(The House of Representatives was called to order at 11:00 o'clock a.m., Representative Joe Aresimowicz of the 30th District in the Chair.)

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Gavel] Will the House please come to order. Will Members, staff and guests please rise and direct your attention to the dais where Rabbi Alan Lefkowitz will lead us in prayer.

HOUSE CHAPLAIN RABBI LEFKOWITZ:

Good morning. What should be our daily goal in life? Our prayerful goal should be to live life in radical amazement; to get up in the morning to look at the world in a way that takes nothing for granted. Everything is phenomenal; everything is incredible; let us never treat life casually. To be spiritual is to be amazed.
Let us never lose the power of celebration. Instead of celebrating, we seek to be amused or entertained. Celebration is an active state - an act of expressing reverence or appreciation. To be entertained is a passive state - it is to receive pleasure afforded by an amusing act or a spectacle. Celebration is a confrontation - giving attention to the supreme meaning of one's actions. Remind us, Oh God that: "Wonder rather than doubt is the root of all knowledge."

As we enter these most important of sessions, and as we offer this prayer, let us be reminded that the primary purpose of our prayer is not to make requests. The primary purpose is to praise, to sing, to chant. Because the essence of prayer is a song, and we, human beings, cannot live without song. Prayer may not save us; prayer may make us worthy of being saved. Can we say Amen?

ALL:

Amen.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Would Representative Zawistowski please come to the dais and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

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. Ladies and gentleman of the Chamber including guests, we enjoy having a very open Chamber and we have guests in here. But just as a reminder, I reminded Members the other day, there is no lobbying to take place on the House floor, there is not handing out of paperwork as it pertains to an issue. So when you are a guest on the floor, we are happy to recognize you and happy to have you here but that is what you are here for. If you have lobby or issues to discuss that will be done out in the hall in appropriate areas. That being said, Mr. Clerk is there any business on your desk?
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CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have House Resolution No. 34 RESOLUTION PROPOSING APPROVAL OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT OFFICE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD AND THE CONNECTICUT STATE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Refer to the House Committee on Appropriations.

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Ritter of the 1st District.

Sir, you have the floor.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker I move that we waive the reading of the House Favorable Reports and the Resolutions be tabled for the Calendar and printing.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

So ordered.

CLERK:
And the Daily Calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. Are there any announcements of introductions? Representative Garibay of the 60th District. Ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. GARIBAY (60TH):

Mr. Speaker, thank you. I rise for the purpose of introduction. I’d like to introduce down below, they are from a business called Family Partnership located in Windsor, Connecticut. They own a gift shop right in the center of town. Their job is employing special needs adults and they do pay minimum wage. So they are very happy. I would like to introduce them, we have Annie, then starting we have Jennie, and Jennie is my niece, Greg, Patrick, Lissette, Ben, Carol and Sue Miller, the owner of Family Partnerships. Please give them a hand.

[Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, Representative and thank you for coming to our Chamber. Representative Dathan of the 142nd. Madam, you have the floor.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in the purpose of an introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Great. I wanted to introduce four very special people, Pat Tinto whose is in my District and has been helping me for the last few months and become very good friends in the process. She is a recovery consultant and the other three ladies Martha Parizot from Norwalk, could you raise your hand, Tiffany Davidson from Westport and Cathy Carter from Old Lyme. They are Mom’s Against Marijuana and they will be out in the hall so you can ask some questions but thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, Madam. Representative O’Dea of the 125th. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of introduction if I may.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would ask my colleagues to approach, I’ve got with me Paul Reinhardt, Craig Turner and Denise Marshall is an addiction therapist. Paul Reinhardt unfortunately lost his son in 2015. In 2016 Paul formed, he was the founding member of the New Canaan Group. And the Canaan Support Group is a mission to give support to parents with loved one affected by addiction and to educate and raise awareness about substance abuse addiction and recovery in our Community and I would encourage my colleagues to listen to their stories. They are quite compelling. “I go to daily mass and I pray for my children’s
health, safety and welfare.” And a number of parents have lost children to addiction and I would ask all of our members to please speak with the people here who’ve lost family members. And I would urge my colleagues in this somber introduction that I gave, I apologize, to please give a round of support to my friends here in their orange shirts. Thank you very much. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Piscopo of the 76th District. Sir, I just had some of your friends up on the dais here with me.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to personally thank you for your hospitality to my group, my visiting group from Thomaston High School and to introduce them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker I have a group of students visiting. They’re an advanced honors’ group, Civics Class, advanced honors, led by their teacher Terri Franzie and she used to work with us so she is very familiar in these Halls and
thank you again, Mr. Speaker for your hospitality and would the Chamber please join me in giving their usual warm welcome.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Let’s give them a warm welcome ladies and gentleman. [Applause] Thank you very much, Representative. Representative Devlin of the 134th. Madam, you now have the floor.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am here with Cristin McCarthy Vahey to introduce the Fairfield County Tax Collectors Association. So we may have some legislators in the House Chamber this morning who have yet to connect with theirs but let me do a quick introduction of who we have in the Well and I will ask them to stand when I call their names. We have the Co-Chair of the Association Ann Scacco and Patricia Moisio [Applause]. Ann is from Bethel and Patricia is from Redding. We have David Kluslewski from our great Town of Fairfield, Jane Hill from Ridgefield, Deb Heim from Monroe, Howard
Richmond from Greenwich, Kathy Larkin from Darien, Bill Domlin from Cheshire, Paula Usher from Bethel, Meredith Petrone from Redding, Katherine Stauffer from Redding and Holly Rapp from Ridgefield. If we could give them a good round of applause and I encourage their legislators to come track ‘em down for a picture. Thank you. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Are there any other announcements or introductions? I believe Representative Hampton who is moving a little slowly might have an announcement. I see some special guests down in the Well of the House. Representative John Hampton of the 16th District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. HAMPTON (16TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. How are you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Excellent, John. How are you?

REP. HAMPTON (16TH):
Good, delighted to make an introduction and welcome to the boys and girls from the Latimer Lane School. So proud of the Simsbury students and thrilled that they’re here to witness government firsthand so I would ask our friends and colleagues to give them a warm welcome. [Applause] Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Let’s give ‘em a warm welcome to the House. [Applause]. Representative Klarides of the 114th. I think you want to add to that introduction, madam.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

I do, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. In addition to our very warm welcome to the Latimer Lane School we have a very special member of that forth grad class and we would like to welcome and say hello to a member of our House Republican family, Bella Aronowitz who is the niece of our very own Jen Stehan and Sara Maloney. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, Representative. And because she is a special guest she is welcome to come up here, I’ll be banging the gavel is a second and she can come up and bang the gavel. Representative Porter of the 94th an announcement or introduction?

