparative analysis as stated on line 47?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Madam, Mr. Speaker. Basically, comparative analysis is the tool in which we are using to determine whether they are applying standards for mental health no stricter than they are doing for
physical health.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

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

And is there a fiscal note on the amendment?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

There is not.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

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

And through you, does this apply to individual and group health insurance plans?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Yes, it does.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

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

And last, does it apply to the State Employee Health Plan? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Yes, it does. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I want to thank the Chair for all his hard work and my colleagues who have worked on this bill for the last couple of years and I urge my colleagues to support it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. KUPCHICK (132ND):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I'd like to offer my sincere appreciation to Representative Scanlon for his leadership on this legislation and working for quite a while now. It goes back last session when, well it actually goes back before that so as a legislator who was serving here with many of you after Sandy Hook happened and the public hearings and the amount of testimony that we received as legislators, what was most glaring was how Connecticut was just not doing the right thing regarding mental health and it was glaringly obvious that there were families across this state who were not getting the services that they needed for, for their family members.

We tried to pass legislation back then and we were unsuccessful so we sat down. I know that Representative Scanlon and Senator Kennedy put in a similar bill to a bill that I had also put in after meeting with members of the National Association of Mental Illness, sitting around family members' tables listening to their stories of how incredibly hard it was to access simple services for mental health. Being denied, denied, denied. Looking, going through
the maze of the medical field trying to find help for the family members and frankly, I was embarrassed to hear these things.

And so we worked. We thought, what could we do? Well we need data. We need data. We need to understand how bad are the services. What is exactly happening. You can't fix something unless you have all the data and so what this bill does is ask that we get the data of what exactly is happening. Now the Millman Report, as Representative Scanlon said, was very glaringly concerning. We need real data so that we can fix a broken mental healthcare system in the State of Connecticut, and every person who suffers from mental health can have the services that they deserve.

So I want to thank you again, Representative Scanlon, for your leadership and your dedication to this, and it's been a pleasure to work with you. And I want to also thank my ranking member, Representative Cara Pavalock-D'Amato for her hard work and her steadfastness working on this legislation as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Cheeseman, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, Mr. Speaker, a few questions for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

The proponent indicated that 34 percent of mental health claims were deemed as being out of network. Does the proponent of the bill have any idea why this is? Is it that there aren’t as many mental health providers typically in a usual network?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Madam [sic] Speaker, I think in part
as my good friend, Representative Kupchick, just alluded to, we're trying to get some data to actually find out what is happening right now. What I believe according to the advocates that we've worked with on this bill, that there is just simply, the provider networks are not great for mental health and that is tied into whether what we think might be noncompliance with the Federal Parity Law and that is exactly why we want to try to pass this bill so that each year in March, each carrier in the state has to report all the different things that they are doing to try to ensure that that does not happen and whether they are meeting that goal or not meeting that goal and I think once we have that data back, we have the ability under this bill to have a public hearing and have a public conversation about it and we believe that's going to be the best possible way that we can get to the bottom of why that 34 percent was happening according to the Millman Report.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Cheeseman.
REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and through you, Mr. Speaker. So would mental health providers include such specialists as psychiatrists, psychologists, clinical social workers? Would it run the whole gamut to whom one might go if one were suffering a disorder of either substance abuse or a mental health disorder?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know if the proponent knows, do we know how many of those mental health providers there are currently practicing in good standing in the State of Connecticut?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

I do not have that number off the top of my head, Mr. Speaker.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and through you, Mr. Speaker, is one of the areas we're going to be looking at collecting data whether or not there are regional differences in the ability to provide these mental health services? I imagine there are parts of the state where you might have a very good choice and other parts of the state where your choice, either through the vagaries of your health insurance network or simply the number of providers might be more restricted.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The bill outlines that
the report has to come in a formal manner ascribed by the commissioner. I would certainly apt to push for such a regional breakdown so that we could see if there are gaps in our system. I know from working with some of these advocates in parts of rural Connecticut, you know ability to access providers is a difficult thing. If the data bears that out, we might be able to come back in subsequent sessions and try and do something about that, but as of right now, it doesn’t specifically say regional, but it does allow the commissioner to determine what form and what kind of data is getting reported.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and through you --

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. Sorry to interrupt. I'm just looking at the final two sections that deal with insurance companies not being able to deny treatment for court mandated substance abuse
disorders. Is this something that is currently going on?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

It is my understanding from advocates that came to us asking for this that this is something that does happen in the State of Connecticut.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and is this an issue relating to people who've been recently incarcerated and are now being recommended for treatment or is it just individuals in general?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it's people who have
had recent interactions with the criminal justice system and have been ordered by a court to seek services. The goal here is that if somebody had been compelled by a court, not necessarily their will to get the treatment, that they should be covered for that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and through you, Mr. Speaker, so if my understanding is correct, this would apply if they were in receipt of state-funded Medicaid services, that they would be entitled and required to receive that treatment?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Cheeseman.
REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker, and as someone who has had family members suffering with mental health disorders and mental illness, I know how important the ability to find a good therapist is and develop a good treatment plan so anything that can move our state forward to recognizing the need to treat mental illness, substance abuse disorder on the same level as physical illness because all are painful and destructive and life-altering and life destroying so I want to thank all, everyone who worked on this bill, Representative Kupchick, Representative Pavalock-D'Amato and the good proponent of this bill, Representative Scanlon, and I too would urge everyone in the Chamber to support this bill. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Great to see you up there. Just a couple of questions. I do support the bill but I do, for mental health, so if you go to your physician will they, he or she, recommend a say psychologist or therapist so that through that process, will that be how the insurance company will hopefully cover the diagnosis and care?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there are obviously a number of ways that a person could get before a primary care provider and obviously, they may refer somebody to a mental health provider, but sometimes people have an incident that is the result of their mental illness and they get sent to the emergency room and because they're at the emergency room, they then get referred so there's just a number of ways that somebody could find themselves in treatment. What we want to make sure is that their insurance is treating that treatment in the same manner it would if you got
into a car accident or if you got your wisdom teeth out.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you and that's, I think they should actually. Too often even in the United States Military there is, you don't see the disease but it's there through mental health or certain disorders so as far as the substance abuse part, many times people don't realize if people have mental health which leads to substance abuse so if you don't, you're not arrested though and you have a substance abuse problem well then will this be covered because I heard previous speakers saying you'd have to be incarcerated first or have to have a court order treatment so I guess my question if you're putting the mental health aside and you feel you have substance abuse problem, will this be covered under this plan?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's a great question. In section 2 of the bill, the section that Representative Cheeseman was referring to earlier is a different section of the bill, but in section 2 of this bill it says that the treatment for substance use disorder can be no more stringently applied than if you had any other physical disorder such as heart disease or lung cancer, that the coverage must be the same for substance use disorders.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you. Thank you for that answer and it should because hopefully in the long run it saves money but more than anything else, is saves lives and somebody's life. I support the bill but I think a lot of people don’t realize mental health, with the start of mental health many times unfortunately is either alcoholism or substance abuse. I think it's an
important step for us and I would hope the insurance companies have, we have a bold, strong plan for policy and coverage for folks so thank you to the Chair, Representative Kupchick and all the people that worked on this, but it's very important for the people of our society. You nip it in the butt as soon as possible and you'll never nip everything in the butt, but if you have early treatment, early diagnosis, it saves lives and it saves money. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Petit of the 22nd District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions through you for the Chairman, sir?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

First there was some testimony on this bill concerning whether or not this could amount to a
mandate per se. Does the Chairman, in terms of the testimony discussion perceive this to be a mandate in terms of mental health coverage?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

I do not.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

To that end, through you, Mr. Speaker, there is really no significant fiscal note in terms of cost to the State, but I wonder if there's any discussion or testimony concerning potential impact upon health insurance premiums for all involved. I mean certainly in my previous care and practice, I view this as a positive step forward and something that we desperately need, but I wonder if there's any data considering what it might do in terms of overall healthcare premiums for the general population.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I think that's a great question. I think that in talking to some of the insurance companies here and the carriers while we worked on this bill to try to get some common ground, a lot of the cases they are already getting and tracking this data to begin with, they're just not releasing it and so I don't really view it as an onerous burden on them to then have to release this to the commissioner every year. There are things in here to make sure that it's safeguarded and that information is not being misused so no, I do not view this as something that would cause an increase in premiums or an overly onerous burden on the insurance carriers.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One further question just in terms of nuts and bolts and maybe I'm getting ahead of the process but in terms of referring someone for therapy and comparing say I took care of people with diabetes so I may refer someone for dietary education, for physical fitness to consult with an exercise physiologist, who, and if they then had concurrent depression or substance abuse or some other issue, who would determine what would be parity? Would that be the insurance company on its own, would that be the insurance commissioner? Who would be in the position to decided what would be considered parity in terms of what a provider is recommending for specific therapy for a patient?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The carriers are reporting on a slew of data on every single covered life they have when it comes to these things and the commissioner then reads the report and determines
whether or not in his or her estimation that they are attaining the level of parity as outlined by the Federal Mental Health Parity Law.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Chairman for that answer and if the company was in disagreement, what would be the next step in terms of an appeal process in either case whether they, the insurance commissioner recommended the requested therapy or denied the requested therapy?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is not outlined in the bill but I believe that they would, through the normal course of conversing with the insurance commissioner, they would let him or her know why they disagreed and why they thought that they actually
attained it and if they found some further
documentation that proved their cause, I'm sure the
commissioner would be willing to consider that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the good
Chairman for his answers and I'm all set. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark
further on the bill as amended? Will you remark
further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff
and guests please come to the well of the House? Will
the members please take your seats? The machine will
be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Have all members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7125 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting 136
Necessary for Adoption 69
Those Voting Yea 136
Those Voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 15

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 63?

CLERK:

On page 63, Calendar 63, Substitute House Bill No. 7094, AN ACT CONCERNING A DIAPER STIPEND FOR CERTAIN RECIPIENTS OF TEMPORARY FAMILY ASSISTANCE. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment LCO 8643. I ask that the Clerk call the amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call Calendar LCO 8643 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A LCO 8643 offered by Representative Abercrombie.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative Abercrombie, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just for members of the Human Services, originally the stipend was going to be a cash assistance for individuals that get temporary assistance. It was a $30-dollar stipend. In this amendment, in talks with DSS and the Diaper Bank, we thought that it was more efficient to do a grant to the Diaper Bank so that they could distribute the diapers. That's all that the amendment says. The money is in the budget currently. We did not put the Diaper Bank amount only because we know that the budget is still being negotiated and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? From the 63rd district, Representative
REP. CASE (63RD):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, a few questions to the good chairwoman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

    Please proceed, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. You spoke on the amendment so it says within available appropriations. In our budget that we had out of Appropriations, it was not in there. Could the good chairwoman tell me what line item in the budget it is in?

        Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

        Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

        Through you, Mr. Speaker. There is a line item that says a $500,000-dollar grant will be distributed to the Diaper Bank.

        Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

        Representative Case.
REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is that in the current, in the budget that we passed? I'm just trying to follow the numbers as we go because, through you, Mr. Speaker also, what is the dollar amount that we're going to be distributing to these agencies with this, with um, for the diapers?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The amount was added after the budget was passed out of Appropriations. The dollar amount we're looking at right now is $500,000 dollars but because it's still being negotiated, that's why we left it open-ended in this amendment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? Ah, Representative Davis from the 57th district. Fresh from a great appearance. Nice to see you, sir.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Always a pleasure to see you on the dais. Mr. Speaker, if I may, a few questions to the proponent of the bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, is the Diaper Bank of Connecticut, is that a
statewide organization?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and how does this organization operate? Do they get a number of diapers donated to them or do they purchase them and then deliver them to other organizations or do they make direct delivery of those diapers to those individuals in need?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, all of the above. So the Diaper Bank is an organization that takes in-kind donations, people drop off diapers. They also work
with homelessness facilities being able to distribute diapers so they distribute them in many ways.

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

   Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, is this organization the only one that does this type of activity across the state or are there other organizations that provide the opportunity for those in need to obtain diapers?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

   Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

   As far as I know, through you, Mr. Speaker, it's the only one that we recognize.

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

   Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And how did they obtain
that recognition? Is it recognition from the State of Connecticut or how did they get this recognition?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, they're a non-profit like any other non-profit. We have a relationship with them so that we know that they're an organization that distributes the diapers to families in need.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So are they a state contractor? Did we go through a competitive process or request proposals to find out if they're the ones to actually obtain this potential money from the State of Connecticut?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.
REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no, they're not a state contractor. They're just a non-profit that distributes diapers throughout the state.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So how did we come about choosing this one organization over potentially the many others that do a similar activity?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. We had a meeting with them before session and we knew that this was a big issue in the state. Families that do not have enough diapers, it prohibits them from going to work because they can't supply the diapers to daycare. Originally, we were going to do this through a cash assistance for families that are on TFA, but through DSS, they felt that doing it through the Diaper Bank was more
efficient because Diaper Bank buys in bulk so that they would be able to distribute more of the diapers that are needed to these families.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know in my community, for instance, we have active food pantries that provide diapers to those in need. Would those food pantries be able to access the diaper bank to get diapers or how would they, how would they get disseminated to the local organizations such as like Department of Human Services and others through towns?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure about that particular organization. I know that they work through different organizations but they were not spelled out when we had the conversations through the
diaper bank.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to a previous question on the debate of the amendment, it was mentioned that there would be $500,000 dollars earmarked for this organization. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's the amount that we have in the budget currently, but being that the budget is still being negotiated, we did not put the diaper, uh, the amount in this amendment and we said within available appropriations because we vote on the budget, we don’t know the exact amount.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.
REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And when I look at this organization's form 990, the last one available on their website is from 2015. It indicates that their income for that year, contributions and grants, but total revenue was about $816,798 dollars in 2015, so this would give them $500,000 dollars on top of that, significantly more than what they currently receive and through you, Mr. Speaker, is there anything in there that indicates that this $500,000 dollars from the State of Connecticut would go directly towards purchasing diapers and diaper-related materials or would it require them to hire additional staff with this additional funding from the state?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. We don’t tell non-profits how to hire if they need. The $500,000 dollars is earmarked for diapers and we would assume, like any non-profit, that's how it would be used.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is it commonplace, and I apologize, as I'm not a member of the Appropriations Committee, but is it commonplace for us to earmark large quantities of money like $500,000 for specific non-profits and give no guidance as to how that money is to be spent?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

So it's commonplace for the State of Connecticut to give large block grants essentially to non-profits and say spend as you see fit?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It depends on what they're doing. So for example, if it's a non-profit that's working with children that have severe mental illness and we do a grant through the state that says, this is for services, you would assume they're going to spend it on the services.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So would there be an audit perhaps by the auditors of public accounts to ensure that this money is spent on diapers or would it be something that is not looked into by the State of Connecticut?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not aware of any non-profit organizations that do not currently get Medicaid dollars that we audit so I don't see who there would be a mechanism for me to, for us to audit this particular organization.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And how many of these non-profit organizations are we making earmarked line items in the state budget that then do not get audited by the State?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have that answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So is it safe to say there's more than one? Are there dozens? Are there hundreds? How many line items do we do direct earmarks for non-profits in the State budget?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As the Chair of Human Services, most of the non-profits that we work with are through the Medicaid Program, which does have an audit process.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But would this Diaper Bank of Connecticut, do they receive Medicaid money?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):
Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And would this $500,000 dollars, potential for $500,000 dollars, would that be from Medicaid or from other source in the State budget?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. At this point, it's a lapse in the Medicaid, I mean in the DSS budget under the TANF dollars, which is federal money that we get from the government.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the $500,000 dollars would come from the federal grant intended for the
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, it's not a direct link to that.
It's a lapse that's in the budget and we are taking some of those dollars to do this grant for the diaper bank.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess how often is it that there's a lapse in a federally allocated program that we then can just unilaterally change where that money goes through a lapse?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's very common
practice. So for example, in this year's budget, there's a $33-million-dollar lapse in Medicaid. We will probably be using some of that money to backfill some of the non-profit providers who we have not been giving an increase to. It's very common practice to take some of those dollars and to be able to support some of the programs here in the State.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and with that example that the kind chairwoman just gave, those would be providers that are already Medicaid approved for the programs and that they would be getting that additional money. Is that not correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

That is correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but through you, the Diaper Bank of Connecticut is not an approved vendor of the TANF Program that these funds would be used for?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and there is no federal prohibition on how we can use that additional money through the lapse that requires it to be done through some sort of federal approval process?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.
REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and how much money is anticipated in lapses in this federal program for TANF?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If my memory is correct, there was $12 million dollars in this year's budget and $14 million dollars next year under the TANF Program. It's due to the reduction of individuals who are eligible through the program.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, from
the kind gentle lady's experience on the Appropriations Committee, is it a common practice for the State of Connecticut, us as a legislature to make these kinds of grants and then come back in the following budget and look at how they actually, results-based accounting, I guess, how they actually performed and if in fact were actually giving the money, a correct amount of money, too much money to one of these organizations to follow through their purpose as in statute?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH): Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If the good Representative would like us to ask them to come back and report to Human Services how the dollars were spent in the next legislative session, I would have no problem with that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.
REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, and I would hope that they would. I would imagine that they would want to come back and say that they want the additional funding in the out years as well so I would imagine that their testimony would try to provide how effective they were in fact in doing this and I ask these questions just because I have a little bit of concern when we're giving a grant and aid to a non-profit who perhaps didn't go through a request for proposal process, but I can understand perhaps certain circumstances where that would not be needed. I also have concerns when we're saying that we're going to give them a grant in aid, but not put an actual dollar amount on that grant in aid, but I do recognize that the need for this type of money is out there. As someone who had a young child not that long ago who was in diapers, I do recognize the cost associated with trying to keep those young people in the proper hygiene with diapers so I would say that I will likely support this bill today but with many reserves that hopefully will be worked out through the budget process that we ensure that the money is
properly spent, spent in the right places and that individuals across the state, not just where the diaper bank actually operates have access to these low cost or no cost diapers.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, a couple of questions to the good chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I did look at the underlying bill before the amendment and I had thought that it was a very laudable goal. I thought we were probably in a better direction than I think the amendment is unfortunately. I did a quick review of the locations of the Connecticut Diaper locations and there's not one location unfortunately in any town or city in Eastern Connecticut. And through you, Madam
Speaker, to the good chair, how do we believe the people in the eastern part of Connecticut would be served by these diaper banks, Madam Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. [sic] Speaker, I wasn’t aware that there wasn’t a location down there.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

And it's, and I appreciate that. I think there's 41 locations and when I say not on one location, I mean from the Connecticut River over there's no locations so cities like New London and Groton, Norwich and Willimantic which I'm right next to would not be served with the valuable resources that I believe that this, the goal of this legislation was for. And through you, Madam Speaker, why was it that the department did not believe that they could handle this or thought it would be better going in this
direction?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr., uh, Madam Speaker, sorry about that. So in the original legislation we were going to do it as a cash assistance for individuals that are on the Temporary Family Cash Assistance. To go to what Representative Davis' concern was, DSS felt that there was no way to monitor that they were using it for the diapers so at their request, they asked that we give the money to the diaper bank because of two reasons; one, the diaper bank buys in bulk which means that they can, for lack of a better word, get a better deal than an individual mom would get, and secondly, they thought that they would be able to distribute it better than through the Temporary Family Cash Assistance.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Ackert.
REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I thank the good chair for her answers. I am just, I know there's times that we vote on legislation that affects a certain area, but it doesn't negatively, I don't want to say negatively, but it doesn't support all of those in this position that may need the resources. One thing that we do know, those that are less advantaged have very, very limited transportation. That's an area that is definitely an issue with those that are less fortunate so I'm going to struggle with this. I understand so it does help primarily about six cities to be honest and that's about it and so for those that are Middletown, New Haven, Bridgeport and Hartford would be served by this but I think that I am very concerned that a major portion of Connecticut's individuals that could really use these resources will not be served by that, through you, Madam Speaker. So I'll listen to the continued dialogue but I think a little more research as to what we are doing and who is going to really be getting the services should have gone into this but I do thank the good lady for her
work and we'll see how I decide to vote on this.

Thank you, Madam Speaker and thank you to the good lady.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you Representative. Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, I have questions for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. I just wanted to follow up with the good Representative. In our Human Services Committee that I serve on, I do remember this conversation about the diapers and the concern was that it could not be tracked so I understand what they're trying to do, to get them out through the diaper bank. The original fiscal note on that I believe was $1.4 million dollars if it was going on the cards for the families. When we were in Appropriations, this bill was voted on as is, I believe with the $1.4-million-dollar fiscal note
on it. Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Chair, Madam Speaker, sorry, my understanding is no, it did not get in that proposal coming out of Appropriations; it was added after.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Chair and so through you, Madam Chair, the bill that was voted on in Appropriations, was there a fiscal note on that particular bill? I thought there was and I believe you had mentioned that something was going to change on that, that you were going to try to go through the diaper bank, but the exact bill that we voted on in Appropriations was a little different. Can you clarify for me?

Through you, Madam Chair?
REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. So the process is that the subcommittee chairs report to the chairs of Appropriations. In our report, the diaper, the money was a line item in there, in the Appropriations. After that process, the bill that came out of Appropriations, which was the budget, no longer had that line item. With talks through the chairs, they have put the $500,000 dollars back in there with the allocation going to the diaper bank.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So just to clarify, the budget that was, the Appropriations budget that was voted on did not have this grant in there. Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.
Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Chair and so through you, Madam Chair,

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That's correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a couple of quick comments just to piggyback on what Representative Ackert said. I do understand the concern and what we're trying to accomplish here. It doesn't appear that this diaper bank could accommodate everybody in the state so that is a concern of mine. One more question, through you, Madam Speaker. If the diaper bank cannot accommodate every town, do you know what the alternative would be? How would people outside of those areas that the diaper bank benefit from this program?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. They wouldn’t. This would only be for participants of the diaper bank.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for answering my questions. Just a quick comment. I'm concerned that a $500,000-dollar increase in spending, you know I appreciate what we're trying to accomplish here but I believe at this time, I don't believe we should be spending more money on something that may be, is it a necessity? It is actually detrimental that we have this in the budget this year? I would disagree with that. We have a lot of other problems but I appreciate us trying to help other people. I will be voting no today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

How many locations does the diaper bank have in Connecticut?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I don’t have that information.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Kokoruda.

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

I believe there's several. I don't think it's just one. I just want to say that the diaper bank works with a lot of our regional groups and I'm happy
to tell Representative Ackert that there is an organization called Bare Necessities in Clinton, Connecticut, it's in Clinton and Westbrook and I've never been to one of their events that the diaper bank isn't part of it so I think we see them in certain key areas because of you know transportation issues, but I think a lot of our smaller regional diaper groups are reaching out and working, working with the diaper banks. I don't think people are aware of that and in my town, Bare Necessities also, it has several towns that it helps but even in Madison, it gives to the food pantry because the food pantry's charge does not include diapers which they get so many requests for. And I believe the diaper bank also deals with adult diapers for our seniors if I'm not mistake so I think their reach is greater in our state than most people are aware and I will tell you, when I ask people that are really struggling, especially young families, what they need, diapers is really one of the first things they mention so I'm going to support this. I know it's a lot of money but I think we've got to be aware that the diaper bank reaches way beyond their
direction locations and they're working with a lot of smaller not-for-profits.

First of all, it helps, they help our small not-for-profits by bulk. That alone, being able to get more bang for their buck is significant so I'm going to support this today. I just think people have to realize what a major issue this is for our young families and for our seniors and the diaper bank is reaching out way beyond the borders of where it's facilities are located. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And just to clarify a few things. Through you, to the good chairwoman so we can understand, when this first came out, it was to be on a TANF cash card and I think working through it and a lot of concerns, we've come down to this as an amendment to put it to the diaper banks. Am I correct with that, Madam Chairwoman?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. He is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

So I thank the good chairwoman and I think there was a lot of concern on putting it on a cash card and not having accountability of it. So this amendment, is this signed off or I'm sure through the work that you do, DSS is in agreement with this, the way we're going about it?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you and I guess you know, I didn’t really understand how much diapers cost until not too long
ago but reading through the diaper bank and I guess there was a meeting at our rotary up in our local area where the good Speaker and myself represent, and it was noted that $2.4 million dollars of diapers each year are given out to the New Haven, Hartford and Bridgeport area, and that the Northwest Connecticut Chamber diaper drive collects their own so these local diaper drives, they're not going to be eligible to receive any of these diapers that are bought in bulk?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

I can only speak to the operation of the diaper bank. They buy in bulk and then they distribute to a lot of different organizations. I can't speak to how other organizations are able to get that bulk amount.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, I wish I could get them
in bulk. Through you, I do support, it's a tough vote when we're not helping out everybody. I know the good chairwoman tried to work to get this out in TANF cards so that there would be a cash advantage for people but we wanted accountability. Going down to the diaper banks, we're limiting the scope of how they can get out. I think in future years we can look at this even going farther so we can impact more but there has been a lot of work done on this. There is a need for it and with that, I'd like to hear any other discussions, but I would like to say my good chairwoman has done an incredible job trying to figure out a way to make things, a good bill a little bit better so I thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Case, thank you very much. It's called a wholesale club. [laughter] Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, if I may, just some questions for the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Please proceed, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The understanding that our fiscal year is about to end June 30, the $500,000 dollars that's already been appropriated or is already available, is that to serve the agency for the rest of the fiscal year or for an undefined term?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. We are working on the 2021 budget so it's the lapse that's in that budget.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know I'm not on Appropriations and you know I'm just trying to figure out, you know I think the fiscal year ends June 30 and I think we're working on the next budget which would
come into play July 1 so am I to understand that the money that's already been appropriated is for utilization this year, and let's just say that nothing is appropriated in this next budget, am I to understand that nothing would be appropriated to this non-profit? I know that was a long question.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. The Representative is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEGIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And the funding presently for this non-profit, where does it come from?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):
Through you, Madam Speaker. They do fundraising, they do in-kind contributions, they get like any non-profit organization you know I'm sure they reach out in their communities to all of the other organizations that they have. So for example, in my area, it's not uncommon to have Kiwanis do a fundraiser and donate to you know the food bank or other organizations like that.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm looking at the 990 for the entity and unfortunately, for some reason on their website, the last one they have there is five years or four years, it's from 2015 and I note that government grants are $27,000 dollars and my question is whether or not the Representative knows whether or not that's state grants presently?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.
REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I have no knowledge.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. And there's also an entry that says there's approximately $730,000 dollars in other contributions, gifts, grants and similar amounts. If the Representative knows, that was what she was speaking about before, voluntary gifts just so I don't get confused?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Does the good Representative want me to list everyone that contributes to the diaper bank? I'm not quite understanding his question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. No, I'm just trying to
We have government grants $27,000 dollars and we don’t know where those come from, and then I see an entry of $730,000 dollars and just trying to link up if that’s what the good Representative was referring before, that they do fundraising, they have people that donate, that kind of stuff. That's just a clump of everything else?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I think that the good Representative just listed where the money comes from so I'm still not understanding what his question is.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Merely looking to confirm. I guess I don’t need to confirm so we move on. When the Representative
represented to this room that there was a meeting prior to the session starting, I would take it that that's with regard to whether or not this entity would be the one receiving this $500,000 dollars?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That is incorrect. The diaper bank, like a lot of non-profit organizations, being the chair of Human Services, we meet with before session to find out what their needs were. The needs were that the diaper bank is millions of dollars, they would need to be able to fulfill the needs throughout the state. Through those conversations, we thought that it was important to put some money in the budget for the diaper bank. Through the budget, we looked at the TANF account that has a lapse that I'll say again, $12 million dollars in 2020 and $14 million dollars in 2021. We thought that some of those dollars could be used for individuals that are part of the TFA, Temporary Family Assistance,
which is a cash assistance program. We thought that we could do a stipend for them. Through the talks with DSS, DSS thought that there wouldn’t be a way for them to guarantee that that money was spent on diapers. They thought it would be more efficient to do it through the diaper bank and here we are with this bill before us.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well Thank you, Madam Speaker and perhaps I misheard something before. A prior question was about the ability of the entity to be able to provide this service and I thought that there was pre-session inquire and merely was asking about that, but is there a reason why, well maybe we did, did we ask for updated financials from this non-profit entity to establish their ability to remain solvent while we're giving them double what their present income is approximately.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. As a member of the Human Services Committee for well over 14 years, we have never asked a non-profit for their prior financials when we are looking at trying to help them.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and perhaps that's one of the reasons why we have so many problems up here, but, cause I can tell you in my town, when we do give money to non-profits, we want to know what the money's gonna be used for. That being said, is there any requirement here that the $500,000-dollar allotment is actually used for the diapers? I didn’t see that in the language before us.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I think it's sad that the good Representative doesn't have confidence in his non-profits in his area cause I've worked with a lot of them being that we're neighboring chairs, uh, neighboring towns and I think they do an awesome job and I don't see that there's been fraud done with his non-profits, but having said that, I think it's very clear that the diaper bank has a great reputation for doing what they're supposed to be doing which is helping low-income families with diapers. Forty-seven percent of our low-income families have a desperate need for diapers. It prohibits them from going to work, it prohibits them from doing other activities in their life, and through you, Madam Speaker, that is my response.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And certainly, did not look to denigrate any non-profit, but as an individual
who is charged with a duty given to me by the taxpayers to protect their money and make sure that it's used for a purpose that we determine to be appropriate, I think we have the power and the right to, in our due diligence, to look for backup documents as is the case that I usually push for in my town, but just to ask the question a little bit clearer, in looking at the language that we are to vote on, does it require that the money is actually spent on diapers, because it's certainly a laudable goal, but I'm just, I don't see that in the language and perhaps the good Representative can point me to that requirement?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. If the good Representative would look at the amendment that we're voting on, 8643, and in lines 5 and 6 it says, shall distribute grants in aid to diaper bank of Connecticut for the purpose of making free or reduced-cost diapers
available to parents.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well thank you, Madam Speaker. I read the language to be a program fee or a program structure so certainly one could be the administrator of this program and arguably be paid through this fund. You know perhaps it could have been set up as sort of a credit system where $500,000 dollars is held by DSS or something like that, the diaper bank can show that they purchased the diapers, gave them out to the people that we in this good body intend to receive those, and then money is paid to the entity. That's not what I'm hearing or that's not what I'm seeing unless I'm reading something different, and my question is are we anticipating through this language just to write a check for $500,000 dollars to this non-profit and cross our fingers and hope that it happens?

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

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I have every confidence that an organization that's called the Diaper Bank of Connecticut is going to use the money to help poor families which 47 percent of them need this particular item.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Is there some sort of statute that precludes the Diaper Bank of Connecticut from donating money that it receives to another non-profit?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Not aware of any.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. That concludes my questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7094 as amended by House A.

- Total Number of Voting: 135
- Necessary for Adoption: 68
- Those Voting Yea: 121
- Those Voting Nay: 14
- Those absent and not voting: 16

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] The great majority leader, Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that we place Calendar 88 on the foot of the Calendar. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Calendar 88 will be placed on the foot of the Calendar. [Gavel] So ordered. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 353?

CLERK:

On page 29, Calendar 353, House Bill No. 7278, AN ACT CONCERNING MOBILE INTEGRATED HEALTH CARE.
Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Good afternoon, Representative.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

Representative Steinberg, you have the floor, sir.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. It does seem perfectly appropriate that we are considering this bill today in that this is national EMS week and this would be creating a new mobile integrated healthcare program which we would ask our EMS professionals to perform, which puts them in a non-emergency role in helping
some of our most vulnerable in a proactive fashion.

It is the --

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

[Gavel] Ladies and gentleman, the good

Representative cannot hear himself speak. Could we please take our conversations outside?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you. This particular bill is the result of the hard work of a group, a mobile integrated healthcare working group that worked for over a year to develop a series of recommendations based upon some innovative new concepts for EMS workers. Specifically, this bill requires the Department of Public Health and local Health Departments to work collaboratively to design a mobile integrated healthcare program and then come back to us to figure out how best to implement it.