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to rise for the purpose of an announcement.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed. Please join us today, the Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence and our 18-member organization for legislative reception being held on Wednesday, May 22nd from three to five in the Old Judiciary Room of the State Capital. Each of the state’s local domestic violence organizations providing direct services across the state including counseling, shelter and court advocacy will be on hand. You will also have an opportunity to learn more about the Connecticut Children’s Center on Family Violence which is a
partnership between CCADV and Connecticut Children’s Medical Center. And I would just ask that my colleagues please join us today from three to five. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam. The Chamber will stand-at-ease. [Gavel]

Will the Chamber come back to order? [Gavel] Our there any other announcements or introductions? We do have another group joining us so we will grab the photo here so we will be at-ease until the next group comes in. The Chamber will stand-at-ease. [Gavel]

The House come back to order. [Gavel] Are there any other announcements or introductions? Announcements or introductions? Representative Ritter of the 1st District. Sir, for what purpose do you rise?

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know folks are still coming in and I see a guy from Hartford, Blue, how
are you. Good to see you, Kenny. Just want to thank all the workers who are here municipal, state, and private workers from AFS-CME who joined us today. We appreciate your contributions to our State, to our economy and all the hard work you do. How about a round of applause for our folks here in the Chamber.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Stand up and give ‘em a round of applause ladies and gentlemen. [Applause] Thank you very much, Mr. Majority Leader and again thank you for your contributions to our State and our municipalities. You are what makes Connecticut, the State of Connecticut run so thank you. The Chamber will stand-at-ease.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The House will come back to Order. [Gavel]

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):
Mr. Speaker I move that we suspend the Rules to immediately consider the following House Resolutions 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

If there is no objection it is so ordered.

[Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar 301.

CLERK:

On Page 65, House Calendar 301, Substitute House Bill No. 6921 AN ACT CONCERNING DISCRIMINATION BASED ON A PERSON'S CRIMINAL HISTORY.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Porter. The Chamber will stand-at-ease. Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

If there is no objection, so ordered. Will the Clerk please call House Resolution HR 28.

CLERK:

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Good Morning.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
I move for Acceptance of the House Committee's Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
The Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution. Representative D’Agostino you know you have the floor, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the first of three accretive contract Amendments that we will be doing with respect to the Judicial Branch. I wanted to just them all in context and then talk about this one specifically real quick. Obviously as you know the Judicial Branch is our third arm of government and therefor it has extensive operations in addition to the regular court personnel that you’re familiar with. This first, what I’ll call it contract Amendment is an accretive of 122 employees into one of the Judicial Unions lead by AFSCME. This is more of what I would call sort of a blue collar set of our Judicial workers, they are the backbone of our Judicial System.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Excuse me, Representative D’Agostino. If we could just pause a moment while we get the Resolution on the Board. The House will stand-at-ease.

The Chamber will come back to order. Representative D’Agostino please continue.
REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

I don’t see it on the board but I assume were okay, so I’ll continue Mr. Speaker. So as I was saying this first group of 122 employees previously not associated with the union executive employees, they are really the blue collar backbone of our Judicial System. They’re clerks, paralegals, you know, administrative secretaries, court planners who go around through the court system and deal with everything from the running of the courts to the running of jury service to the administration now, most people are aware of our juvenile programs. They are accreting or being absorbed into an existing contract on the sort of what we talked about previously, the standard CBAC terms where there is no retroactive pay increases for 16, 17 or 18. Costed out this contract costs all in with benefits $350,000 dollars in the first year, that is additive to the current salaries, $930,000 dollars in the second year, and about $1.7 in the third year. These are not as we’ve discussed before,
these are not new state employees, they are existing state employees, really the backbone as I said of our judicial system and I certainly urge adoption of the Resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Representative D’Agostino. Will you remark further? Representative Lavielle of the 143rd, you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. And may I?

Through you.

Say good morning to my counterpart across the aisle because we spent so much time together doing this.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much. So just a couple of remarks before we go on. I believe that we have before us today five contracts and an arbitration
award and this is the first of the five and I know some of the terms in here are similar to those of some other contracts that we’ve discussed during this session because we’ve had quite a number of contracts, I believe six, five come before us in recent weeks. However I just want to say that while it may seem a little tiresome to go over all of these things two years ago we went through quite a bit of effort in the bipartisan budget to make sure that the legislature had not only the right but henceforth the obligation in statute to vote up or down on any negotiated union contract with the State and so we are fortunate to be exercising that right today and throughout this session. And it is a good opportunity to make sure that we inform the public of what is in each of these contracts so that they can also come to a judgement about how for example their Representative voted or how they would like to see things so. I will be asking some questions and some of them will be repetitive and I know it boring for the chamber but, and probably for the public too
but that is my reasoning and I wanted to be clear about it. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Hello, here we go. We’re back. Didn’t know what that was, probably nobody wanted me to ask the questions [Laughter]. Anyway, so these are as the good Representative said, various employees of the Judicial Branch, 122 of them and so could the good Representative explain the cost of living increments for the year 2020 and 2021 please.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the record I never find Representative Lavielle boring. [Laughter] With respect and as she correctly stated, this is the first of three judicial area contracts. Again, these are more of the sort of blue-collar backbone
of the Judicial Branch. What sometimes they call
cost of living increase, I think we also talked
about as a general wage increase, that’s what I’ll
be referring to and if there is something else I’ll
correct that and the Representative will correct me.

But with respect to the general wage increase
this does still follow the CBAC architecture so it
is a 3.5 percent general wage increase in fiscal
year 20 and 21 that is on top of, of course, the
three zeros for 16, 17 and 18 so there is no
retroactive pay here and then in 19 it is also a
zero although the members consistent again with the
CBAC architecture will get a $2,000 lump sum payment
so that payment in 19 is about $207,000 dollars.
The general wage increase is about $300,000 dollars
in fiscal year 20 and 21. I should note that all of
those costs the GWI is also an annual increment
which I am sure we will discuss. All of those costs
are accounted for in the reserve for salary
adjustments and the transfers to the Judicial Branch
that are set, not only in this budget but in the
placed plan for budgets but the Governor’s and the Appropriations Budget. So we are well within our reserve for salary account having anticipated these accretions for the moves of these 122 people.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And as the good Representative referred to the wage increases in 20 and 21 I believe those would be what we also refer to the step-increases. Could he confirm what those are in 20 and 21 please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So that is different. There is the 3.5 percent general wage increase that the employees receive and then again consistent with CBAC architecture that governs all of our current, most if not all of our
unionized employees in the State workforce. These employees are also eligible in addition that GWI increase in 20 and 21 a step-increase or if they are at top-step already although I understand, I don’t believe that there are any at top-step or if there are there’s only a couple, if they are at top-step I believe they get a lumpsum payment of $1,000 dollar so the annual increment or again lets refer to it as the step-increase for these particular employees. It is paid biannually, not biannually. Some employees get it on June 30th and some get it at the end of the year so it is a bit broken up but that cost is an additional $136,000 dollar in 20 and about $295,000 dollars in 21. Again that is in addition to the GWI and again both those costs GWI and step are subsumed within the RSA account.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):
Thank you. And are there longevity payments that are retroactive for fiscal 19 and if so what does that mean and who is eligible for them?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So, yes there are employees here eligibility for longevity. When you’re not in a State employee union and you are in the executive branch management you do, you can qualify for longevity and again just to be clear no one hired, I think it’s June 30, 2011, gets longevity but for some of our longer tenured employees they had a contractual right to longevity. These employees, it is very important to note, were receiving those payments and would still be entitled to receive those payments but for this contract. Now of course those payments are brought into the contract and they are paid a little differently. Previously these employee would get
those payments in their paychecks now they will get
in those two, I think it’s biennial payments of
longevity and so for the current year, so this is
occurring at the end of the current fiscal year
there is a retroactive, what’s called a retroactive
longevity payment to make sure those people get
those payments. They’ve actually been taken out
already of their checks and we need to make sure
they get those payments because they would have been
otherwise entitled to them So for this fiscal year
that is about $97,000 dollars and then going forward
of course until they retire they are entitled to
these longevity payments going forward and that is
about $329 to $369,000 dollars in 20 and 21. Of
course that will depend on retirements and the like.
But that is basically how the longevity structure
works when you are bringing in people into the, into
a new contract.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.
REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