Madam Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 7907. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
Will the Clerk please call LCO 7907 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 7907 offered by Representative Steinberg and Senator Daugherty Abrams.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The amendment makes some modest adjustments to the underlying bill. It offers some more specific criteria for developing the EMS Program and secondly, allows the department to at least contemplate different reimbursement rates. It does not in this bill actually change the reimbursement rates, but asks DPH to consider what the appropriate reimbursement rates would be and then come back to us and lastly, allows EMS to transport a
patient to a different location than the emergency room with the explicit permission of the authorized hospital in the event that there's a better destination than maybe just taking them directly to the ER. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. PETIT (122ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will reserve my comments for the amended bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the

REP. PETIT (122ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I fully support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it as well. I think it will improve healthcare in our communities in the long term. In addition to providing better healthcare, it will lower costs. I would like to just ask the good Chairman a few questions.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. PETIT (122ND):

Through you, Madam Speaker, doe this apply to patients in emergent situations or only in non-emergent situations?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. It does not change the existing responsibilities of EMS with regard to
emergency circumstances, but is targeted at trying to be proactive almost in a triage kind of fashion to give EMS with the appropriate training the discretion to provide the services or transport to the most appropriate means of providing healthcare rather than relying exclusively on the emergency room.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (122ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the chairman for that answer. Through you, Madam Speaker, who would provide overall oversight through this program and specifically, to the emergency medical services providing this?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I understand the Representative's question, it would still be the Department of Public Health and the whole idea is
working in collaboration with the local health
districts to come up with a program which would make
it very clear what kind of discretion EMS employees
could use in what context. It would be a
collaborative effort.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (122ND):

Thank you and finally, Madam Speaker, as I recall
from the public hearing, we had widespread support
through the Emergency Medical Service providers,
emergency departments and as I recall, little to no
negative testimony. There was testimony that this
would provide a good community needs assessment, would
provide better healthcare and lower costs. To his
recollection, does the good chairman recall that there
was any significant opposition to this process going
forward?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.
REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the good Representative for bringing this up. This was a really well-done collaborative process with the involvement of lots of different stakeholders and even though we had some minor revisions that are reflected in the amendment, it shows that everybody was on board, everybody contributed. This is something that really hopes to save healthcare costs in the long run and to provide the opportunity for the Emergency Medical Service technician or the paramedics for the most part to be in a position to help us direct care in a way that's most efficient.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (122ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I urge support of the amended bill and per former President Roosevelt, be on time, be brief, and be seated.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Great words, Representative. Representative
REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And I just have a few comments. I want to commend the Chair of Public Health for this work. One of the problems, particularly as patients leave hospitals is that followup care and I'm looking at a study from Oregon and they found that this mobile integrated healthcare through the use of EMS reduced hospital readmissions by almost 30 percent. In the study group, only 6.3 percent of the patients were readmitted as opposed to 23.5 percent and if the Commissioner of Public Health is listening, Massachusetts has put together a great program and I suggest if they're looking for forms to promote this program, they steal a good idea from our neighboring state. So thank you to the Chairman and the ranking member and I urge my members to support this because it will do a lot to help preserve the health of Connecticut citizens. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Wood from the 141st.
REP. WOOD (141ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wonder if the other Representative Wood wants to stand up and we can really continue confuse people around here. A couple of questions to the proponent of the bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

How will EMT's, when they're on a call, EMT's or paramedics, how will they decide where to transport the person? I mean are there a set of protocols in place or will that be designed by DPH over the summer?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. That’s an excellent question. Yes, the intention of having DPH work with the local districts and obviously the EMS personnel is to come up with exactly those criteria, work on protocols, anticipate the various circumstances. I
would predict exactly how that's going to turn out, but as Representative Cheeseman brought up, there are good models elsewhere and I'm sure they'll take advantage of those best practices and lessons learned. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Wood.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

And I would assume one of the reasons this was done was to avert going to the ER for something that could have used something with less intensive intervention. Through you, is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. That's exactly correct. Obviously, the ER is one of the most expensive ways to deliver healthcare and this is intended, the EMS professionals with their expertise to be able to use discretion and actually direct the individual to the most appropriate and cost-effective
healthcare setting.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Wood.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Great. And one last question on followup care. I know a couple of years we did have legislation that would do a test model for EMT's to visit people, especially senior citizens who had just been released from the hospital to their home to avoid that cycling back so quickly to the ER. Are there specific guidelines for this or is this just a general directive for DPH to work on over the summer?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. An excellent question. It is exactly one of the areas they discussed in the working group and it is indeed something they will be looking into. It's almost a wellness function for our most elderly in trying to get out in front and make
sure that they're not getting themselves into a healthcare bad situation that will be more expensive so yes, indeed, that will be something they'll be looking at.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Wood.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Well I think this is terrific and I'm going to go out on a limb and say I think this is one of the more important bills we're gonna do this year and I applaud everybody on the Public Health Committee for passing this, for working on this, passing it out of Committee and I hope everyone will stand and support this. We need to do this for the citizens of our state. Thank you. Thank you to the Chairman and Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you very much, Representative Wood.

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I might, a
quick question or two to the Chair of the Public Health Committee. I noticed that what we're talking about here is that people are going to be presumably transported instead of to a hospital and an emergency room, that they're going to be transported to some other location. Am I reading that correctly?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. To be clear, they might end up transferring an individual to another setting if appropriate. It certainly does not mean that if the most appropriate place to send them is the emergency room or the hospital that would not take place, but it would give EMS within certain limits some discretion if the emergency room was not necessarily the best place to send them.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. The question arises in my mind and I don't believe I've seen anything in the LOR report or really in the fiscal note indicating what happens in terms of reimbursement to an ambulance if they take someone instead of to an emergency room, to a hospital, to some other what is deemed appropriate location. So do they get paid basically for that ambulance run?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. That's an incredibly pertinent question. Rather than make any recommendations at this point or change in reimbursement, that's indeed what DPH will be studying and coming back to us with recommendations. We expect obviously that they'll be some changes in reimbursement and we'd have to look at that from a fiscal standpoint so the good Representative's question is very pertinent and we're all eager to get those answers before we would move forward with any
such program.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So then I take it from the previous answer that actually this whole program won't be implemented until we have that schedule of reimbursements for transports to non-hospital locations?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Indeed, the amended version of this bill is explicit on that point, to make sure that DPH consider reimbursement rates, but that is only for them to make recommendations back to the legislature.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative O'Neill.
REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the gentleman for his answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

CLERK:
House Bill No. 7278 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting  136
Necessary for Adoption  69
Those Voting Yea  136
Those Voting Nay  0
Those absent and not voting  15

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 45?

CLERK:

On page 63, Calendar 45, Substitute House Bill No. 5575, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SUSPENSION OF DELINQUENCY PROCEEDINGS FOR FIRE STARTING BEHAVIOR TREATMENT. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Comey.

REP. COMEY (102ND):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Comey, you have the floor, madam.

REP. COMEY (102ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This bill allows a child charged with a delinquency offense that is involved in an act of fire starting to file a motion with the court for an evaluation to determine if he or she would benefit from participating in a fire starting behavior treatment program that has been developed through the Department of Children and Families. The motion must be filed within ten days after the child enters a plea and the bill permits, that's the first part of it, and then the second part is that the bill permits the court to suspend the delinquency proceedings so that the child may attend the program and if he or she successfully completes it and complies with the suspension order, the court may dismiss the delinquency charges.

During the suspension period, the child must be supervised by a juvenile probation officer who must monitor the child's compliance with the court orders,
and the child's parents or guardians must pay for the evaluation and the program, for the program costs unless the court waives the cost if the parent or guardian is indigent. So if the court on the child's or on its own motion finds that the child has successfully completed the program and complied with the other suspension order conditions, it may dismiss the suspended delinquency charges. If it denies the motion and terminates the suspension, the prosecutor may proceed with the case.

I will say that this is supported broadly by the fire marshals, by the child advocate, by the public defenders and it passed unanimously out of the Children's Committee as well as the Judiciary Committee. You know we think that this gives children, gets maybe a traumatized child into treatment, it reduced recidivism and it gives judges another tool for dealing with these matters. I move adoption of this. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Green.

REP. GREEN
Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm just going to reinforce what the good Representative said. This bill has big support with the Office of Child Advocacy, the Office of the Public Defenders and Connecticut Voices for Children. This bill passed out of committee with full support and this bill also passed last year out of the House, but died in the Senate. I'd like to thank Representative Boyd, Representative McGorty, and Representative Linehan for their good work in bringing this bill back out again, and this bill oughta pass. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Representative McGorty.

REP. MCGORTY (122ND):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker, thank you. I just rise today in support of this bill. I want to thank the Kids Committee and the Judiciary Committee and over the past two years, the Fire and EMS Caucus have been working really hard to get this bill here today. Hopefully, it passes here today. I encourage all my colleagues to vote for it and hopefully it passes in
the Senate as well. Thank you very much, ma'am.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 5575.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Voting</th>
<th>137</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those Voting Yea 137
Those Voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 14

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 191?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Abercrombie, you have the floor, madam.
REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The first portion of this bill just changes the name of the Department of Rehabilitative Services to the Department of Aging and Disability Services. With that, Madam Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment LCO 9061. I ask that the Clerk call the amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Will the Clerk please call Calendar LCO 9061 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A LCO 9061 offered by Representative Abercrombie and Representative Cook.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, what
this attempts to do is, there has been an issue with the Meals on Wheels Program through the last few years. What people don’t understand is that there are two different programs. There's a program that's distributed funds through DSS, which does the waiver programs and then there's dollars that are done under the Meals on Wheels through the Door's Program and there's been a discrepancy on what these programs get paid. What this bill attempts to do is try and figure out why different programs are charged different amounts. It also puts in a 10 percent increase in the DSS budget for the waiver programs that offer Meals on Wheels. With that, I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the good Chairwoman of Human Services, through this amendment, is there a fiscal note attached?

Thank you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

   Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE:

   Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes, there is, but the money is in the budget. There was a 10 percent increase put in through the waiver programs which I believe is about $457,000 dollars.

   Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

   Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

   Thank you and through you, Madam Speaker, so there is a line item in the budget that we passed out of Appropriations?

   Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

   Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE:

   Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes, and it did move out cause we were talking a little bit about process so it was the recommendation of the sub-committees and in the final Appropriations bill, it was still in
there.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I'll speak to the bill once the amendment is passed.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Madam Chair, and as we work diligently
in Human Services for our most vulnerable, I do feel as though it is important that we study and that we look at and that we make sure that this population that has been added through this amendment is equally treated by the different pots of money that we put together. I think this begins to solve that and make it a more cohesive effort so that the dollars are distributed and I urge my colleagues to support.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7163 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting 136
Necessary for Adoption 69
Those Voting Yea 136
Those Voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 15

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel]

Announcements or introductions? Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, for purpose of an announcement?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Please proceed, madam.
REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you. Good colleagues of the Chamber, next Friday, May 31, will be dress down day. What that means is, in order to dress down, you pay me or my colleague, Representative Zupkus, $5 dollars but for those that don’t feel comfortable and want to leave your suits on, it will cost $10 dollars. This year, the organization that we will be donating the monies to is Homes for the Brave which is an organization out of Bridgeport that helps veterans, women and men and families with home needs and other needs that they have. So please contribute. We appreciate it and for our friends outside of the Chamber, we take money from them also. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. I hope everyone participates. It is a great cause. It helps us get our work done a little better the more relaxed we are. [laughter] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 354?

CLERK:

On page 29, Calendar 354, House Bill No. 7301, AN
ACT CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH'S
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING REMOTE ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC
MEDICAL RECORDS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH.
Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on
Public Health.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker, good to see you
again. I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's
Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Madam
Speaker. This is a very straightforward bill. It is
to enable and facilitate the transfer of critical
health information to the Department of Public Health
in the most expeditious manner. It grants the
Department of Public Health access including remote access to hospital electronic medical records on reportable diseases and emergency illnesses and health conditions and also the tumor registry. We charge the Department of Public Health with the responsibility of maintaining lists on these various diseases and conditions and therefore, it is in our interest to make it easier for them to obtain this information. I should add very importantly that this information is kept confidential as per current law and will not be shared with any party other than the original hospital and the Department of Public Health. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, Madam Speaker, to the Chairman of Public Health, as I recall there was testimony on this bill in Public Health that was concerned about the privacy of these records especially under the HIPAA statutes. I wonder if the good Chairman would comment on whether the bill as
currently written will protect privacy and is consistent with the HIPAA regulations that are currently in place.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the representative for that question. Indeed, we did spend some time talking about assuring the privacy of this information. First of all, it's a very limited set of information related to the things for which DPH is responsible for maintaining the list and I have confidence that there are appropriate safeguards in place to assure privacy and that no third party including another provider would be privy to this information.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, would any
other entities other than the Department of Health have access to this or would the software, encrypted software utilized to transfer information only go through the healthcare facility and the Department of Public Health?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. No, this is a two-way street with no side streets, you know to DPH for their explicit responsible purposes for maintaining those lists, nobody else.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So I'm not, is it fair to assume that the Department of Public Health is proscribed from sharing this information with any other entities unless they have explicit permission from the parties involved?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. That's indeed correct. Via current law, they have access to this information currently. All we're doing currently is expediting the transfer of that data on a timely basis.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, through you, obviously a timely issue has been vaccine so the simple transmission of data concerning a procedure such as someone received a vaccine I assume would be included, but is there, is there separate language involving mental health records versus traditional medical records?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.
REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. That's an excellent question. I don't know for certain where mental health falls within the categories. There's stipulated reportable diseases and emergency illnesses and health conditions. It would not surprise me that certain mental health conditions might be part of that group, but I don't know that offhand.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, in terms of our current opioid crisis, I assume that this would also be able to include information involving overdoses and emergency departments or people that are hospitalized and the drugs that were utilized that perhaps could be utilized to try to improve public health?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.
REP. STEINBERG (136):
    I'm sorry Madam Speaker, I didn’t catch the tail end of that question. If the good Representative would please repeat?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
    Representative Petit, he didn’t hear the last part of your question. If you could please repeat it, please?

REP. PETIT (22ND):
    Thank you, I'd be happy to do so. I just, I don't know that we don’t, and I apologize if we discussed it and I forgot. I assume this would also include the ability to transmit information concerning drug overdoses or fatalities in facilities and have that information transmitted in a timely fashion to the Department of Public Health and perhaps that dissemination in a timely fashion could help prevent further deaths if that information was obtained in a timely fashion.

    Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):
    Representative Steinberg.
REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Certainly that information is critical to be had in a timely manner. I'm not exactly sure which of the things the good Representative mentioned necessarily fall again in these very explicit categories. Certainly there's some information that would be very helpful to have with regard to reportable diseases and conditions to stem the expansion of any epidemic level concerns, but I do not have the information to be specific again as to which might fall in this category and which might not.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Will the Chamber please stand at ease? Will the Chamber come back to order? Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And just for background and maybe I should’ve started here, I presume that this information in the past was transmitted via traditional snail mail per se and now we're attempting to do this electronically. Is that
correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm not sure everything is currently being transferred via snail mail but certainly the direct access with the appropriate protections will be greatly speedier than the current means.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and certainly when the information of electronic medical records, electronic health records has been brought forward, a big issue in the field has been the variety of software products that are out there. Does this bill speak to what will be involved in terms of getting the different systems to speak to one another in appropriate fashion with appropriate safeguards and inscription?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a really important issue that we have vis-à-vis electronic medical records in the first place. The compatibility, the ease of exchange of data is an issue we're still dealing with so this doesn’t necessarily overcome some of those obstacles which we're still working on but hopefully in many cases, the hospitals and DPH have the means by which to share information in an electronic fashion. That's really what we're looking at right now.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am told that an amendment may be called so I will stand down at present and wait for the amendment to be presented.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I heard the same rumor. [laughter] I would ask the Clerk to, the Clerk has an amendment LCO 7411. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 7411 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 7411, offered by Representative Steinberg and Senator Daugherty Abrams.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative Steinberg, you may proceed with summarization.
REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and apologies to all members for not having perhaps brought this up a little earlier. There are a number of technical word changes, some clarifications in the early sections and in section 2, it also just clarifying language. The one significant change is a new sub 2, a hospital should provide the Department of Public Health with access including remote access if technically feasible. That really addresses the point that the good Representative brought up. It has to be something they can currently do. We’re all working towards that sort of solution where communication is both secure and easy and we haven’t gotten there yet, so this clarifies that critical point. I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is adoption on House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Will you remark on the amendment? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.
REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, just emphasize, my apologies for not having brought it earlier. There are minor technical changes. This is still a very straightforward bill to expedite exchange of critical information that DPH needs to maintain. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. On the, on the bill as amended, in section 2, number 2, it states a hospital shall provide DPH with access including remote access if technically feasible to the entirety of a patient's medical record. This question goes to whether or not a
patient or physician would have the ability to withhold part of the record from this type of review if they didn’t want the entire record revealed. I certainly understand having done chart reviews done before, having the entire chart is often very necessary to get the complete picture, but I wonder if there’s the ability for people to withhold information they feel is very sensitive?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. No, this section does not specifically address the ability for an individual to hold back information though to be clear, this is just as deemed necessary only in rare circumstances where there is desire to really come to the bottom of perhaps a broader healthcare issue so it's not necessarily something that would be done with any regularity, but only after they’ve come to the conclusion that this particular case may be critical to further understanding how to address a problem.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and through you, would the fact, if this bill passes, would it allow the Department of Public Health to go forward with clinical research initiatives that have not yet been specified? For instance, if they wanted to look at a specific question, does this allow them broad access or only under the circumstances of specific conditions or diseases that are reportable in prior statute to the State of Connecticut?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. My reading of this amended bill does not give them wherewithal to open up whole new avenues, but the additional information is to be accessed only in the event to establish completeness of reporting and data accuracy consistent
with the lists that they maintain so it's very limited in its context.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the Chairman. I have no further questions. thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and Madam Speaker, along those same lines in that section, if the good Representative could tell me, through you, do these provisions, I guess are they put in place to conform with federal law?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I understand the
good Representative's question, its' certainly conformance with federal law which we're obliged to maintain and the section is written as such to limit the authority to access the personal medical record, both I imagine to be consistent with HIPAA requirements, but also to recognize that this should only be accessed within the context of maintaining the federally required records on reportable diseases and conditions, not for any other purpose.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate that answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]
The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Have all members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. Representative Walker, for what purpose do you rise?

REP. WALKER (93RD):

Thank you, madam. I would like to be registered in the affirmative. I know I pressed the button, but for some reason the green light didn’t show up.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

One moment, Representative, we will get that noted. Anyone else have an issue with the button? Will the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7301 as amended by House A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Voting</th>
<th>137</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those Voting Yea 87
Those Voting Nay 50
Those absent and not voting 14

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 454?

CLERK:

On page 38, Calendar 454, Substitute House Bill No. 7385, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND CHANGES TO AFFIRMATION, AFFIDAVIT AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR LARGE STATE CONTRACTS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the bill modifies contract compliance requirements for certain state municipal and quasi-public agency contracts. It's a good business bill. It eliminates unnecessary bureaucracy and the procurement process without comprising state's higher standards for fair and ethical contracting. So essentially the bill streamlines the process by which a vendor demonstrates acceptable compliance with existing state ethics laws. It will eliminate the need for 90,000 forms of business submitted to the state every year. It's a good business bill for the State of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, there's an amendment. Will the Clerk please call LCO 7656 and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize?
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 7656 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A LCO No. 7656 offered by Representative Fox.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the underlying amendment is somewhat of a technical amendment in just that it makes absolutely clear that the provisions of the bill only apply to contracts entered into after July 1, 2019. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative France.
REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The summary the good Chairman provided is accurate. It's a minor technical change for clarity in the language and also it adds an on or after date of July 1, 2019 for enactment of that particular section. I recommend adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to point out the underlying bill does not eliminate any of the legal protections or requirements just a separate piece of paper. It streamlines business and it's good for the State of Connecticut. I move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and the summary for the purpose of the Chamber and those watching, the Commissioner of the Department of Administrative Services came in and wanted to streamline. There were seven different attestations or submissions that had to be provided with each contract submission. The Commissioner wanted to streamline that process, eliminate the seven. Upon listening to the public hearing, the representative from State Enforcement Commission raised concerns about the ethics portion and so the Committee heard that and added that provision back in. So we eliminated six of the seven, leaving the ethics requirement in there and with that, through you, I have a couple of questions for the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):
Thank you, Madam Chair and through you, Madam Chair, in section 1, lines 8 through 19 are struck and it seems to me they were replaced with lines 22 through 25. If the proponent could summarize the effect of that change.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the Representative for the question. Those changes go to streamlining of the bill, the fact that it will streamline the process, will eliminate over 90,000 forms of business submitted to the state every year. It's just a means of streamlining the bill and making the state more efficient.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer and that's exactly, that's at the heart of this bill. It's really taking
the prescription out of it and the mandate out of how to respond to contracts and providing you know basically that the chief executive officer or his authorized signatory is responsible for the actions of the key employees and they have to assert things and it gives them leeway in how to do that, but it also specifies that the contract would need to specify that so that is something that certainly DAS will be aware of to make sure that in the contract they'll specific that requirement and that similar language is also in section B and elsewhere in the document. There are conforming changes throughout the proposed change.

As we move on, section 5, which begins on line 215, just so everybody understands, that's the section and the proponent can confirm it, that deals with the ethics requirements that the State Election and Enforcement Commission was concerned about and this deals with putting that back in. If the proponent could just confirm that that is accurate.

Through you, Madam Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fox.
REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I can. That is correct.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you and just so everybody understands, that is essentially the meat of the proposal that the Commissioner of the Department of Administrative Services brought before the GAE Committee really to streamline the process, reduce the cumbersome paperwork that had been basically mandated on every contract submission. It will also go to hear the concerns of the State Election Enforcement Commission and to ensure that the requirements the ethics portion and the contribution portion are covered. With that, I recommend that my colleagues all support the change. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to commend the ranking member for his efforts in making this bill ready for the floor today. I appreciate all his efforts thus far this session including with this underlying bill as well. I just want to acknowledge the efforts with the new Commissioner of DAS who's done a great job for this bill. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7385 as amended by House A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Voting</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (82ND):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 370.

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey of the 133rd, you have the floor, madam.
REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's great to see you up there.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good to see you out there.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a tremendous opportunity and permissive in nature for municipalities to together or jointly establish a land bank authority governed by a board of directors. These authorities may acquire, maintain and dispose of real property. These land banks will give municipalities an opportunity to address blighted and
abandoned properties, lower crime and stabilize the tax base and convert vacant properties into productive use. This bill has been supported by multiple stakeholders, passed unanimously out of committee, and Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO No. 9096. I would ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9096 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A LCO No. 9096, offered by Representative McCarthy Vahey, Representative Zawistowski.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the amendment excludes brownfields from the land banks that we are hoping to pass today. It excludes any taxes collected by the state and applies only to municipal property taxes and it eliminates the tax exempt status of any bonds issued and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark further on the amendment? Representative Zawistowski of the 61st, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the amendment and would like to speak further on the bill as amended.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Reyes, you have the floor, sir.

REP. REYES (75TH):

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on the bill after the amendment, please.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

I defer to my ranking member, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zawistowski, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
You may proceed, madam.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is this, is a land bank available to any municipality or just cities that have blight or abandonment problems?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker, that's one of the best things about this bill. This is available to any municipality in the state and in fact, this is an issue that does plague every municipality in some fashion so it's a great tool for all of our towns, cities, boroughs, whether they use it singularly or combined via an interlocal agreement with other municipalities as well.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

And the good Representative anticipated my next
question which was whether or not municipalities could combine forces to establish one land bank shared by more than one.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

And yes, Mr. Speaker, municipalities may work together. In fact, I think it's a great idea but certainly, if an individual municipality would choose to do so, they may as well.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker and this is actually, this is a municipal option and not a requirement. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, yes, this is permissive. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

And Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good Representative for her answers. This is a great tool for any municipality that has a lot of abandoned or blighted properties. It brings the properties back into productive use, increases the tax base. This did go through committee unanimously and I do support it and recommend that my colleagues do the same. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Cummings of the 74th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, a couple of questions for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
You may proceed.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The inventory that is referenced in line 132, are there any specific requirements as to where the inventory must be located?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no, there are no specific requirements that I'm aware of.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Cummings.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and would a property that is coming out of the land bank into a third-party purchaser be subject to the conveyance tax?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):
Through you, Mr. Speaker, that's a good question and I'm not certain.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Cummings.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and may a board member hold interest in an LLC that would like to acquire property that is coming out of the land bank?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Mr. Speaker, thank you. Through you, thank you to the good Representative for the question. There is a provision in this bill that explicitly states that there is not a conflict of interest allowed so that the answer to that would be no.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Cummings.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I do support this bill as it will help urban communities, particularly those like Waterbury, help get rid of these blighted properties that are plaguing our streets and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Reyes of the 75th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. REYES (75TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few questions for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. REYES (75TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, so the question was already asked about joint municipalities and the question for the proponent of the bill, is there any time frame for these transactions to actually be completed?

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

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no, not that I am aware.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Reyes.

REP. REYES (75TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and this House Bill 7277 is a bill that we worked on with associates right here from Hartford and I believe it's a great, great bill to address some of the blight issues and I'm a proponent of the bill. I'm actually endorsing this great bill and it is absolutely a good bill and it should pass. Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Napoli of the 73rd, you have the floor, sir.

REP. NAPOLI (73RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this bill and I want to thank the Chair of Planning
and Development as well as the ranking member. This is a very important piece of legislation for all of our cities and towns especially mine of Waterbury. This bill could actually impact 300 properties and of course, turn them over to developers and make them affordable homes for people so again, I rise in favor and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Dubitsky of the 47th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A quick question for the proponent of the bill, if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Does the board of directors have any time of eminent domain power?

Through you.

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

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, I do appreciate the question from the good Representative, and the answer is no.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the authority as a whole have any eminent domain power at all?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Will you remark further on the bill
as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7277 as amended by House A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Voting</th>
<th>139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 345.

CLERK:

On page 70, House Calendar 345, Substitute House Bill No. 6530, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PRESENCE OF AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATORS IN ALL STATE-OWNED OR LEASED BUILDINGS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg, you have the floor, sir.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you. In the interest of providing no surprise going forward, let's move right forward. The Clerk has an amendment, LCO 8166. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 8166 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A LCO No. 8166 offered Representative Steinberg.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure everybody at this point understands that automatic external
defibrillators save lives and they often make the difference between life and death because they are there at the right time and provide lifesaving services. We also understand that having them present and accessible in as many settings as possible will facilitate their saving lives. This bill is intended to make them available in as many public state-owned buildings as possible. The amendment addresses the fact that that's a lot of buildings and actually puts some limits into the bill within available appropriations. It has to be a building that is currently occupied because the state owns lots of buildings that are not necessarily regularly occupied and basically just makes clear that this is something that we seek to do, it's something that we should be doing, but we recognize that it's an expensive proposition and it's a good first start. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative
France, you have the floor, sir. Moving on. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, just to reiterate, this is intended to eventually encompass as many state-owned buildings as possible. We're starting within a reasonable standard within available Appropriations and buildings that are fully occupied and are currently in use and have the greatest opportunity to save lives. I move adoption, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Petit of the 22nd, you have the floor, sir.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, a comment. This bill was brought forward by a colleague from the other side of the aisle who put forward a story about someone in a state building who, if there had not been four primary responders available with the ability to perform CPR for 18 minutes, this person likely would have succumbed so I think it's a good idea, though it is pricey. To the good Chairman, I think the changes in the amendment including within available appropriations and the language that occupied, a building occupied on a full-time basis by state employees during normal business hours is an attempt to moderate the cost a bit?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Yes, exactly. So we recognize that's not going
to transpire in every state building, certainly not immediately and the focus is going to be on buildings where we have the greatest prospect to save lives so they need to be operated in a full-time basis. We expect that will significantly reduce the overall cost of the program.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In addition, one of the changes, strikes standard set for by another organization approved by and inserts or the international liaison on committee on resuscitation and strikes Department of Public Health. Is this an attempt to widen the ability for accrediting institutions?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it recognizes why
we didn’t think of it sooner to assign this responsibility to the well-known international liaison committee on resuscitation who are clearly the experts in this area rather than the Department of Public Health so that seemed like a sensible shift to the experts, the international experts.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it’s only a tough bill in that obviously in these difficult fiscal times, there’s a significant fiscal note, but I think it’s tough to put a price on human life. I would note that the good Representative from the 105th was instrumental in the past two years and prior to the past year, there was only automatic external defibrillator in the Capitol Building for the entire facility. We now have one on each floor due to the efforts of the Representative from the 105th, so I think this is a good bill and should move forward and I thank the good Chairman for his efforts on this
bilateral. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Lavielle of the 143rd, you have the floor, madam.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good afternoon to you, madam.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

We had this bill in Appropriations and obviously it's a wonderful idea, it saves lives. There's no objection to the principle. I just have a few questions on the, what we know at the moment about the cost and the extent of the work required. So do we actually know at this moment how many of the 3000 state buildings are actually occupied on a full-time basis during normal business hours?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, I'm not familiar with the precise number. I believe it's significantly less than 3000, but I don't have that number.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Well the other question that arose and it came from the first fiscal note which I assume wouldn't change now that the amendment is the bill, one of the remarks in that fiscal note was that there needs to be an employee on site when the building is in operation who is trained in using AED's and that that may require that not just one, but maybe several employees be trained at each location or at some of the locations because there wouldn't be one person who was on call the whole time, and I wondered if we had any idea of how many people that might be?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.
REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a very good question. Obviously the size and the occupancy of our various state buildings varies considerably. So to your point, whether they would be shift employees or depending on the hours of that particular facility would vary as well. I don't have a number for you. I do believe though that many people have indicated willingness and eagerness to become trained in the administration of AED's and hopefully that would not prove to be an obstacle.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the cost per defibrillator is I recall about $1000 dollars each?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, indeed, the cost
per defibrillator is the direct cause of what might be a large expense, over 3000 buildings or even a subset. We're hoping that costs continue to come down and as has been mentioned earlier, it is, there's a natural attention between our ability to do so and our desire to save lives and we're going to work as hard as we can within available resources to make that possible. This sounds like something that's going to take a period of years to maybe implement to the degree we would care to.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and also, are these, is this equipment maintenance free? Does it last forever until it's used or forever period or does it need to be periodically maintained or replaced?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do believe that there is a level of maintenance required. It is not particularly rigorous and I'm sure that we would develop a schedule for routine checking to make sure there was operative. Again, even with the large numbers involved, this sounds like something we could probably work with to manage within available resources.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, well one more question. I know that the amendment says within available appropriations, available resource, totally understood, but is there any, is there any funding currently allocated in the budget that was passed out of Appropriations or in the Governor's budget?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not familiar with any specific line item that would include such an appropriation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank my good colleague from Westport for his answers. I share his concern for this. I do think it's a good measure. We ought to have them everywhere. They do save lives and reliably so. I'm going to vote for it but I am concerned about the extent of, well the funding required to do this properly and also about the need for maintenance over the long term which apparently there is. I don't think we have enough facts on really what we would need in order to equip all the necessary buildings. I think we're kind of groping around in the dark on this.

If I understand from the good Representative, it's kind of like a best efforts doing what we can even if we can't reach goal because it's important and
I'm fine with that, but I think we ought to know where we are and I think we ought to have a very precise idea of what we think we would need to put into this and I don't think we have it yet so, so I'd like to register my concern about that. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Ferraro of the 117th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

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

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the proponent of the bill and through you, I noticed in reading the fiscal note, does he have an idea before the adjustment and within appropriations if all these units were to be financed, what would be the total fiscal note?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I understand the good Representative's question, he asked if we before reduce the eligible number of state-owned buildings, what the overall appropriation would be, the simple math would be if you have roughly 3000 buildings, not that we necessarily really want to do that as per the amendment, and you're looking at a cost in the range of high hundreds to $1000 dollars, pretty straightforward math on that point so you have 3000 times $1000 dollars.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, I certainly appreciate the amendment and looking out for the pennies that belong to the taxpayers and at the same time, recognize the need for having these devices
in state buildings and the fact that they can save lives. It is probably prudent to start off with a doable number shall we say.

The other question I have revolves around liability and through you, to the proponent of the bill, are the only people allowed to use defibrillators in state buildings people who have gone through the training on how to use them?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, indeed, the goal is to have people operating them who have had the training.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good gentleman for his answer and one last followup question in that regard. If someone were to apply a
defibrillator on someone and they did have the training, and they went through the training, and for one reason or another, it failed and the survivors of the family took it upon themselves to sue the state, would the person be covered by good Samaritan laws?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very glad the Representative brought that up. Yes, the good Samaritan law I believe would be covering in this instance.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and one last question. Does the proponent of the bill ever see a scenario where somebody's life is on the line and the defibrillator would be incorporated at that moment by someone who was not trained?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ideally, the goal is that we would have somebody trained in that circumstance. It would not necessarily preclude somebody choosing to take action on their own, but that's not what we seek here.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Klarides-Ditria of the 105th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. KLARIDES-DITRIA (105TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the proponent of the bill.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, madam.