    Thank you. Is there also, I believe there is a stipend for each or most of these employees? Might be interesting to find out which, to have an automobile available for their job and that has a certain amount attached to it.

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

    Through you.

    That is, the auto stipend is about $300.00 a year for certain employees and I appreciate the question, it’s a good question. I had the same question myself. Not all of the 122 receive it. My math, if they costed it out at about $10,500 dollars a year. This is if you use your car for work. OFA cost it out at about 35 of the employees but my understanding actually it is much less than that, is actually principally the Court Planners who are required to use their cars. I want to be clear,
they are not using a state car they are using their car and being given $300 dollars a year for the use of their car, wear and tear maintenance. The Court Planners are folks who actually, they help run the day-to-day operations of our 13 judicial districts across the State, so the Court Planners actually have to drive to the different judicial districts and facilities across the state and it is those people, there might be a couple of others, there is one person I think who oversees the various juvenile nonprofit centers which are not as we know part of the judicial branch, we did that last year or two years ago. They have to visit all of those nonprofit centers across the state so they use their car. So OFA cost that at about 35 people entitled to that annual stipend but again I am told it is actually less than that. I think they were just being overly conservative. It is really the Court Planners and this juvenile nonprofit person who oversees the juvenile nonprofit centers.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. So a more general question. The elements we’ve discussed so far the onetime lumpsum, however much it is for each, the first for 2019; the cost of living or general wage increase for 20 and 21; the step-increases for 20 and 21; the longevity payments for those who get them and the automobile availability stipend, which of those elements or are all of them if not which ones are included in their salaries for the purposes of calculating pension?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

I believe all of them are. The only one I’m not sure of is the automobile stipend. I am assuming it is. Typically you would see contract language that says something is or is excluded if
it’s gonna be excluded and it’s not in there in the contract here, so absent that language and any further information my understanding would be all of that would go toward the pension calculations.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much. And just to confirm I believe the Representative may have mentioned this but well of these people, these individuals, were already state employees. They are joining an existing union not creating a new one. Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

Correct. Not creating a new union or creating any new jobs.

Through you.
Thank you. So to summarize on the costs if we were to add up the incremental costs for 2019, 20 and 21 that are linked to this contract we would find those to be, I’m just gonna make sure I have the right number here, pardon me one moment, Mr. Speaker. Right. We would be looking at the incremental cost over those three years of approximately $2.9 million dollars. Is that correct?

I am assuming that the Representative is adding everything together, is so her capabilities are better than mine, I went to law school to avoid math, but I am looking at $360,000 dollars roughly in 19, $930,000 dollars in 20 and $1.7 in 2021 and
that annualized to $1.8 in 21. So the aggregate
cost of that I’ll take the good Representative’s
math at its face that we are about $2.8 million
dollars accretive for these employees joining this
contract and again all of that already reserved, set
aside in the reserved for salary account which has
about $77 million dollars it right now.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much. And I did indeed add
together the $359, $930 and $1.7. Additionally,
were we to take the annualized cost from 2022 on
which OFA provides as about $1.85 million dollars a
year, that means we would be, due to this contract
paying $1.85 million dollars more than we do now
annually in fixed costs from 2022 on, is that
correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH)

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

Through you.

I guess I would say, not necessarily. If the contract was renewed this contract expires, of course, on June 30, 2021 and if it was renewed on exactly the same terms that would be correct. I think we are all anticipating significant negotiations under the CBAC architecture with all of our State employee unions leading up to that June 30, 2021 date that is when I’m sure there will be a robust discussion in this Chamber about the nature of collective bargaining in Connecticut going forward and even if it does continue at that point, which I hope it does and think it should because it helps us achieve all these cost savings remember of course the last time the contracts expired, the State achieved significant give backs, hard zeros, you know, no general age, no annual increment, increases in pension contributions and healthcare contributions, etc. I think we can anticipate the Governor’s office and the unions getting back to the
table again, the unions giving the way they have always done now, 2011, 2017 billions in concessions to the State. I think a reasonable expectation is that at time you will see that. So I appreciate the question and taken in a vacuum, yes those are costs going forward but I think we can anticipate some significant structural changes again in 2021.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, I appreciate the answer. I would assure that also there could be attrition which would bring the cost down of course but I certainly hope to, in fact I look forward to working with the Representative to make sure that we in fact achieve glorious results on behalf of the State and the taxpayers including the State employees who fund it. So we will see when the time comes, but I am glad to know that those numbers are correct and that we can present the facts accurately to the public if they
are watching or listening. So I will leave my questions there. I am going to reserve my comments generally for when we get closer to the end of all this but I thought it was important to get those facts out. I appreciate the answers and to summarize we have a total incremental cost of approximately $53 million dollars across the three years plus if we were to annualize if nothing ever changed, it would be about $1.85 million annually unless we have attrition or another negotiation. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I find the amount to exceed what we can currently afford at the moment. Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Ma’am. Will you remark further?

Representative de la Cruz of the 41st, sir, you have the floor.

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank you for bringing this great bill out. Again, I think I am just going to comment today, try to do it one time,
but I know we have a bunch of these contracts to go through. What we’re doin today is basically agreeing on negotiated contracts between what the State has already done with the labor unions and moving forward I know we have probably five or six contracts and going by what was said previously, a lot of the stuff we’re gonna hear today is how we can’t afford it, how this is just crazy, you know, they’re paid too much already, we need to mirror what the private industry has done. We’re gonna hear that over, and over and over again. We’re gonna hear how states around the country do a much better job than us, how it’s much cheaper to have government and pay government. I want to remind people that we are Connecticut. A lot of folks in these other states that we refer to at the end of the year qualify for the Earned Income Tax Credit, these are police officers, teachers, janitors, people that work for DOT if you work in Florida, or Mississippi or Alabama so a lot of times you’re gonna hear the comparisons about how it’s more
expensive to be in Connecticut and ultimately a lot of it comes back to we take care of our folks. That people have at the end of their working career are able to retire. What we have to figure out is why they retire to Florida, Alabama and all the places I described earlier. A lot of the times it’s because it’s cheaper because they are not paying the folks. So when they go move down there, their money goes a little bit further because the police, the teachers, everyone I just mentioned are on the earned income tax credit so the states, the local folks, the local taxpayers they don’t have to shoulder the burden like we do here in Connecticut. And I said that over and over again and in fact I’ve been workin and spoke with TBIA which I want to work with them so we can actually get that point across to the other states that again if you are a taxpayer down in Florida and you filed your taxes last year 25 percent of the folks that filed earn the earned income tax credit. In Connecticut that was 11 percent, in Alabama the same exact statistic, 33 out
of 100 people that filed their taxes in Alabama go
the earned income tax credit. So when we talk about
cost and why Connecticut is more expensive we got to
remember way. You’re gonna hear that the state
employees are the reason why we’re in this trouble.
Again a lot of times when we’re referrin to what’s
happenin with state employees, we’re thinkin of Tier
1’s and Tier 2’s, we are all the way down to Tier 4a
at this point in Connecticut. And what does that
mean for the State, it means obviously when Tier 1’s
and Tier 2’ start dying off, and I guess that will
happen soon, because they are older folks, that’s
possible. They basically got us down to 4a which a
lot of times they don’t have the retirement or
nowhere Tier 1’s and Tier 2’s had. They’ll work 40
years and probably won’t have a retirement. Again I
preach this a lot on the floor, I say in the
backrooms, but ultimately in the end when Florida is
going to end up experiencing the problem we have, we
don’t make retirees anymore and I know in this
Chamber we look up to Florida for a lot of different
reasons, I guess cause we’re seein their economy and how great it’s workin but their economy is completely based on retirees from the north and not just Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Michigan goin down to Florida with insurance cards in their front pocket and a bunch of money in their back pocket and that is how their economy is operating. What they don’t see is the curveball of us not paying our people anymore cause Tier 4a’s 25 or 30 years from now they are not gonna be retiring to Florida, buying a second home and havin insurance cause what we see now in my town, what we see here in Connecticut, in Groton alone $34,000 dollars in Groton last year to pay for insurance for every employee that we had an I see those same town employees in line at CVS that can’t afford their own prescriptions. So they’re not gonna have any extra money. This is a phenomenon that I think Florida and these red states down, I shouldn’t say red states, but these states that are on the earned income tax credit they are gonna be sufferin because
we’re not gonna be feeding them anymore. And I think we should take all that into account when we think about what we’re doin with this new and future generation. I think the last comments we heard from the last time, and these long contract talks, with these folks are gonna retire with everything. And if you’re a Tier 4a and I mention my nephew who again, he is not a state worker but he is a local town police officer that followed in his father’s footsteps and because he was hired three years ago he does not get the benefits, they don’t even have a pension anymore, but two years before that they got hired he would have been much better off and if looks just ten years in front of that, they look at 25-year-old kid, he’s lookin at a 35-year-old person sayin, man I wish I was born earlier. I hear that a lot. I hear the people say I wish I was born in the 80’s cause I’m a union sheet metal worker and I can tell you we used to get overtime after seven hours and all the overtime was double-time. When I tell kids these stories, they almost don’t believe me and
the further we get away from that, and again, isn’t a state worker the crown jewel of Connecticut. I think so, when you’re in the labor, if you’re someone whose lookin up to someone that is a regular worker, you say, wow one day I might be able to make $75,000 dollars. But if you’re not workin for the State, if you’re doin the same job that you would be doin for DOT, you may be workin for $10.00 an hour. And we can’t operate that way and that’s why I keep fighting for these same issues over and over and we’re gonna hear a lot of long talk. We’re gonna be here for a long time. I’m just makin my statement now and saying it early. I know I’m gonna hear some things that are gonna bother me, they’re gonna upset me. I promise to not keep getting up, this will be my once and done [Laughter]. Maybe, maybe not, I may get up again. But the reality is that is a lot of other things on the side of the coin here. When we talk about really hammerin down on state workers and get ‘em down to the point and again, I think there’s some folks in this room that think if we get
the state worker all the way down to at the end of the year they’re collectin earned income tax credit from the Federal Government than we will be able to compete with Florida, with Alabama with taxes. I don’t think that is the route we have to go. I think Connecticut is unique, I think when I see state workers who have good insurance and good benefits, I see their kids, their family life. The quality is good, those kids end up goin to college and they stay in Connecticut. When we start beatin up those position we’re gonna see a seismic change in Connecticut if we don’t take care of our state workers the way we have in the past. And believe me we’re goin further away from what we used to do and I am actually, if the world was to end today, and they put me on the stand, I could testify about what happened to labor in American. I walked into a job like I said in 1989 with no experience, $6.50 an hour, 12 paid holidays, one week’s paid vacation, at $6.50 an hour, with health insurance I didn’t have to pay any money. Now I talked to a college
graduate like a couple of years ago and told him that same scenario, $6.50 an hour. I was talkin to a kid that had $80,000 dollars in student loans and had a bachelor’s degree and you know what he told me, I would take that job. I would take that job today, right now. You mean I don’t have to pay any money for my health insurance at all? So what my concern is when we keep talking about the deficit that we’re gonna leave our children and the future generations of Connecticut, we have to leave them with a job that is gonna be able to allow them to stay in Connecticut. A future where they can bring their kids to the hospital if they are sick and we are goin away from that at a pace that scares me. So this is my talk for the day. And I’m sure we’re gonna hear a lot of stuff saying how we just can’t afford it, I’m here to tell you we can’t afford not to pay our employees. We can’t afford not to bring these folks along with us and yes, they are the shinning jewel but we are different than any private employer cause when you hire someone through the
private employee, you really don’t care where they live. You don’t care where they get their extra benefits from. If you’re the State of Connecticut you can’t pay somebody money as a low wage where they have, where you have to meet ‘em again at the other door, the Human Services Department or you have to meet them somewhere else or pay for their rent. We don’t have that option as a state. So thank you guys for listenin to my little spiel and I look forward to hearing this debate over and over again. I know there’s about five contracts to vote on and I look forward to hearin that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly in response to my good friend from the 41st, I don’t want to upset him but I agree with you, in a lot of what you said. My problem, I do not blame the union
worker for anything, God bless ‘em, we need them. I blame everybody in this Building for the current mess we’re in. When the union negotiates a deal they ask for the moon and we give them the stars. We can’t afford to pay the public sector more than the private sector. My good friend in the 41st, you’re exactly right. The private sector doesn’t make as much as the public sector. The public sector job is better than the private sector job now. That was never the intent. Remember back in the 80s and 90s the reason why people went to the public sector was because of passion. It wasn’t to make more money than the private sector because of job security, the passion for the work in the public sector. It was for the benefits, generally they would be medical benefits. The private sector paid more but didn’t have the job stability you had in the public sector, you didn’t have the benefits you had in the public sector but the private sector paid more. But now, as my good friend pointed out, the public sector gets paid more than the private sector.
and it has better benefits and it has job security. We flipped everything on its head. We can’t afford this. So when you hear my colleagues on this side of the aisle debate the issue, it is not at the expense of the public sector employee. We don’t blame them. We blame ourselves for voting these contracts through that we can’t afford. So I look forward to listening to the debate. I hope not to upset my good friend from the 41st any further and I look forward to listening but I urge my colleagues to vote no on these contracts. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Candelora you have the floor, sir.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I also rise to make similar points as Representative O’Dea. You know, being an employer in the private sector and serving in this General Assembly and watching how our economy in Connecticut has evolved, I think
Representative O’Dea is correct that this is not a conversation about the worker, but it needs to come back to a conversation about our big picture and our budget. For the last ten years, Connecticut has continued to cycle in very difficult fiscal times and yet we sort of continue to barrel ahead making decisions in a vacuum. I remember just a couple of years ago when this Chamber approved the underlying CBAC agreement that is sort of the parent chain to all these contracts. You know, and that vote took place prior to us getting a budget and in fact it ended up putting the State in peril in the sense that it created a complete impasse on budget negotiations because we voted for this contract in a vacuum and then a month later we are saying, “Now what”, how do we pay for this, how do we get a budget together. And nobody wanted to take those difficult votes because they knew in the end that tax increases and spending increases was bad for the rest of the State of Connecticut. It might have been good for our state employees, but bad for
everybody else. And I think at some point we tread very close to this issues becoming moral issues of how do we not only create state employment that is sustainable for them in the future, how are we going to fulfill these pension promises. And then on the flipside, how morally are we going to have the rest of the State of Connecticut be able to pay for all these things. You know, most recently we increased the minimum wage because we’re finding that our economy is stagnating and so the way we addressed that situation is rather than growing our revenues by growing the economy, we’re trying to force it up and there was just a recent study that came out that we may lose 15,000 jobs because of that decision a couple of weeks ago. And so this situation is similar here. It’s not that we’re against these benefits or against these contracts but how much more can we continue to try to fit this square peg into a round hole and think that everything is okay and we’re gonna be able to keep paying for it
About eight years ago when I came into the Finance Committee, you know, I had proposed the first concepts of a volatility cap to try to pay for our unfunded pension obligations and I remember sitting down with a union saying why can’t you get behind this. And of course because it came from a Republican they didn’t want to come out and support that concept until eventually it was proposed by a Democrat. Well the problem with that proposal right now and the lack of it being supported is the option is goin to be failure and that’s what we’re reaching here. So a vote against these contracts are not against our state workers but it is a recognition that Connecticut is headed toward failure and at some point we’d better figure it out because the budget decisions are getting more and more difficult and this doesn’t make it any easier. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us?
If not will the Staff and guests please come to the
Well of the House. Will the Members please take
their seats, the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members
voted? Will the members please check the board to
determine if 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 will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Resolution No. 28