REP. KLARIDES-DITRIA (105TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I know we talked within available appropriations, have you considered grants for the AED's?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A very good question. No, we haven't explicitly discussed that. Seems like an avenue we want to consider. Maybe I should add if we are actually going to get a lot of defibrillators, maybe we could get a volume discount which might bring down the cost.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Klarides-Ditria

REP. KLARIDES-DITRIA (105TH):
Thank you, through you, Mr. Speaker, as far as the grants go, I think a lot of these companies will donate to certain entities and I think that's a good venue. Through you, Mr. Speaker, do you think we should talk to these different companies and donate some AED's to us?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a very interesting idea. As long as there are no strings attached, I think that's something that would be worth pursuing if we want to expedite having as many buildings as possible with AED's.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Klarides-Ditria

REP. KLARIDES-DITRIA (105TH):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, I just have a comment. One of my fellow legislators asked about the battery check and as someone who is the person that
checks the battery, it's an annual battery check. The batteries usually last about five years and then they need to be replaced for a cost of about $55 dollars.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you very much. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Case of the 63rd, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Mr. Speaker, I know we heard this quite recently in Appropriations. I think it's a great idea for the State of Connecticut. My concern was, as a lot of people are talking here today, is the cost implicated and it says within available appropriations and when we talk about people's lives, it's very difficult to say. But with this, these defibrillators, they're passed out and I know the company that I have, we have
safety champions that go around to my company offices and they check them. To the good proponent of the bill, does he know the lifespan of the batteries of these?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I vaguely recall a comment that suggested maybe they last as long as five years.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and with the possibility of 3000 units throughout the State of Connecticut, who do we have administering and taking a look at these and making sure that they're in working order?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.
REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we have in many of our buildings somebody responsible for routine maintenance for any number of different pieces of equipment. Perhaps we could ask people familiar with other mechanical or electronic equipment to take on this role so it would not represent effectively a new responsibility for an individual.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I thank the good Representative and with a lot of these AED's, when they're in multiple facilities of one group like in the State of Connecticut, the manufacturer might have to have somebody that will come out because there are software updates. Are we aware or have we had any communications with what it would cost to obtain one of these companies to have somebody on board to have somebody do those software upgrades to these AED's?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative Steinberg.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not aware of the current state and that's one of the challenges with technology, it's very hard to keep up sometimes and it's hard to predict the innovation timeframe before a software upgrade might be recommendable or whether the technology has advanced so significantly, we're looking at something other than AED's in a period of years, but this seems to be a pretty standard piece of technology right now and I would imagine we would seek to find AED's that are state of the art and would be so for some time.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Case.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and once again, I thank the good Representative. No more questions, just a few comments and you know it's something that we're finding that's really saving some lives rather quicker
than usual. You know our state police, our Capitol police, our local police, they all have them in their cruisers. It's interesting, I was taking a look at one of the ones in the buildings in the business that I work at and it's basically a different type of AED [sic], I don't know, it's an AID [sic] that teaches so as soon as you press it and you need it, it tells you the steps on what you need to do, quite ironic, so we don’t need to have somebody trained within the facility, but saying that, such an AED like that does cost a lot more. I do see that this is within available resources. I hope we do find the resources to do this and if we save one life, I think it's well worth the venture so I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Mastrofrancesco of the 80th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few questions for the proponent of the bill? Thank you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, madam.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, can you tell me has there been an incident recently where we didn’t have one of these AED’s in a state building that prompted this? Did something happen where maybe the paramedics could not get there in time?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, we haven’t done any specific research on incidents. Not necessarily sure what the path for reporting would be in those instances, but when you think about the sheer number of employees that the State employs and the potential for somebody to have such an episode, I would say that this is not a remote possibility.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.
REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you and through you, I certainly understand that anything can happen in any building. I just had a couple on concerns on, on, you know there's, you can't put a price tag on somebody's life obviously, but I am concerned about training the staff. There's 3000 buildings that we would have to equip right now in a central location and staff needs to be on site during business hours. Through you, can you tell me what the cost is to train the staff? I see in the bill it's $100 dollars per class. Can you tell me what the cost to the state would be? I would assume that we'd have to train more than one employee in case they're not available.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The good Representative is correct. We would need to have more than one employee at any location. We are looking at fewer than 3000 buildings. The classes conceivably could be
large enough to take care of a lot of employees at any given time, but I don't have a precise number on what the cost would be to the state and again, if we're implementing the program over a period of years, ideally in any given year, it would not be particularly onerous.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, I understand the concern. Certainly I don't know if there was thought put into unintended consequences for this as well. You have an AD in a central location in the building. You could have a building with five or six floors, maybe ten floors, you know does every single employee know where it is if there was an emergency?

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I believe there would be a lot more training that we would need. I think it's a great idea. I have a little concern that I'm not sure how effective it would be and paramedics
getting there seem to be doing a good job, I'm sure they get there on time and I don't see any incidences or any data showing that, geez, we've had a fatality because a paramedic couldn't get there. But, through you again, Mr. Speaker, is there any thought into additional training for the employees as to how to access the AED, what to do when they get it and so forth?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would look for reference to how the private sector deals with this. You know I would imagine that it would be incorporated into other safety related training for all employees, what to do in case of a fire, how to find emergency exits, how to access other kinds of emergency care as needed. I imagine that that protocol would be integrated into such protocol for both new employees and current employees and could be managed in that fashion.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you and through you, Mr. Speaker, has any thought been put into the State possibly needing an additional insurance policy perhaps if something wrong, an employee was to use the AED and something went wrong and something fatal happened? The State potentially would get sued.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not an expert on insurance particularly commercial or public sector insurance. I would imagine that the State has significant liability coverage in all of its buildings. I don't know if this poses a significant new threat.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you and through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you, Representative. I have no further questions. It's been clarified. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Wilson of the 66th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just feel that I need to make a few comments. So many of these bills that we're debating and are being proposed this year deal with very emotional issues and this is certainly one of those very emotional issues. How can you put value on the life of a State employee? On the other hand, when we start to look at the numbers, how they come together for example on this bill, well you know is it a $100-dollar training and we need one person trained. Do we need two people trained? If we multiple that by 3000, now we're up to $600,000 dollars. If we try to estimate what the annual maintenance is going to be
and if we pick a number out of the air like $250,000 dollars or $250 dollars, now we're up to another three quarters of a million. We're going to pay $1000 dollars for these machines each, now we're at $3 million dollars. It just goes on and on and so the financial fiscal dilemma plays against the emotional dilemma. We don’t see anything in this bill that talks about how long it's going to take to phase this in. Is it two years, three years, five years, so how many budget years is the expense gonna be spread over and I think, I just get the feeling, the way I'm feeling right now is we're being bulldozed with all kinds of these emotional bills with fiscal notes on them and the bottom line just keeps going up and up and up and so as much as I may be looked down upon because of a no vote here, it isn’t because of the emotional side. It's because of my concerns for the State of Connecticut and the taxpayers who send us here to do the best that we can for them and this is just one more kaching in the bottom line so I'll be voting against this bill, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Cheeseman of the 37th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and as someone who took the decision several years ago to acquire an AED for my children's museum, I want to reassure my colleagues who have doubts about this. One, they are very easy to use. The current models will not allow you to, for the machine to deliver a shock unless it is needed. It says rhythm detected, yes, no. You press a button. We have the appropriate pads for both adults and children. I was able to get training for $35 dollars a head so if the state needs help driving a better bargain, I am happy to oblige. And it is not just State employees whose lives may be saved by this. It is every person in Connecticut who may be accessing a State building. Perhaps the Department of Motor Vehicles and I can't think of anywhere that's more likely to give you heart failure than the Department of Motor Vehicles so I think we would welcome AED's in there. I agree it may take time to do this, but these
machines are simple, they'll save lives. They'll save not just State employees or other people living in the State, our fathers, brothers so as long as it takes, I would encourage my colleagues in the Chamber to support this because everybody will be better off. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Thank you very much, madam. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Buckbee of the 67th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You look good up there my friend.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Well thank you.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

   Quick question for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   You may proceed, sir.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So this, the dollars we're allocating to this, this hasn't been officially
allocated yet, right? It's as proposed through the budget?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

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

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative Buckbee.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

   And my question, I guess, one more followup, are there any here at all right now?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

   Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, indeed. We have an AED in this building. It's actually not far from here.

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Buckbee.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

So not far is great as coming from someone who has used these in the past, someone who has worked with someone who has dropped in front of them in a facility. You want every possible tool at your disposal. The dollars will be allocated as it gets to that point. We talk about these things that could save lives. This literally just plain and simple saves lives and especially look at how many people are in this building now, not just those of us that are here. There's so many people here. This is ridiculous for us not to look at. Absolutely I support this. This is a great idea for a bill. This should be in State buildings. I commend those who put it forward and thank you for the time, for the proponent of the bill and for you as well, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff
and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Have all members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. Representative Kupchick, for what purpose do you rise?

REP. KUPCHICK (132ND):

For an announcement, Mr. Speaker? No?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The Clerk will please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill No. 6530 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting 136
Necessary for Adoption 69
Those Voting Yea 132
Those Voting Nay 4
Those absent and not voting 15

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions?

Representative Kupchick.

REP. KUPCHICK (132ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to acknowledge that is National Rescue Dog Day so I want to applaud everyone in this Chamber and everyone across the State of Connecticut who rescues dogs instead of shopping for dogs so kudos to all the rescue owners in the Chamber and in the State of Connecticut. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. We applaud all their hard work. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 75?

CLERK:

On page 63, House Calendar 75, House Bill No. 6996, AN ACT EXTENDING THE FORECLOSURE MEDIATION
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette, you have the floor, sir.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Doucette, you have the floor, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill extends the State's foreclosure mediation program for a period of four years to July 1, 2023. Current sunset date is July 21, 2019. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO 9106. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the
Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9106 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A LCO No. 9106 offered by Representative Aresimowicz, Representative Ritter, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment does two things from the bill originally reported out of Committee. The first is to amend an existing statute that the Judicial Department prepare a report annually and submit it to the General Assembly. That requirement is now changed to every other year.

The second change from the bill as it was passed
out of Committee is somewhat more significant. The bill, the amendment renames the foreclosure mediation program after our late colleague, Representative Ezekiel Santiago. As everyone in this Chamber knows, Representative Santiago passed away on March 15, a few days after the Banking Committee reported out our bills including this one. This was a program that he felt very strongly about. This was a bill that he felt very strongly about. It's only fitting that we name this program after him in his honor, as it helps so many people across this State including in his home town of Bridgeport. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Delnicki of the 14th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Yeah, just a quick comment here. I plan to speak on the actual bill once the amendment is adopted here. Quick question, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the
proponent of the amendment. Are there any changes between LCO No. 9106 and 9105?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not actually aware of, through you, 9105. Is the proponent, is the question if there are any changes to the original bill or?

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the question is pertaining to the previous amendment that I was under the impression was going to be called. I salute the fact that it is a good thing that we are naming the program after Ezekiel, a great guy, it was dear to his heart and it's an issue that we both shared and I'll get into that under the actual discussion pertaining to the bill, but this is pertaining to the differences
between what I thought was going to be the original amendment that was going to be called versus what was called.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for the question. I believe I checked the number, and I believe I understand the question now. No, as I summarized there are two changes included in this amendment. The first is the recording requirement by the Judicial Branch and the second is renaming the program after Representative Santiago. The first amendment number that you referenced was the first of the two changes I just described.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the proponent of the amendment for his answer there. I
just wanted that for clarity for those that thought that 9105 was gonna be the amendment called, that the only difference is the naming of the program for Ezekiel Santiago and it doesn’t change was the proposed amendment was going to be with that exception.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, that's correct. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):
I'll reserve the rest of my questions for the amended bill once we go through the amending process.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.
Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, I'd like to ask the proponent a couple of questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there a fiscal note on this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, there is. There's
an estimated fiscal impact to the state of $1.9 million dollars in FY20 and $2 million dollars in FY21.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and again, through you, how is that going to be paid for?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The program as it is designed is intended to be funded through the Banking Fund which is funded through assessments by the banking and mortgage industries in the State. The funds are appropriated into the banking fund and then as has been the prior practice, shifted to the judicial branch where the employees, the mediators, and the additional staff allocated to the program are housed.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

And again, thank you to the proponent of the bill for the answers there and through you, Mr. Speaker, just to get to the heart of the matter pertaining to changes to the bill, the one pertaining to the reporting, is this being done in response to the testimony of Judge James W. Abrams, Chief Administrative Judge, Civil Division, Judicial Branch during the banking committee public hearing of February 7, 2019?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, it is. The testimony at that time by Judge Abrams is that the preparation of the report was quite time consuming and burdensome so in response to that, we have required it to be every other year.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

And again, thank you to the proponent of the bill. Followup question to that. Is every two years appropriate? Will that provide the appropriate information we need?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, I believe that it will. We will have a report on or before March 1, 2021 and then a second report with the same information covering the previous two years that is due on or before March 1, 2023 which is currently the sunset date for the program in the bill before us.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):
Again, thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you to
the proponent of the legislation here. Again,
referring to Judge Abrams' testimony that day, the
second action, restoring of the banking fund resources
to operate the program by the end of the fiscal year,
he stated that there will be ten foreclosure mediation
staff supported by the banking fund. So then is it
ture that will be entirely funded through the banking
fund, and not a penny from the general fund?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, my understanding
is that is correct. It is included in the budget with
an appropriation within the Judicial Branch. However,
it is funded as I explained earlier from the banking
fund.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):
Again, thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you to the proponent of the bill. During that same public hearing, we received, let me rephrase that, yes, during the Banking Committee public hearing of February 7, we received testimony from Sarah Poriss and it pertained to supporting 6996 and her commentary was to the effect that she's an attorney, she works exclusively with clients who are in foreclosure and have, and has many clients who have the crumbling foundation issue.

And she goes on to make a further statement in her testimony, in addition, the continued availability of the program as we move into this new crisis, referring to the crumbling foundation issue and the fact that folks conceivably are walking away from their mortgages and their homes will provide homeowners with the issue as well as the banks and other interests such as the towns and the State as a whole an opportunity to work out the issues associated with foreclosure on the homes. And I'm assuming, and if the proponent could answer that question, I'm assuming that her statement there is indicating that
it will buy them some time to go through the captive insurance, to go through whatever gap financing they might need, to delay that foreclosure so they will not have to walk away.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, to the good Representative, as we discussed at that time, the Foreclosure Mediation Program is proper if not a perfect venue to discuss those issues relating to crumbling foundations affecting the homeowner and the property, and to resolve those issues through the available loss mitigation options which may include waiting for the captive or any sources of relief.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

And again, thank you to the proponent for your answers there. A couple of comments. You know, my
support for this lies in the fact that and it's no secret in my Chamber that my area and quite frankly, a number of legislators', both in the House and Senate, areas are plagued with the crumbling foundation issue. It is truly a unique and new disaster that's hit Connecticut, though it's roots go back as early as the 80's. My belief is given an opportunity to see whether or not this is a successful program for these folks is critical because I know talking to folks in my district, many of them never realized that they could utilize the foreclosure mediation and quite frankly, if they hadn't sought out the particular attorney here that provided testimony and a couple of other attorney's that specialize in the issue, they wouldn't have known that the Foreclosure Mediation Program is another took that would be available in the toolbox, again for the folks with a crumbling foundation issue. And quite frankly, I probably would not have been supporting it today had it not been for that issue, but I am supporting it today because of that issue and I'd like to go a step further.

I can fully understand and appreciate a
legislator from a different part of the State that doesn’t have the issue looking at it and saying, you know, I'm not gonna support it and I certainly can respect that and honor that and appreciate that. Again, I ask that the legislators do support it because of the issue and how the issue has affected my district, Representative Doucette, many other Representatives here in these Chambers and of course Senators up above. So I have no problem with this interim extension of the program to see whether or not it truly does yield an effective tool for those folks and for that reason, I rise and stand in support of this bill. Again, I thank the proponent for the answers he provided and I thank you, Mr. Speaker for the opportunity to speak on the issue.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on this bill as amended? Representative Felipe of the 130th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FELIPE (130TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of the bill. I apologize in advance if I seem a
little shaken up but this is an issue that affects our cities, that affects my district and the district that was represented by Ezekiel Santiago and I don't think there is any more fitting a way to honor a man that cared so much about our city, cared so much about the district, cared so much about everybody he came across, a lot of people in this room. And I stand in strong support and I urge the rest of my colleagues to support it as well because, I'm sorry, because I loved Ezekiel Santiago. Ezekiel Santiago loved our district and this is so good for the district. I urge everybody's support. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative and for those heartfelt words. We all know and we love and miss Representative Santiago. Thank you. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Lavielle of the 143rd, you have the floor, madam.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions for the proponent, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
You may proceed, madam.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. So I believe we've already discussed that the fiscal note for 20 is about $1.9 million dollars and for 21 about $2 million dollars so I would presume that going forward in 22 and 23, were this to extend that long, that we would be in the $2-million-dollar-a-year range. Would that be correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it's a safe assumption, through you, but I would say the program historically, the funding and the amount of employees allocated to it has changed so it is certainly possible that there would be a change in the future as well. If, in fact, the amount of the volume of the foreclosure docket were to decrease, it's possible that the fiscal note and the fiscal impact would be even less in the next biennium so it is a safe assumption to say that it will be somewhere approximately in the same area in
the next biennium, but subject again to that caveat which I just described.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The fiscal note mentions that funding would include the salary and benefits for ten mediators. Do we currently employ ten mediators or more or less?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that we currently employ 20 mediators or there are 20 staff allocated to the program so in fact, we're cutting in half, again, in response to the volume of the foreclosure docket over the last few years.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.
REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

So those employees, those ten employees that are not allocated to this would be assigned to something else?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Presumably, through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, they would.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

In um, I know that when the program was first launched in 2008, when it was intended to be an emergency program dealing with the real estate crisis, it was intended to be temporary and one of the reasons was the high volume of foreclosures and one of the figures that appeared in some of the testimony was that there were about 20,000 foreclosures in 2009. Where are we now visa vie that figure?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative Doucette.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly safe to say that the number of cases is less now than it was in 2009 and if I may just consult the report here, it looks like the last full year that we have in the report prepared by the Judicial Branch is 12,628 foreclosures filed in 2007. Through you, Mr. Speaker, 2017, excuse me.