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The Resolution is adopted. [Gavel] [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The Chamber has to be reminded there is no clapping in the Chamber and the gallery. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 301.

CLERK:

On Page 65, House Calendar 301, Substitute House Bill No. 6921, AN ACT CONCERNING DISCRIMINATION BASED ON A PERSON'S CRIMINAL HISTORY, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

If there is no objections, so ordered. Will the Clerk please call House Resolution 29.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    The Question before the Chamber is I move for Acceptance of the House Committee's Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution. Representative D’Agostino you have the floor.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So this is the second
of the three Judicial Groups that are accreting into existing bargaining units. To this particular Memorandum of Understanding deals with seven legal counsel, and I will explain what they do in a second, they are accreting into an existing Judicial Professionals Union that is under the AFT umbrella. Again we are talking about seven people here. This particular group is really specialized and again if you think about what I was saying before about how the Judicial Department, we tend not to think about it here in the Legislature that much but it really is, it’s a coequal branch of government with a massive set of operations and they like the Legislative arm the Executive arm need their own legal counsel. So these seven attorneys are effectively the legal counsel law firm for the Judicial Branch if you will. You might ask why don’t they use the AG’s Office again because the AG really serves the people of Connecticut and the Executive Branch. The Judicial Department these folks do the more, you know, regular day-to-day work
of negotiating contracts for the Judicial Branch with facilities and vendors, etc. They deal with other more technical aspects of the practice of law such as dealing with Addendums to the Rules of Practice that govern all of the lawyers in the State of Connecticut. They handle, again negotiations for the Judicial Department. They will be a liaison with the other branches and when you think about how many times we rely on our counsel here in the Legislative Branch and of course the Executive Branch does as well with the Governor’s Office of Legal Counsel. These are their legal counsel in the Judicial Branch these seven attorneys. Many of them are longstanding attorneys. They’ve practiced for a while and they really have served the State very well. They are accreting into an existing union and therefore there is no new positions or any new union, similar to what we just discussed. The accreting cost is about $20,000 dollars in 19, $62,000 dollars in fiscal year 20 and $120,000 dollars in fiscal 21 and I urge the members to adopt the Resolution.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you very much. Would you care to remark further? Representative Lavielle of the 143rd. You have the floor, Ma’am.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I’d be delighted. Before I say anything about this particular contract. I do just want to say something to respond to the last discussion on the last resolution. With all due respect to the good Representative from Groton, there again, and as my colleague said, one of the things he explained and I understand his being uncomfortable with the possibility that someone might say that the state employees are the reason for all this. Never in a million years could I imagine that the state employees themselves are the reason for this. The way that negotiations are handled and state government is setup are the reasons for this, not the people themselves. As I will tell you why. Because I believe it is our value, one of our
values, our greatest values in this State and also in this Country [Applause] that again, the good Representative referred to the state employees as the crown jewels of Connecticut. It is our values that everybody who puts in a good day’s work, who is in good faith, who makes an effort, who does a day’s work for a day’s pay and makes effort they can is the crown jewel of wherever they are. And it doesn’t matter if they work for the state, or for the private sector, or for themselves or for anybody else, the value inherent in someone who works has the good faith and effort and the drive that they put into it. And that is whoever you are. So, for the record none of this is the fault of the state employees and number two, yes, state employees are taxpayers. They belong to the same group of taxpayers who fund their own wages and benefits. So let that be clear. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and now I have a few questions for the proponent, if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.
REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

So these are, as the good Representative explained the Judicial Counsel and Legal Services Professionals and there are seven employees, is that correct?

Representative D’Agostino.

Through you.

Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Excuse me, before recognizing, I just want to point out to the body that we must be limiting our discussion to the Bill that is before use and not previous discussions on previous Bill.

Representative D’Agostino you have the floor.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that admonition. I think we are in a little bit of a unique situation here in that we’ve sort of got these groups together contracts and I get that and I certainly appreciate the spirit of the remarks and frankly, I think is worth, on all these contracts,
we can have this sort of discussion, to me it’s not necessarily specific to a different contract when we talk about, but I certainly appreciate the points being made about these being state employees and cost, etc. and you’ll hear me say, with respect to each contract, sort of the same things again from sort of my side of the aisle which is, you know, the state employees are not responsible for the pension crisis, these are unfunded amounts for years that Republicans and Democrats did, that our current pension obligations actually are well-funded. This State has done a good job getting a handle on that the last few years and that these employees, from my perspective, and I think this group is a good case to study are underpaid when you compare them to the private sector. I know we’ve heard, we’ve had discussions about that before and we can have those discussions with respect to all these contracts that are coming before us. Yes there are seven of them. There are seven lawyers who have long-served the State of Connecticut and it is interesting if you
look at just to sort of further my point about the pay scale here and the underpayment, and I should note that many of these folks, this group, the prior group no raises over eight year. If you look at the pay scales for this group, these seven people, and you can do this for the other contracts too, when you look at them on the steps you will notice something very interesting. It says Step 99, Step 98 and the Step 1, 2, 3 and 4. What does that mean? Those steps like Step 99 is where you see somebody starting out at Step 99 and going to Step 1, that is the starting salary in 1999, that is where people started out at and this group I think it starts out at step 97. So that is reference to a year, a salary in a year 12 years ago, is the starting salary for the group. Now look, none of them are at the starting salary anymore, they’ve been there awhile but my point is embedded in all these contracts you see those references to starting salaries, Step 99, Step 98, Step 97. Starting salaries from more than a decade ago. So when we
talk about our state employees, my perspective is there is less of them doing more work, being underpaid compared to the private sector and the only thing that really attacks you to this job, these seven wanted to join a union because they are concerned about obviously retirement and etc. but 20 year attorneys doing the work they’re doing, I would imagine they could go out and make more. We should do a study on that heading into the next set of contracts quite frankly because I think we’ll see across the board, white-collar, blue-collar state employees making less and now since we’re of course moving new employees into a 401k type of plan and increasing pension costs and health care costs, I’ll be honest with you, when these contracts come up in 2021 and people retire, I don’t know how we are going to fill spots for the State of Connecticut because I don’t know who is going to work here because we’re not paying better than the private sector and the retirements will be the same as the private sector and you’ll be understaffed. That’s
not all that appealing. So that’s a long answer. The short answer is seven.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m not sure I remember what my question was. But I would ask the good Representative as question. Have any of our state negotiators done a study of what people in equivalent jobs make in the private sector just out of curiosity?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So I don’t know if one was done here. That is done more on an ad hoc basis depending on the negotiations that are taking place when you’re accreting a small group into an existing union and we’ve got the CBAC architecture, there is less of a
need to do that. Where we have seen that in the past in this body recently of course, are in the arbitrated agreements when you were going out making a case. There for example I know we saw that with respect to a couple of groups where the State actually does those studies because you’re negotiating sort of salary levels ground up. If we do the State Police contract today, I believe that was part of the overall, you know, negotiations with the State Police as well. So it’s done on an ad hoc basis. I think it would be fascinating to do across the board, I don’t want to give people more work to do but I think that would be fascinating to do across the board with all of our different classes of employees. But when it comes to the particular negotiation it really depends on the mechanics of that negotiation.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just again, what in this group and I recognize there may be some disparities because it is a very small group, but what is approximately the average salary in this group?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

So it is going to depend obviously on their year and where they are. Again nobody is at the sort of starting level but just to give you an idea the max that we’re talking about is between $111,000 and $130,000 dollars at the top step for somebody who has been practicing law. My understanding is many of these folks are long-term employees 15-20 years of experience. You know, that sort of commensurate experience in the private sector, you know, I thing again depending on what you’re doing, making more than that. But there is a range and I’ve given sort of a top set of the range.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. So if we could go into the details. I believe that for like the, oh and by the way, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Representative’s earlier remark about the fact that we’re talking about a whole group of contracts but I apologize if I was out of line but I do believe that the remarks that I made just before apply to this contract as well as all those that come after and the one that came before. So that was my intent.

So, in the year 2019 each one of these individuals if they are eligible for it, get retroactive longevity payments, am I correct for this year?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Yes, that’s the same sort of structural change that has to be made that I mentioned previously so if you are entitled to longevity and again, to be clear, no one hired after June 2011 gets longevity. In the Executive Branch the nonunion employees, you’ve been getting longevity if you were entitled to it a certain way with your regular paycheck. Now that is taken out and you are getting these two sort of biennial payments and we want to make sure that these folks get that because they’ve earned it for this year. So that is about $6,500 dollars in what is called retroactive but it is for the current fiscal year 19 to make sure that because of this switch now accreting into a union they are paid correctly and frankly not paid extra for longevity. So they stop getting it their paychecks a while ago and now we’ve got to make sure they get the amounts they’re entitled to assuming this contract is approved.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And for 2019 every one of them gets a $2,000 dollar one-time payment unless they are already at the top step in which case they get $1,000. Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

That is correct, following the CBAC architecture, correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and then we have a 3.5 percent general wage increase for fiscal year 20 and 21. Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Yep, again consistent with the CBAC
architecture that is the 3.5 GWI.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

And then we have also the annual increments or step as we once called it and how is that evaluated? What is the percentage and I believe it actually not only covers 20 and 21 but some of 22. Could the Representative please explain that?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes. So the annual increment again, some members get it June 30th, some December 1st so whenever the AI is costed out by OFA you see that broken up over the course of a couple of years and of course it is cumulative, it goes into the base salary so you’ll have a partial payment of an AI for fiscal year 20 of $10,000 dollars and then the effective annualized cost of that in 21 is $22,000
dollars and the annualized cost in 22 is $22,000 dollars that is the two payments together when we talk about annualized cost and that’s actually an important point that I didn’t mention and the Representative has asked that. And this particular contract expires June 30, 2022. It is one of very few contracts that we have that are not expiring on June 30th of 2021. There is an extra year on this contract, the State Police is sort of another one that is outside the regular chronology of contracts. I would fully expect however that if all contracts are reopened in 2021 it is possible that is, and likely, that this union would also be part of those negotiations as well. So that 2022 cost is not necessarily written in stone. It will depend on those 2021 negotiations that we are going to have. But that’s how the AI works. I confess I do not have a percentage breakdown of AI for the seven. I can get the numerical costs but I do not have a percentage cost.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. So is there no sort of medial percentage for that per year as we usually have with the other contracts?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

I mean the median percentages is three percent and if I compare for example the general wage increase to the AI as costed out, they are roughly identical. So we must be looking at the 3-3.5 percent range for the AI. That would be typical and consistent with the other contracts.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):
Okay, thank you that is very helpful. So two again, and I believe the Representative whet over this but just to make sure, the total incremental cost of the terms of this contract over the years 19 through 22 were 22 to pan out would be about $360,000 dollars.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

The Representative is doing math on me again, she knows this is like my Achilles’ heel. I’m just adding it up, it looks about right for the annualized cost. I’m going to defer on it. Again I can give you the year-to-year breakdown but for the seven employees, you know, $20,000 dollars the first year, $62, $120 in the third year and again all that funding is budgeted for or already transferred over to Judiciary. It is in their budget for this fiscal year and included in the budget outlays for the next fiscal year so it is planned for and all accounted for.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much. And also the annualized cost going forward from 2022 on barring other unforeseen circumstances is in the neighborhood of $158,000 dollars. Am I correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