Representative Lavielle.

Were all of those dealt with through the Foreclosure Mediation Program?

Through you.

Representative Doucette.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, I could cite that statistic as well but the Foreclosure Mediation Program is an opt in. It is optional to participate.
The mortgagor receives notice of their, the availability of the program at the time the lawsuit is served on them. It looks like that in 2017, according to this report, again, there were 3799 requests to participate in the Foreclosure Mediation Program and that resulted in 3289 cases that were admitted and went through some form of the process.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and so at the time, we had 20 mediators working on about 3100 cases?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I believe that is correct. I do not know exactly what the other job duties were or may have been of those other staff members. I believe the figure that is being cited is staff allocated to the program, not just the actual
mediators.

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

    Okay, thank you. Do homeowners who are facing a potential foreclosure process or difficulty paying their mortgage have other recourse in Connecticut through other program to get the issue resolved?

    Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there are other available avenues of recourse; however, the other programs that we have existing in statute including the EMAP Program, the Emergency Mortgage Assistance Program, there are a few other programs, but the eligibility for those programs are much more restrictive than the Foreclosure Mediation Program.

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

What were people doing before the creation of the Foreclosure Mediation Program? Before 2008?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, presumably they were availing themselves of other programs. They were hiring attorneys at a significant expense in most cases I presume to defend them in a foreclosure action or defending themselves pro se and trying to navigate the system of civil procedure which would require them to file various motions and make proper pleadings and present proper evidence before the court, which of
course for most laypeople, is not something that they're easily able to do.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Another question. Is, I'd be interested in the good Representative's comments on whether through Dodd Frank and other measures, consumers who are thinking of buying a property have more protections in place before they actually make the decision to go forward and possibly make an unwise financial move that they can't afford.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I believe that's fair to say, that there have been significant changes over the years as there continue to be in mortgage disclosures.

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

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and finally, just one other area. There were several reports, I know the Judicial Branch did one recently, 2018, they do it regularly. Apparently, while this program has been in effect, while it's had amazingly good results in the early years, but it has also apparently slowed down the foreclosure process for each transaction in Connecticut to an average of 957 days which is quite a bit past what we see in other states. Is that the case?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the good Representative is correct. The statistic that I have is that close to 90 percent of the cases have completed mediation with the parties reaching settlement. This means either the homeowners are
staying in their homes or gracefully exiting from their homes so it is by any measure a very successful program.

With regard to the timeframe, the program as it's structured allows the homeowner and the plaintiff lender to engage in up to three mediations, court sponsored and supervised mediations and in statute, which is not changing, the timeframe is seven months to complete those three mediations so it does indeed add some time to the process than what existed prior to the passage of this bill in 2008. I will say that Connecticut, which is a state which requires judicial foreclosure process, is inherently and was before 2008 a lengthier process than many, many other states.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good Chair of Banks for his answers. Just a couple of remarks. This was, I know when it was instated, first instated, this was an excellent program. We needed it. We
really needed it. There were so many families in distress. I had a lot of calls from constituents near the time when I was first elected for two or three years and it has certainly served an excellent purpose. I am concerned about extending it. One, because we have a pretty heavy fiscal note here that would go on for another four years and we know the kind of struggles we're engaged in with our budget.

The second reason, and this may be a bit controversial, but it is a, it is a real concern to me. There are a lot of people in Connecticut who need help and we're a very generous state and we do help and we go to very great lengths to help and a lot of people were caught in this vise at the time through nothing that they did that was of their own fault. It was a terrible situation and a lot's been done to address that. There's always gonna be a few people who land in a bad situation, but I find that more and more legislation is going through here where decisions that people make of their own accord, on their own finances, on their own circumstances, the same kind of decisions we make here at the State level when we
spend too much money, there are some people who do that. Who go way beyond their means or who don’t save or who don’t do most of the things that we usually consider financially prudent, and there's been a lot of legislation that has gone through this legislature in the years I've been here where we seem to consider the legislature's responsibility to save people from themselves. And I worry about that a lot. It's expensive. It's not even at a certain point goodhearted. It's really going beyond where we are required to go and where people in general, not every case of course, but where people in every case don’t need us to go and it's a trend that I find somewhat disturbing.

I like this program. I think it's great. I think we needed it when we introduced it. I'm very skeptical about extending it because I think at some point, we've really got to get our house in order so that everybody has access to a good housing market and one that grows and one that thrives and we're certainly not there today. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Simanski of the 62nd, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SIMANSKI (62ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in opposition to this bill. It's due to sunset this June and I would suggest that we let that occur.

This program was set up to solve a problem during the foreclosure crisis in 2008 and in fact, you've heard testimony it did solve the problem. Since the problem has been solved, we should sunset the program like we told people we would when we originally created the program.

Another reason we should in fact let it sunset as it's supposed to, is we found out that several years ago, since the foreclosures were down considerably, that the mediators who were paid for under the banking fund were being used in other areas of the Judicial Department. Once that was discovered, of course with egg on their face, they decreased the amount of mediators, they decreased the assessment against the
Banking Fund and here's a rhetorical question; if this was paid for this General Fund, by the Judicial Department as it should be rather than assessment against the Banking Fund, would people still be in favor of the program? I personally would not be.

Another reason we should let it sunset and not continue it, you heard testimony about how long it takes in the foreclosure and mediation program. We've heard from the banking industry it takes forever. It could take as much as three years under the foreclosure mediation program. Now, this was also testified at the land bank forum in attended in January, that the biggest problem in blight remediation is the Foreclosure Mediation Program. The biggest program in blight remediation is the Foreclosure Mediation Program. Now I've been challenged by Mayor Luke Bronin who is one of the people who made that statement, that he does support the Foreclosure Mediation Program for occupied properties. Blight does not affect occupied properties. It's for those abandoned properties so by virtue of the fact that the banks say it takes
forever, and by virtue of the fact that the Foreclosure Mediation Program is the biggest problem in blight remediation, that's another reason we should let it sunset and not continue it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand in firm opposition to this bill. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Kokoruda of the 101st, you have the floor.

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker [sic], Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

That's okay.

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

Let me clean my glasses first, I'm sorry. Through you, Madam, through you, Mr. Speaker, [laughter].

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may, yes.

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Chairman of
Banking, were any banks exempted from this? Are all banks included or is any one exempted?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you. No, no lenders are exempted. There are a few exemptions for parties that would be bringing a foreclosure action including a condominium association and so forth, but no, I'm not aware that there are any exemptions for lending institutions bringing actions as a plaintiff in a foreclosure.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Kokoruda.

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While the negotiations on this bill were going on, were small community banks included in the conversation?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that they were through the Connecticut Bankers Association who certainly was at the table and testified on the legislation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Kokoruda.

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

Mr. Speaker, through you, were they in favor of this extension?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Generally, in speaking, the Connecticut Bankers Association was in opposition to the extension. However, throughout the discussions I will tell you that we discussed the idea of a permanent extension. We discussed the idea of a two-year extension, of a six-year extension so I think
it's fair to represent that where we came out here was generally a compromise between all of the interested parties to the legislation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Kokoruda.

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):

Mr. Speaker, when I talk to my community banks, that's not what I'm hearing. We have a bank in the shoreline, it's in Branford, Guilford, Madison, Clinton, and Saybrook and I might've missed a town. They are true community partners. It's the Guilford Savings Bank. They have been asking us for years to help them with this. We all know this program was needed in the beginning but small banks, community banks did not cause this problem and the fact that we continue to include them with the large banks, it really bothers me that we're not listening.

When we meet with our community banks, they're very clear that this program has just gone on too long and we need to start, in small towns like mine, we don't have very active big banks. The banks that show
up for little league, support our concerts, support our kids, support our seniors, they're our community banks and if we stop listening to them and we vote for this when they really don’t want it, I just don’t know why, how you answer that with your constituents. I know my small banks said this thing four years ago, five years ago could’ve ended and it was really holding them back. They didn’t create the problem and the fact that they're being included with the large banks that did create it, I think is a real problem. I know I can't stand here today and not vote for my community bank. Guilford Savings Bank is a major part of our community and if we're not going to support them, I just don’t know how we can possibly do our job. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? From the brass city, Representative Butler, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's good to see you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
It's good to see you too.

REP. BUTLER (72ND):

I just want to rise in strong support of this bill, this initiative. I'd like to thank the co-chair of the Banking Committee for bringing it out. This is something that I've actually worked on earlier in my career and I'm glad to see that it's being extended, well the proposal in front of us is to be extended because it has done a lot of good work over the years. It started off in recession years where a lot of people were losing their homes. It created a lot of problems in cities. When you start to think about the blight and I know there was some mention about well it's not blight until people are out of their homes. Well guess what? After fighting for months and months and months, some people just walk away from these properties so yes, a lot of these properties do become abandoned and blight.

I'm very glad to see that Representative Santiago's name is going to be associated with that because I know his whole fight to actually get these funds extended, I know that he was right there in the
forefront making that happen and there's mention about a fiscal note. And in the grand scheme of things, the fiscal note associated with this is you know not a real big deal in terms of what we spend and look to spend in this coming session because there is a lot of good that's being done over the whole State addressing people and their need to save their homes. And I just want to know if there's, for the same people who are facing their crumbling foundations, if they had to take that no vote now on that versus you know people savings their whole homes, I'd like to see the same kind of sentiment you know for them as well. We're extending ourselves to save those homes so I hope that we're gonna do the same thing on this bill as well so I would urge all of my colleagues to support this initiative because people still need hope and need to know that we're gonna be there to help them save their homes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Wilson of the 66th, you have the floor, sir.
REP. WILSON (66TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I'll be brief. I just want to echo some of the statements by my colleagues, Representative Kokoruda and Representative Simanski. The cost for small community banks to extend out the process becomes insurmountable at some point. We also heard in testimony from the Connecticut realtors and they were opposed to this bill so in the interest of helping stimulate small business in the State of Connecticut, which includes those realtors and those banks, I think we should be very careful about not allowing this to sunset as it was designed and since we've already heard a lot of testimony, I think I'll just sit down and say that I can't support this and thank you for the time.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]
CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 6996 as amended by House A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Voting</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 380?

CLERK:
On page 71, House Calendar 380, Substitute House Bill No. 7395, AN ACT CONCERNING A LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, TRANSGENDER AND QUEER HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES NETWORK. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk, has an amendment, LCO 9091. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Can you please repeat the LCO?
REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

9091. 9091.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 9091 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 9091, offered by Representative Allie-Brennan and Representative Currey.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

The amendment makes technical changes. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Case of the 63rd, you have
the floor, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker, good evening.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Good evening.

REP. CASE (63RD):

    Through you, to the good Representative in regard to the bill or the amendment in front of us, a few questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    You may proceed.

REP. CASE (63RD):

    Through you. So in the Department of Public Health's write-up, DPH must adhere to stringent State procurement standards and so on and so on. Is that what this amendment tends to clarify and make the bill forward?

    Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Representative Allie-Brennan, you have the floor.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

    Yes, it makes technical cleanup to the bill.
Through you, Mr. Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the amendment is a good amendment. It should move forward. There was some question on the effectiveness of the network in moving forward because there would be some complications in the bidding process or the process of procuring funds and grants so I appreciate the good Representative for his amendment and good amendment, oughta pass.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

Thank you. What this bill does is establish an LGBTQ Health and Human Services Network. There are many service gaps and service needs across the State affecting the LGBTQ community. This was something that was brought up to us. We as a legislative body and State Government have a responsibility to this group of people who need to have their services met. It's a great bill. It's something that I have seen personally working through Triangle Community Center in Norwalk that services Fairfield County. A lot of the service needs get met down in the south, but sometimes we have loopholes in the north where you know we're missing students. There was a suicide and you know these are really things that we have to focus on making sure that we're getting all corners of the State and the needs met so and I look for my colleagues’ support on this bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and we heard quite a bit of testimony on this in Human Services. There is a great population here that the State of Connecticut needs to work with and help out, if I may, the House has a, the Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 9116. Will the Clerk please call the amendment so I may be allowed to summarize?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9116, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule B?

CLERK:

LCO No. 9116, designated as House Amendment Schedule B and offered by Representatives Fishbein and Case.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. CASE (63RD):

    Mr. Speaker, this amendment, as we had talked with the good proponent of the bill, it just summarizes language and it -- Mr. Speaker, can I withdraw that amendment please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    If there is no objection so ordered.

REP. CASE (63RD):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    You may proceed.

REP. CASE (63RD):

    The Clerk is in possession of LCO 9117.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Will the Clerk please call LCO 9117, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule C?

CLERK:

    House Amendment Schedule C, LCO No. 9117, offered by Representative Fishbein and Representative Case.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative Case, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In working with the good proponent of the bill, there were two amendments up here. The lengthier amendment that I called first just incorporates all the language into the existing amendment but I will call 9117 which is basically in line 67, the word dollars and insert within available appropriations. The good proponent of the bill and I have spoken and we'd like to have this accepted as a friendly amendment and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

To my colleagues, we accept this amendment, we accept this as a friendly amendment. Thank you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Wood of the 141st, you have the floor, madam. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Wood of the 141st, you have the floor, madam.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and a few questions to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

I do sit on the Human Services Committee and we did hear extensive testimony on this and it appears
there is a great need for more understanding and more service, filing in service gaps for the LBGTQ community, plus, I've learned plus community. To the proponent of the bill, can you tell me what some of the risk factors are, that is the reason why this legislation was put forward?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

We have received a lot of information regarding the service needs and gaps in the State and some of that includes that 23 percent of Connecticut's homeless youth is LGBTQ even though the community represents about 4 percent of the State's population; 22 percent of Connecticut's LGBTQ population reported being food insecure and a similar share of that same population reported having annual incomes of less than $24,000 dollars. I would add that in 2017, according to FBI data, 15 percent of all hate crimes victimized people that were LGBTQ. You know there are some other challenges we see, finding a primary care provider in
the medical field who will understand the identity and limited experience that people of the LGBTQ community face.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Wood.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Thank you for that answer and is the needs assessment that is part of this organization, part of this committee so to speak will be looking at filling in the service gaps and coordinating throughout the State; is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

Correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Wood.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Why is that this has taken, it's always so
interesting when it gets quiet in here, [laughs]. What's everybody thinking?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

They don’t want me to hit the gavel.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Good point 'cause you're good at it. I'll just shorten this. Again, sitting through the public testimony on this, it's clear this is an area of need in our State and I absolutely support the spirit of this legislation and the intent of it and I believe it's a vulnerable population that we need to open our hearts to and figure out how we can close the gaps on some of these needs and embrace them with great humanity so I stand in support and thank the proponent for bringing out this bill and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Mastrofrancesco of the 80th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions for the proponent of the bill.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. And through you, to the proponent of the bill, can you explain to me exactly what this commission would be doing?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

So it directs funding, the funding that is received to basically have a needs analysis done, to see really where the service needs and gaps are and work with the non-profit groups in the State to kind of connect them better because we do see that some areas such as Bridgeport maybe know better how to access grants that help similar issues like LGBTQ veterans or homeless youth and how we can connect that with more of our rural communities across the State.