Again similar to how I answered that question previously and all things unchanged, sure that’s the going forward carrying cost of the contract in those future years but of course again the contract will expire. I would actually expect negotiations to take place even a year earlier than when this one expires and you could see, I think we will likely see again, you know hard zeros and other negotiations sort of holistically done in terms of
salary annual increments and pension and healthcare when the whole CBAC slate of agreements in the overall pension, healthcare and the wage agreements are all reopened again.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Representative for his answers. And if you would like to relax for a minute. I don’t have any more questions for him. So to summarize this particular contract we have seven individuals in an average salary range of about $110,000 dollars or thereabouts who are getting either a $2,000 dollar or a $1,000 dollar onetime payment in 2019, a sort of cumulative increase, well an increase of anywhere from 6.5 to 7 percent increase in what they are paid in 2020 and then cumulatively again another 6.5 to 7 percent increase in 21 and also for certain of them some longevity payments for a total incremental cost
of $360,000 dollars to the State and $158,000 dollars roughly barring any unforeseen circumstances annually. I really look forward, I hope that the Representative’s optimism regarding negotiations in 2021 pans out.

Again I will just comment on this briefly before we get to the others that all of these people, I’m sure, or at least most of them are very deserving and do excellent work. Unfortunately in the circumstances where we find ourselves, with the State’s financial condition it is not a question of whether they deserve this or not, it is whether we and everyone who is funding our State’s government, the people who live here can afford it. And right now, I’m afraid we can’t. So I will not be voting yes on this contract. I will be voting no and I would also urge others not to support the Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Ma’am. Ranking Member of the Finance Committee Representative Davis of the 57th
District you have the floor, sir.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, a few questions to the proponent of the Resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was stated earlier that there was only seven employees in this union, is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

Yes, seven and again this is not a new union that they are organizing, they are joining an existing union. The existing union has, I’d have to check the numbers, I know it’s several hundred maybe more than 1,000 members. Again but I’m not really sure but they are joining an existing union but
seven people joining.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Previously these seven employees were nonunion members is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And did the State challenge their efforts to become a union?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

My understanding is, I can check, but my understanding is that they did challenge this group. So the way this works is if somebody is potentially the manager or had some managerial responsibilities the question is, you know, do they meet the statutory criteria. The State Office of Policy Management, Office of Labor Relations, they will take a challenge to the State Labor Relations Board to challenge folks who were previously not in a union moving into one. That, I believe, did occur here and they lost at the State Labor Relations Board. There is some more extensive work that the State did with one of the other upcoming contracts the ANR contract, I’m sure Representative Davis will have similar questions on as well and we can get into it more there but my understanding on this one is they did challenge the move and lost and I don’t have the decision but again when you look at those statutory criteria, there are really some very particular requirements and when I look at the job
description here for example of Counsel and Legal Services I really don’t see a lot of management. It is, you know, the traditional overseeing of other employees, directing policy, that sort of thing. As I mentioned these really are inhouse staff lawyers for the Judicial Branch so they are going to take their direction from the Chief Court Administrator and the responding to folks in that respect. But they are not really managers overseeing large operations, etc.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And prior to joining this union, did they have access and participate in the retirement plans and health plans of the State of Connecticut employees?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

Through you.

They do, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So previously in the debate is was mentioned that they joined this union to have access to those things cause they were fearful of those things and they were joining this union to get that access. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

I mean if in terms of shorthand, just trying to attribute, you know, a wide range of motivations to people, I probably shouldn’t do that. I mean why folks decide to join a union could be any number of reasons why they want to do that. Of course, you
know, when you’re in the management part you are still by statute you get a lot of those same benefits but they are all triggered off of, of course, the state employee negotiations for retirement, healthcare, etc. We don’t typically individually negotiate that. And I mean, speaking for myself, I could see well, I’m gonna be stuck with those terms anyway I should be part of a bargaining unit that actually has some say on what those terms are. It could certainly be a rationale. And then of course by statute we can always do whatever we want with respect to nonunion employees because we don’t have contracts with them. So, you know, of course we can’t take away already vested rights but this Legislature has a lot more leigh way so, you know, there’s a number of motivations for people to join, you know, typically with respect to securing existing rights and having a say in the negotiation of them going forward which you normally may not have. So, you know, I don’t want to suggest that they were concerned about, and if I did, I apologize
that they were concerned about those right being taken away wholesale if you’ve got vested retirement rights, you’ve got them as a property right whether you are union or nonunion. But in this case, I’m sure there were other motivations in terms of the overall retirement scheme, the overall salary scheme that these folks felt more comfortable being part of an existing bargaining unit than on their own.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And with these contracts would one of these seven employees or more than one qualify for paid time off for union activities under this contract?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
There, the contract they’re accreted into requires the union to give the State the stewards, the union stewards who may be able to take time off of work, again, banked time off, part of the contract, already subsumed in there, for that kind of work that has not happened yet with respect to these seven. We don’t know yet if they will be designating a steward or not or if it would be easier for an existing steward who for example may have oversight of similarly situated employees in the Judicial Branch to just handle any grievances or other union related activity for these seven. That is something that the union will have to be discussing with the State and of course the State can always, you know, that is always going to be the subject of bargaining as well. If the State doesn’t think that person should be designated the State has management rights as well. But that has not happened as far as I understand it with respect to these seven.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And from the writeup of the contract that I see before us from the Office of Fiscal Analysis the $2,000 dollar bonuses that these individuals would be receiving, would that be in this fiscal year or would that be in the next fiscal year.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So the $2,000 dollar payment is again part of the CBAC architecture for this fiscal year, no one gets a wage increase or a step-increase for this fiscal year or frankly for the prior fiscal year so there is no retroactive payments here at all but, you know, if you’re top step or not you either get the $1,000 dollars or $2,000 dollar payment and that was negotiated for all the state employees as part
of CBAC and so they are joining CBAC so they would get that payment that would be, looks like about $8,625 dollars for fiscal year 19.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So they would be getting the $2,000 dollar lumpsum in this fiscal year and then also be getting the 3.5 percent COLA adjustment upwards in fiscal year 20 and then a 3.5 percent COLA adjustment fiscal year 21. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