Through you, Mr. Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.
REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker and I really apologize. I honestly could not hear anything. Would you mind repeating your answer for me? I can't hear with all of the noise going around.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

So the bill establishes a network to make recommendations to state legislative executive and judicial branches concerning health and human services delivery to LGBTQ people. The funding that is in the bill, it directs the funding to be used to assist the network to conduct a needs analysis and those funds are supposed to go towards grants to help make sure that we can connect a greater network in services.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, when you, after that data is collected, what will happen with it
then?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

We will know where the gaps in service needs are throughout the State.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, would you be able to tell me, do you know if we have any other commissions set up in the State that you would model, maybe something like, do we have a separate model for domestic violence or child abuse or anything like that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

Not to my knowledge. We have outside
organizations.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you and through you, so this commission or this committee would be unique to serve a certain community; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

Yes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. So I guess I'm understanding. So it's a unique committee to serve, the LGBTQ community. We do not have any other commissions set up separately for any other community for maybe domestic violence, for maybe child abuse, other ethnic groups and so
forth and I understand through you, Mr. Speaker, that it's within available appropriations of $250,000 dollars. Can you tell me exactly, and I'm new to this, what does within available appropriations mean?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

If the money does not go into the act, if the, if the money doesn’t go in the budget, the act does not go forward.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you and through you, so if the Appropriations are not put into the final budget that comes out of Appropriations, then this would not go forward or it would still go forward without any funding?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

Correct. It would not go forward.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. So the only way that this can proceed to be successful is with the available appropriations. Can you tell me exactly, if the appropriations, the funding was available, put into the appropriations, the final budget, exactly what those dollars will be used for?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

It's for the services, looking at them to connect the great LGBTQ network to make sure that we're meeting those needs.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you and through you, Mr. Speaker, can you be more specific? Is it going for a payroll or is it for a certain educational program?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

So it's going to basically assess the needs that we have in the State, whether it be homelessness, LGBTQ veterans, you know suicide rates and trying to help focus what those needs are and see how we can put all of our effort behind making sure that those needs are met.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. Thank you for answering my questions, Representative. I appreciate it. Just a couple of comments really. I understand what we're trying to do
for people. I am certainly in support of every community. To me, everybody in here is the same regardless of your race, your sexual orientation. I'm concerned that it's really only for one community. You know we have people out there that are different religions or different, they're just different that we don't support, that we don't have these types of programs. It seems to me at times that we want equal rights and I believe in that and I think we all should have them, but we all don't want to be treated the same and I don't know if that makes any sense to you but we want equal rights, but for some reason we don't want to be treated the same so those are my concerns. I appreciate what we're trying to do. Certainly we want to help the community. I have nothing against LGBTQ. As far as I'm concerned, everybody in this room to me is the same. We all breathe the same air. I'm just concerned that we're segregating, putting people into separate buckets and I really would like to see everybody come together so just a few concerns. But thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you the Representative for answering my questions.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Dubitsky of the 47th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):

Thank you. I would ask why do we, why do people who have a certain sexual orientation need a separate health network?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

It's to coordinate care within this population, to see what their needs are.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. Are the needs of people with certain sexual orientation different than the needs of other people?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

This is a population that hasn’t been served well and we've seen, this bill has been brought to our attention because of the needs across the State and as a legislative body and people within the government, we are to serve the people and there's a great community within the State that is not being served and it's our job to make sure that we're doing as much as we can to address that need and that's why we want to find out what the needs are through this bill, to make sure that that population has a strong voice and that they feel like their government is representing them.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.
REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It would just seem that there would be other ways to ensure that people that are within this community, they have their health needs addressed as opposed to segregating them out into a separate network. Again, I understand the point of the bill, but to my question, are there, are people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer, do they have different health needs that would require a different health network than people are not?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

I think you're taking the word health network out of context.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):

Then, through you, Mr. Speaker, please put it in
context.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The good proponent indicated that I had taken the word health network, the phrase health network out of context and I would ask that the proponent put it in my context for me in lieu of my question asking that if people of certain sexual orientations need their own separate health network.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND):

This is looking at each person as their whole needs. Some of it is health and some of it's more and we're trying to figure that out. IT's homelessness,
there's suicide, mental health, things that like so we're trying to look at the bigger picture within this community that's underserved and not well represented.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there, I'm still wondering why a certain population, based on who they love is segregated into a separate health network and I would ask the proponent to explain that, please.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

Again, it's really not a health network. It's the person and their needs.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):

Okay. I will go back to the question I asked
before. Do people have different needs based on who they love?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

That’s not what this is addressing.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):

I’m sorry, I didn’t hear his answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

That’s not what this is addressing.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I’m really trying to understand if the good proponent would explain it in
more than a couple of words, I would appreciate it. I'm still trying to find out why a specific population needs to have a separate health network and I would appreciate if the good proponent would explain that to me.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN(2ND):

So the health network addresses many different areas. It's homelessness, mental health, food and security, things like that so it's a vast network to assess the needs of this entire population that's underserved and not well represented and it's our job to make sure that these communities that are not well served get the attention that they need.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITKSY (47TH):

All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll listen to the rest of the debate.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Currey of the 11th district, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say I really appreciate the work that the proponent has done on this piece of this legislation with myself and many of the LGBTQ advocates here in Hartford and around the State. I think it's important to remind folks that with regard to our minority group, we're a little bit different than some of the other minority groups in that we're not necessarily born into a family that shares our minority traits and so you know, Patrick Dunn, the executive director at the New Haven Pride Center said it best in his testimony, that even the most supportive and loving of parents sometimes just don't know where to turn for all of that additional help and support that some of their kids may have. And this isn't just a kids issue. This definitely is going to benefit all of the LGBTQ plus members in Connecticut, young, old alike. And it's you know
there's been some conversation around singling out one particular organization.

I would remind this body that we also have the Commission on Equity and Opportunity. We have the Commission on Women, Children and Seniors so we actually do have these types of bodies that are addressing the needs of these minority populations so I think that this would be just one more that we'd be able to add. And while other states have taken the steps to include these types of networks, Connecticut would be the first to statutorily create that. That should be a win for everybody in this body because we know that there are deserts in pockets of Connecticut where they just don't have those programs. They don't have those services. They don't have those safe places where some of our friends and family are not able to go.

So if we're able to take this money and utilize that so we can identify those areas and plug those holes, I think that should be a win for us all so I would ask my members, the members of this body to support this bill and hopefully move this forward.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7359 as amended by House A and C.

Total Number of Voting 136
Necessary for Adoption 69
Those Voting Yea 130
Those Voting Nay 6
Those absent and not voting 15

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 341?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg, you have the floor, sir.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Good afternoon again, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you. This bill seeks to do something very straightforward. It basically would prohibit somebody who does not have an appropriate degree in social work from calling themselves a social worker. Now, you know there already any number of laws in place that prohibit anyone from using inappropriate titles unless they have a license or a degree. We're just doing it for social workers. So, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 9805. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 9805 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO 9805, offered by Representative Steinberg, Senator Daugherty-Abrams, et
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment makes two changes, one fairly minor in clarifying the language with regard to the appropriate degrees. More importantly, the second change acknowledges that there are large numbers of municipal and state workers who currently fall under this category which we would exempt for these purposes with the added little wrinkle that going forward for state workers, for hiring purposes, the state would seek to hire social workers with the appropriate degrees as their preferred qualifications. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the
amendment? Representative Petit of the 22nd, you have the floor, sir.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, to the Chairman, I believe this amendment addresses when people look at the testimony, there was a fair amount of testimony against some of the specifics in the original bill and I believe this amendment addresses those issues which people had testified against. Am I correct in that regard?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, indeed. I thank the Representative for pointing that out. This was the most serious of concerns with regard to this bill and hopefully we have addressed it.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will you remark further on the amendment before us?  Representative Fishbein of the 90th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  And good evening, at this point.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good evening.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

I just um, a few questions for the proponent of the amendment just to clarify if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you.  My understanding is that a purpose of the amendment is to create a carve out for those that are in this industry that are using the title social worker, but that are employed by a municipality or the state.  Is that true?

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

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's correct.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And while I don’t serve on this committee, I'm involved with individuals who provide this service in the private practice that utilize this title. Am I to understand that this carve out does not extend to those individuals?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that is correct.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.
REP. PETIT (22ND):

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Understanding that, then I'll save my other questions which would go to that area for the underlying bill once the amendment passes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative O'Neill of the 69th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, a question. Regarding the fiscal note for the amendment, it says that it strikes the fiscal impact of the bill and in looking at the fiscal note that accompanied the bill, it said that there wouldn’t be any fiscal impact and so I, I guess I'm curious as to if there was some sort of subsequent recognition that there was going to be a fiscal impact as a result of the underlying bill or what the, how to reconcile so to speak a fiscal note for the bill that says no impact, and then a fiscal note for the amendment that says it strikes the fiscal impact of the bill, which taken literally would now
mean that there is now a fiscal impact as a result of the amendment, sort of like a negative/negative. In any event, if perhaps the good Chair could explain what, if any, was the fiscal impact of the underlying bill that's now being eliminated by the amendment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the good Representative. This is indeed curious. I am not in a position to enlighten the good Representative any further other than to suggest that we were concerned about the potential ramifications for municipalities in particular, and existing contracts at the state level. I'm not exactly sure how that translates into a fiscal note or additional costs, but we've been assured that the state and from what we heard municipalities are grateful for the change and believe that it will make it possible for them to continue to operate and provide services as they have in the past, but I cannot really fully elucidate why there might
have been that particular language.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and for purposes of the amendment, just to be clear, if the amendment is adopted, the bill is amended, is it true that it will have no fiscal impact?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's my understanding.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you very much. Will you remark on the amendment? Will you remark on the amendment?
Representative Ackert of the 8th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, I think I guess a clarification from a question that was asked earlier. So through you, Mr. Speaker, so the change with the amendment is that an individual classified themselves as a social worker without a Bachelor's degree employed by a municipality and the state shall remain employed with them under that title?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Representative could repeat the question. I wasn’t clear exactly where he was going and I should add that a Bachelor's or a Master's degree.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and so right now, if
somebody is working with a municipality or a state, under the term social worker, they can stay employed without those degrees with this legislation going forward?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that's correct.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):
But an individual that say has been practicing outside of those employments, privately with another organization whatever it may be, classified as social worker without the degree will no longer be employed?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should clarify. This
is in terms of the way they refer to themselves, the title of social worker or initials related to that. This is not directly related to employment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So are there people practicing social work that do not have the degrees that are now going to be in this legislation?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that's my understanding.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I think what I'm trying to get around here is someone that is doing
social work, being paid to do social work that does not have a degree that I'll specific as a -- I guess I'm concerned about the continued employment of them if the job title that they've been going by is social worker and they no longer can either practice social work I guess and be called a social worker, or they don’t fit the job title for their organization so I do have some concerns so could the good gentleman help me with understanding what would happen to a person that is using the term, does social work or is using the term social work today, after the passage of this inception, they do not have a degree, they do not work for the state, they do not work for a municipality, what is their classification?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll endeavor to clarify. This is with regard to the title. This does not necessarily speak to terms of employment or even their job description and I'm sure there are many
different ways in which somebody can be employed doing forms of social work with different job descriptions. The only thing we're changing here is their ability to refer to themselves or through advertising as a social worker so this does not necessarily change the terms of their employment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I don’t know how to I guess figure out what would happen to somebody that is providing services today, that is called -- let's say they do a private practice and I'm a social worker, I'm paid by contract, whatever it may be and they're hired for that and they’ve got 20 years of experience doing that work. They don’t have the nice certificate, baccalaureate degree or Master's degree hanging on the wall, can they continue operation in their business after the inception of this law?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Steinberg. I would have to say conceivably yes, they could. I cannot possibly speculate on every possible circumstance.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that many degrees, I think I said many occupations that when a legislation was passed that said okay from now on, you have the, you know these are new requirements for you. You need to get more experience, a license, something like that, whatever it might take, maybe a degree in this case, and the other folks who have been going the work and can substantiate it through some manner, that they're grandfathered in so to say. So even though they don’t have that wonderful degree, four-year, they’ve been doing social work for 20 years, great experience, great result in their work and they can't use the title any more so I guess my concern is that
you know just because you went to a four-year institution doesn’t mean you have a great 20 years of experience doing this work and you're not given the opportunity to continue that maybe in, without going forward. So I'll listen to the further dialogue but I'm a little concerned that we don’t think about past experience, real experiences as opposed to just having a college degree for experience.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'll listen to the dialogue on this and may have further questions for the bill, but I thank the good gentleman for his answers and I'll try to frame my future questions a little clearer as I read the legislation. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Fishbein of the 90th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and now that the amendment has been adopted, some questions for the proponent, if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you. What is the underlying intent of this proposed law? Why do we need this?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is this is to assure that those who are referring to themselves as social workers have the appropriate qualifications to do so, very much like titles that we
require certain educational background or licensure that we do for some of the others. We just, we even in some cases, prohibited the use of license master or clinical social worker already in statute. We're now just addressing the social worker title.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And why am I to support this if now this body is to say one who's a therapist who works for a municipality or state does not need the education, yet one in private industry does need the education? Why is that a good thing? Why shouldn’t everybody be held to the same standard?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Representative brings up a very good point. Ideally, we always have a perfectly level playing field. Unfortunately, in
reality that's not always the case. In this instance, this speaks directly to existing contractual arrangements with municipalities and the state, the ability for us to sort of unwind those aspects would be challenging and take quite a period of time. Perhaps there'll be a time in the future where all employees will be, all those using the social worker title will be held to the same standard. Certainly that would be the ultimate goal.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know it's interesting that we tell people if you go into private business, you're going to be treated one way, but if you work for the government, you'll be treated a totally different way but moving forward, the bill also restricts the utilization of any initials associated with the title social worker and I think it would be appropriate if the public and this body as they vote on this language knew particularly what
those initials were.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg. We have MSW, BSW, MSW obviously referring to a Master's, BSW to a baccalaureate, and then there's the LCSW, licensed social worker if I have that correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

What about licensed clinical social workers? Would that be barred here as well?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank the good Representative for correcting me, that should’ve been included as well.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Is that, are those the only initials that we would bar one from using under this language because it is non-descriptive?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would imagine that in the context of license, that's something you need to have a license in the first place so that's even beyond the specific course of this bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well if it's beyond the course of the bill, I would ask why in line 13 we are expressing barring the use of, or it's 13 through
14, or an initials associated with such title.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure I understand the good Representative's question, if he wouldn't mind rephrasing?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the good Representative had said that it would be unnecessary for us to limit that because one who did not have those, that licensure would be unable to use those initials anyway so it's already verboten against the law, why would we need to adopt it into this law?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll refer the good Representative to the immediately preceding section which does talk about licensed clinical social worker and that's an existing law so I was speaking parenthetically about licensed, but the change comes in section sub c.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

I see that now. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Okay, that clears that up. May I ask, at the end of the section, lines 18 through 19, it allows for the council to determine an educational program that it deems to be equivalent. What council are we talking of?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That would be the Council on Social Work Education which obviously
specializes in checking educational credentials and the reference I believe the good Representative is making is for those who may come from out of the country and it would be up to this council to determine whether their educational qualifications were equivalent to the baccalaureate or Master's degrees here in the United States.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that ends my questions. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Gilchrest of the 18th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of House Bill 7198 as one of seven social workers elected to the Connecticut General Assembly. I think this is a long overdue bill. In addition to being a social worker elected into office, I teach adjunct at
a few social work programs here in the State of Connecticut and just want to put on the record that in order to get your BSW or your MSW in the State of Connecticut and across the country, there are certain practice standards that students have to meet. Additionally, we have to obey by a code of ethics that we all sign and then in a BSW or an MSW program, also do field work in the field. And so in order to protect our clients, in order to increase the respect of our profession and to ensure the value of our degree, I support House Bill 7198 and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Abercrombie, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and in simple terms, it just codifies social workers and the degrees that they get, their level of education and it makes sure that people that are there saying they’re social workers
cannot say that if they don’t have the educational level. And I'm going to give you an example. There's a lot of people out there that work in school districts, nursing homes, that say that they're social workers because they do social worker work. That doesn’t make them a social worker. This just codifies social workers and I think that we need to make sure that when someone is serving a vulnerable population, and we know social workers take on the most vulnerable, that they should have the right credentials to back it up so I am in full support of this.

I will give you an example. We also, probably about ten years ago had an issue with behavioral analysts. We had people out there saying that they were behavioral analysts. They were charging school districts hundreds of thousands of dollars. They had no certification at all and we stepped in as a state and said, if you're going to say that you're a behavioral analyst, you need to have the proper documentation so I am in full support of this legislation and just for the record, it doesn’t change
anyone's scope of practice so if somebody is doing some services that mirror a social worker, that are under their title, they can still do it. They just can't say they're a social worker so I stand in full support of this legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Hughes of the 135, you have the floor, madam.

REP. HUGHES (135TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, as one of those seven licensed master social worker or at least social workers in the legislature, I stand in support of this bill which is protecting the most vulnerable especially the public because we have to adhere to a strict code of ethics. We have to adhere to a credentialing body which was referred to by Representative Steinberg in the accreditation board and I think this body wants that type of protection and we have to update our credentials every year. We have to take online evidence based or in person you
know education courses to make sure that we have the best evidence based practice and research out there to support our practice so again, it is helping those people who maybe were working for municipalities or state workers 20 years ago before the National Association of Social Workers was accrediting those social workers and they would change their title to maybe social work coordinator or something like that, case manager, but not use the title social worker so it's helping those settings, transition those people who have been grandfathered in but now really it's signaling to the public that these are highly trained credentials and current professionals that adhere to the code of ethics.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I urge my colleagues to support this.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Wilson Pheanious. You have the floor, madam.

REP. WILSON PHEANIOUS (53RD):

Yes, sir. Thank you. I rise in support of this
legislation as well. I am both a professional social worker and an attorney, but the difference between the way our professions are treated, the way we're received by the public is quite outstanding. As a social worker, virtually anyone can hold themselves out as a social worker and regardless of a lack of training, they can do for a vulnerable public what some call social work. Sometimes I call it anti-social work because often mistakes are made and there is no one to hold the person accountable who is not a professional social worker.

We do have a code of ethics as has been mentioned. We do have regular training. We have standards and our practice is extremely important to us. We work with some of the most vulnerable families and the most vulnerable in this state and in this country and not to have title protection simply means that anyone can hang out a shingle, say that they're practicing this profession and do who knows what in the name of service. No attorney would stand for that. No doctor would stand for that. When you go and seek the services of an attorney, you know what
you're getting [clears throat] excuse me, someone who's taken courses, has passed a bar examination, who has ethical principle, who practices those principles and is held to those principles by a body that manages their accreditation and their licensure. That's what we need in social work. And so I am fully in support of this legislation and hope that my colleagues will join me in that support. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good to see you up there. So I'm guess I'm, I even might say this, maybe I'm out of my lane here in a manner because I guess what I'm trying to grasp is, you know having a my license in an occupational career, I guess I just look at, we just said that if you work in the government that you don’t have to have the degree, we're going to allow you to be in there. So through you, Madam Speaker, do we understand and do we believe that those that we are allowing to remain in work for
municipalities and state government, have they been getting the standard training that the other social workers that the good Representatives mentioned earlier that they go back and get you know updated training? Do we believe that they're getting the training that we believe they should be getting each year?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. [sic] Speaker. It's a challenge for me to address all those providing various social work-related services in municipal and state government so I can't really speak categorically to their precise level of background across so many people performing in a variety of roles based upon their job descriptions. That is why though we added prospectively that when hiring in the future, the State will look to somebody with that explicit social work education as a preferred qualification for hiring, indicating our desire to move in that
direction and to ensure consistency going forward.
But to answer the good Representative's question, I
cannot give him any sort of categorical answer on that
point.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the
good gentleman. So for the folks that spoke earlier
and that mentioned about the value of having the title
and all the updated training that they get and that's
important and critical to those that are being served
and that makes good sense, I mean many of us have
different professions and do we have to go to
continuing education? I am one that has to go to
continuing education for the value that keeps my
license and getting training each year, but we're not
sure if the ones that we're going to codify, that can
stay in their job actually are getting the updated
required training to me it seems from the answer the
good gentleman gave.
I guess what I'm grappling with here is that we're allowing a sector of folks, we understand the value that we want to have this title and you're going to have to have the appropriate training and that we carve out certain people, but we're not sure if they're getting the training that they should get to serve their public, that their, I don't want to call them patient but those that they, their clients that they protect and serve so I guess I don't understand. I guess I'm confused on this legislation unfortunately that you know especially if somebody's been doing a job for many, many years and they don't have that degree hanging on the wall but they've been serving their clients for years and they kind of don't have the title that they get to and I think that there should’ve been some type of grandfathering and then mandated training that they could, that they would have to fulfill as they went forward so they could better serve their clients so I guess that's what I'm struggling with.

If the good gentleman could assure me that, and I guess it's unfair to ask and I won't ask that question
so I'll refrain from any more comments on this and I
don't know if anybody else will have any more comments
but I'll grapple with this one. Thank you, Madam
Speaker. Thank you to the good gentleman also.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative
Fishbein for the second time.
REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker for the second time. I
just, in listening to the exchange with my various
colleagues, I just had some additional questions for
the proponent if I may.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Please proceed, sir.
REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you. In order to exempted from this
educational component, what is the requirement, what
is the definition of employed by a municipality? Is
it full-time, is it part-time, is it on-call? Cause I
can't tell from this language.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr., Madam Speaker. Yes, to your point, it is not explicit in that regard so I would think it would apply to anyone employed by the municipality whether part-time or full-time.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, the education, I totally agree with my colleague from the 53rd that we should be keeping everybody to the same standard. I still can't wrestle successful with this exemption for government workers but you know I have to -- when I went back to college, I took ten years off to get my degree, I had to take Algebra and I didn’t do very well and I dropped out of the class and I taught myself Algebra and I was able to take a test, a CLEP and I scored so high on that test because I taught myself that I got credit for Algebra I and II and my question here is, since some of the people have
been in the industry for years and our education in the street brings us better people, better practitioners, all of that stuff, are we going to allow these people that are doing this presently, since government is exempted, to show to the council that they have the acumen, they have the education, without spending thousands of dollars to get this formalized education so that they can maintain this status in their private employment? Is that going to be contemplated in some way, shape or form?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is a good question. There are any other number of analogies, particularly in the healthcare field which I think are applicable. I mean you may be a nurse or a physician assistant who's practiced for 20 years, performed all sorts of clinical functions, be an expert at what you do, but if you want to call yourself an M.D., you’ve gotta go and get that degree and get the additional requisite
educational training and clinical training in order to do so. So we're not precluding any individual who is inclined to get the degree of social worker, to return to school and fulfill those educational requirements, but I'm suggesting that experience in and of itself is insufficient to justify the title of social worker in this instance.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker and I appreciate the answer, but unfortunately, it's not an apples to apples approach because we don't say that M.D.'s, so long as they work for the government don't have to get their education. We say that all M.D.'s have to get their education but it seems that on one plane, we're taking this situation serious and the other hand we're saying not because they're not government employees so you know last week I got up here and I talked about anti-business bill. This once again is an anti-business bill. It says if you're in private industry,
you need to spend thousands of dollars to maintain your title, but if you work for the government, even part-time, you don’t. That is not the way we should be dealing with these things in my humble opinion so I thank the good Representative for the exchange, the debate and intend to vote against this bill. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7198 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting 136
Necessary for Adoption 69
Those Voting Yea 111
Those Voting Nay 25
Those absent and not voting 15

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 81?

CLERK:

On page 64, Calendar 81, Substitute House Bill No. 7122, AN ACT CONCERNING MOBILE DENTAL CLINICS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Wilson Pheanious of the 53rd, madam, you now have the floor.
REP. WILSON PHEANIOUS (53RD):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. WILSON PHEANIOUS (53RD):

Yes, sir, thank you. I move that we accept this bill. This bill enjoyed unanimous committee support. This bill will improve access to oral healthcare for HUSKY clients all over this state. The bill will allow the folks who run the mobile dental clinics to submit claims to DSS for service when they are providing that service up to 50 miles from their fixed location site. This is an expansion of these already existing wonderful mobile services. Right now, people with mobile clinics are allowed to provide those services up to 20 miles from their permanent site. This would extend up to 30 miles for most places in
Connecticut, and up to 50 miles in the area of New London County, Litchfield County and Windham County. I move adoption of this bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as the good woman from Appropriations mentioned, this bill is aimed to reach out to many more people throughout our good State of Connecticut by extending the mobile dental networks out 50 miles in the rural areas. We were, we were stuck in a 20-mile radius and we really weren’t reaching out and through you, Mr. Speaker, one question to the good proponent of the bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed, Representative.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So the reason for the mobile clinics, just to clarify, is that the mobile clinic is basically the holder of the files and the
medical records of the people they serve and those mobile hubs need to be in the State of Connecticut. Through you, Mr. Speaker, correct?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, that is correct.

REP. WILSON PHEANIOUS (53RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, that is correct.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll end with a final comment. It's a good bill, oughta pass. We should be able to help out more of our young and less fortunate people by allowing this to extend out farther into the rural areas is a major plus for the State of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Representative Ryan of the 139th district, sir, you have the floor.

REP. RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to get up in
support of this bill. It's an important bill for Eastern Connecticut because of the fact that there's a great deal of distance that separates different schools, different facilities in Eastern Connecticut, the 10-mile limit just didn’t work in that part of the state. A lot of people didn’t have access to care, were denied care so this will help remedy that situation. The facilities, the equipment that's available will be able to be used over a wider range and thus, more folks will be able to get help with their dental care. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Will you remark further on the bill before us? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7122 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting 134
Necessary for Adoption 68
Those Voting Yea 134
Those Voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 17

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 522?

CLERK:

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Blumenthal of the 147th district, sir, you have the floor.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just before we go any further, I'd like to clarify this does not have anything to do with the Trust Act. This is in fact the Uniform Trust Code. We are not known as the land of steady habits for nothing. We have been behind the curb in adopting the uniform trust code which gives predictability, flexibility and an existing body of law to the trust code and the administration of trust in this state. Adopting this bill will cause more
business and more wealth to stay in this State and will make us more competitive, visa vie Delaware, New Hampshire, and other states. I urge this Chamber's support.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Representative Rebimbas of the 70th district, madam, you have the floor.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the proposal before us and I thank the good vice-chairman for clarifying that this is the trust code and not the Trust Act. I think a few of us got a little nervous there, but with that said, certainly this is a very lengthy bill and I want to thank my members, several of which did certainly did read through all the 90 pages of this bill. I'm happy to say that there were a lot of professional individuals who practice in these areas who put a lot of hard work, a lot of hours into reviewing everything and making it the proposal that's before us and it's
certainly a good one for all the ones the vice-chairman has already indicated so I do rise in its support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Will you remark further on the bill before us? If not, staff and guests to the well of the House. Members take your seats and the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7104.

Total Number of Voting 133
Necessary for Adoption 67
Those Voting Yea 133
Those Voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 18

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The bill passes. [Gavel] Representative Ritter of the 1st district, sir, you have the floor.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We come to our conclusion. We have one more bill to do tonight. We are going to start at noon tomorrow. There might be committees prior to that, but we will start at noon here in the House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 100?

CLERK:

On page 7, House Calendar 100, House Bill No. 7000, AN ACT CONCERNING CHILDREN'S SERVICES. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Children.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Linehan of the 103rd, madam, you have the floor.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 9092. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9092 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 9092, offered by Representative Linehan and Representative
Zawistowski, et al.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Seeing none, Representative Linehan, please proceed.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a strike all amendment that actually encompasses a bill that was in the Public Safety Committee and which we have now picked up in Children's that essentially is an extension to a program that we voted out of this Chamber in 2017 where we are taking police training that we did regarding children with autism and we are now putting that for firefighters and making it available for EMS as well. Additionally, we have added the addition of a downloadable talker to all first responders. What is a talker is, Mr. Speaker, is it is actually a communication aid where someone who is nonverbal can simply point to certain things that they wish to communicate as in I am hurt, my pain level is 10, my back hurts, someone's left in the
home. It's a way to communicate when you are nonverbal. This has broad bipartisan support and there is no fiscal note. I move adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Thank you very much. Will you remark on the amendment before us? Will you remark on the amendment before us? Representative Fishbein of the 90th district, sir, you have the floor.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I support the underlying bill, the intent and all of that, but I think the intent of the amendment is to reduce the fiscal note. Perhaps a question to that affect through to the proponent of the amendment?

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Linehan looks prepared. Representative Fishbein, please proceed.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

    I note that I believe there was a fiscal note involving the original program as anticipated and as approved by Committee and I believe that this
amendment removes the fiscal note. Is that true?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

   Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

   Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm very sorry, I could not hear the exact question.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

   Hang on one second. [Gavel] Ladies and gentleman, this will be the last bill of the evening. The Representative is trying to ask the other Representative a question and they can't hear each other so please, take your conversations out in the hall. Representative Fishbein, I apologize for the inconvenience, sir, but would you please repeat your question?

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

   Thank you, sir. I shall do so. So my understanding of the bill as originally approved out of Committee had a fiscal note. Is that true?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the bill that originally passed out of Committee is nowhere in this current bill so while it did have a fiscal note, that is not the, that is not even part of the bill even after the amendment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the intent of the amendment, because I didn’t hear anything about reducing the fiscal note in the summary, is the intent of the amendment to reduce the fiscal note to zero?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Fishbein.
REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I'm missing something here but I'm aware of the program. It had to do with fire and police I believe it was being taught about children with autism and how they would attract to water. This is an extension of this to go to fire and EMS and my understanding was, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that originally this was a program that was supposed to be adopted, but now we're making it optional through the amendment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, if the good Representative is speaking about the bill that was originally in front of Public Safety, then in fact that bill, we have changed that so that there would be no fiscal note, but more importantly, that it matches the programs that we sent out of this Chamber and passed into law in 2017 and this would now make it so that those programs that are currently in existence,
can now be used for fire and EMS training.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, madam. I'm looking at the amendment, line 49 and it indicates that we're establishing an optional fire service training and education program in the handling of incidents, so on and so forth. Am I to understand that optional is in the language in all iterations?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, yes, it is indeed optional and it can be made available at no cost.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the word optional, is that new to the amendment or has that been in all versions other than the original dummy bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it is new to the amendment.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So we get to where I wanted to be in that I believe that originally, we didn’t have it optional. It was seen as being, as having fiscal impact and therefore, we've inserted optional and Mr. Speaker, with regard to that, I think that these programs are essential and necessary and I'm not in support of making this optional. We see, I have autism in my family, and I don't think that if we find this program to be that important, that we should make it optional just because there might be a
financial impact. I'd like to know the financial impact is. It's not in what we have here today so as I said before, I support this program. I think we need something like this but I don't want to see that we're taking some serious and through this amendment, just making it optional, just getting over the fiscal challenges that we have. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? No, on the amendment, I apologize. Will you remark further on the amendment? Let me try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the bill as amended? The ranking member, Representative Green of the 55th district. Madam, you now have the floor.

REP. GREEN (55TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand, I rise in full support of this bill. It's a good bill. It helps the autism community. I stand in support. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Will you remark further? Representative Zawistowski of the 61st district, madam, you have the floor.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Children's Committee for taking up this bill. The training portion of this was originally in a Public Safety bill that was brought to me by the Foundation of Exceptional Children of Suffield and also Project Keep Me Safe. It's an organization that actually does trainings and actually does grants for training. The organization is really great with autistic kids and with their families, very supportive. This is an important bill. Communication is important with any first responder with anybody on the autism spectrum or cognitive difficulties and I strongly recommend passage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, madam. Will you remark further? If not, staff and guests to the well of the House. Members take your seats and the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7000 as amended by House A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Voting</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The bill passes as amended. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Fox of the 148th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The GA Committee will be meeting tomorrow at 11:30 in room 2B.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

11:30, 2B, the GA of the E Committee. Thank you, Representative.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Yes, sir, thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Any other announcements or introductions?

Representative Reyes of the 75th district. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. REYES (75TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purpose of general notation, business in district, D'Agostino, De La Cruz, Stafstrom, Lemar, Boyd, Lopes, Butler. Business outside the Chamber, Walker and Rojas. Sick today, Representative Orange, Verrengia and Rose. Personal,
Representative Woods, Simmons, Stallworth, McGee, Miller, and Haddad. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Journal will so note. Representative Betts of the 78th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for Journal notations.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

please proceed, sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Representative Camillo in district, Representative D'Amelio out of state on legislative business, Representative Rebimbas who's in court on work, Representative Smith who's out of state, Representative Hill who's back in district, Representative Floren out of Chamber for legislative business, Representative Labriola and Representative O'Dea back in district. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative
DiMassa of the 116th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. DIMASSA (116TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of an announcement, sir.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. DIMASSA (116TH):

The Appropriations Committee will meet tomorrow at 11:00 in 2C. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Please have that Appropriations Committee finish on time sir.

[groaning] Representative Vargas of the 6th district.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Yes the Executive and Legislative Nominations Committee will be holding its public hearing and meeting, hopefully the last one for the year, tomorrow
at 9:00 a.m., Room 1A. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Seeing none, Representative Currey of the 11th district, sir, you have the floor.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will be in beginning at 12:00 noon and there being no further business on the Clerk's desk, I move that we adjourn subject to the Call of the Chair.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adjournment subject to the Call of the Chair. Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing none, we are adjourned subject to the Call of the Chair. [Gavel]

(On motion of Representative Currey of the 11th District, the House adjourned at 7:07 o'clock p.m., to meet again at the Call of the Chair).
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