Yes, that falls to CBAC architecture similar to the other contracts that we’ve done and as I mentioned those amounts including the AI on top of the GWI that’s all already in the Judicial Branch
budget for this fiscal year so it is covered and it is budgeted for next year.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And what is the longevity pay for one of these individuals, like what one individual receive in longevity payment under this contract?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So there are it looks like four in fiscal year, five in 20 who will get the longevity payments. Those vary depending on your years of service. It’s anywhere, again there’s two payments. They are usually anywhere from $300 dollars per payment to $800 dollars per payment depending on where you are
on the scale. So I don’t know specifically what each one of these get, we can get that but the total longevity payment is about $6,500 dollars for the seven so we can average that out, maybe a little less than $1,000 dollars per person, but I correct myself since they are not all getting it, it’s maybe closer to the $1200 - $1300 dollar range.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand there is some furlough days that may be optional within this contract. Could the kind gentleman explain how those four furlough days would work, would the employees be required to take them or would they be able to choose to take a furlough day?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So for this contract and I think this is a couple of the other ones, we’ve depending on the particular contract there were, if you remember, as part of CBAC mandatory furlough days, three mandatory days. Those have been taken by most employees and if you were in management, no not if you’re in management, if you are in a non-classified position, that was also imposed upon you to take those three furlough days. So my understanding is these folks have already taken, but hit with those three furlough days, that is why they are not being mandatory again but included is an optional furlough day if you again, depending on schedule, and these are lawyers so everything is going to have to approved by their supervisors if they want to take an unpaid day, they can take up to four. I don’t have any visibility on how many may take it, what will be taken because it is optional OFA does not cost that out because it is all optional but that is a part of this package that an unpaid workday can be
taken up to four for these employees. Again subject to scheduling, subject to their supervisor approval.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And would the longevity pay that is in this contract, did these individuals receive it prior to joining this union or is this a new benefit that they will be receiving that perhaps was previously taken away from them, the longevity payment?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So it’s a, the short answer is no. It is not anything new but longevity is paid differently outside for most employees outside of the union structure. And again as I mentioned before you’ve
got sort of these two biennial payments for longevity. Typically what’s done outside that structure is this was afterward there was a whole set of revisions to longevity to include of course eliminating it for anybody hired before 2011, excuse me, after 2011 where the longevity payments currently would be rolled into their regular pay, now they won’t be getting it rolled into their pay, it will be part of these two payments that they receive but it is not a new benefit for them.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I see based on our debate here that these individuals would get pain the $2,000 dollars before July 1st of this year as their lumpsum payment or have they already been paid this lumpsum before this contract is approved or disapproved by the Legislature?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

My understanding is that if it hasn’t already been paid, it will be before the end of this fiscal year, part of fiscal year 19.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So is that not a pay increase if it is used towards their pension calculations?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

Sure, no it is. The $2,000 dollar payment and again it’s not just these folks who are getting it, it’s all the folks in the CBAC architecture for fiscal year 19 there were no cost of living
increases, there were no AI increases but they did get a $2,000 dollar one-time payment of I think it does vary depending on the union as to whether it counts for pension, this one, I may be wrong but this one definitely does count to the pension but it does not count as I understand it to the base pay going forward. In other words the GWI is not on top of the $2,000 it is a, it is considered a one-time payment for pension purposes but not for your salary increase purposes so it is not accreted going forward but, sure, everybody didn’t get a GWI but you did get a $2,000 dollar payment or a $1,000 dollar payment if you were top-step.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So this would end up being essentially equivalent to what the COLA increases are in the years going forward or are they also going to get additional lumpsum payments going
forward?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

No, no other lump sum payments are in this contract. In fiscal year 20 and 21 the GWI does kick in on the prior whatever base salary was from I guess would be 16 because that was the last time there was an increase or maybe even 15, you would get the GWI increase off of that, not off the lumpsum payment. The lumpsum payment just think about it as sort of a onetime check that again counts toward your total nominal amount for pension purposes but does not get compounded upon for the GWI increase and there are no other lumpsum payments in this contract or frankly in any of the others CBAC contacts that I’m aware of that call for that. As for the percentage we’d have to compare that to people’s salaries. Here for example if you’re
making $110-$100,000 dollars it is obviously more akin to two percent than three percent. The prior group, you know, the average salary was maybe $50,000 dollars so it is going to have a different percentage impact.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And would any of these seven individuals that were previously nonunion that would now become union, did any of their actual pay increase by making that change or did every single employee keep the same pay rate that they were receiving prior to unionization?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

No everything’s the same except obviously the
pay increase the GWI increase that takes effect in the next fiscal year, the 3.5, so that will be on top of whatever they were previously making and that has been frozen for some time.

Through you.

But there is no other increases imbedded in this aside from what we see here in the OFA.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the kind gentleman for his answers. Again as contracts in the past and the current contract here before us, these are seven individuals that were previously nonunion that became union. They are attorneys, there are only seven of them that want to join this union, have a separate contract or join into a contract and have it be different than others, for years, and years and years and decades these individuals were negotiating their own contracts,
their own pay, their own benefits like anybody else in the private sector outside of a union would do so and now they’ve decided to join this union and take advantage of the benefits that are provided to them as union members including the one to two percent increase that they would be getting in a lumpsum payment in this year before the end of June 30th in addition to the 3.5 percent increase that they would be receiving in fiscal year 20 and the 3.5 percent increase that they would be receiving in fiscal year 21. And as the kind Ranking Member of the Appropriations Committee had mentioned it is not a matter of whether these individuals deserve it, I think that they probably do based on the hard work that they do for the State of Connecticut it is about whether or not we can afford it. And at this time when we are facing billion dollar deficits the potentials for massive tax increases on the people of Connecticut I would argue that perhaps that we cannot afford these types of increases at this time. So for those reasons I will be opposing this
contract. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Betts of the 78th you have the floor, sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A couple of questions if I may?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

We’ve heard an awful lot of discussion about the contract and the benefits to the employees. My understanding although I am not a lawyer or familiar with labor negotiations, my understanding is the taxpayers who foot this bill are supposed to be represented by the Governor’s Office I guess through OPM. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

Through you.

OMP, Office of Labor Relations they represent the State which is the employer here and certainly by extension the Executive Branch is elected by the people of Connecticut.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you, that is my understanding as well. So many people come and ask me, okay we understand what it is the employees are getting, we understand it is a problem with the system as we’ve heard before. What is it that the taxpayers or if you will the employer, the Governor’s Office, what specific accomplishment, gains, benefits do they achieve under this contract that will provide financial relief not only in this contract but in moving forward? Were there any and if there were could you please tell the General Assembly what they
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So, sure. Look again so these folks are joining an existing contract that was part of the CBAC architecture and as were the prior contract that we did. And so I think I’ve said this before, you have to look holistically at what we’ve achieved with those agreements and these folks are getting some of the benefits of that agreement but they are also getting all the things, hit with all the things the State achieved with those agreements, right. So increased pension contributions, increased healthcare contributions, cost of living and retirement increases come 2021. They’ve got no retroactive pay availability because there were those hard zeros that the State achieved. So those contracts in total, this contract was part of it,
saved the State and the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut $1.5 billion dollars in the last biennial budget, that let us close our budget. Without those savings, those givebacks by State employees, right, we would have had to come up with $1.5 billion dollars and as late as we were here last year, I shudder to think what we would have done if we needed to come up with another $1.5 billion dollars because you either decimate State services for our taxpayers or you have revenue increases on our taxpayers or both. So that was frankly the linchpin of saving the State money, the taxpayers of the State, money in 2017 and of course imbedded in that were a host of other structural changes to all of these jobs. I mentioned the pension increases, I mentioned the healthcare cost co-payer increases, there were co-pay increases by the way on everything from pharmaceuticals to doctor visits. There were a number of other changes that also saved the State money in the long run on the pension side. The number we’ve heard was $25
billion dollars, $20 billion dollars over 20 years and stabilized really the State employee pension system. I think you can look at that credibly from an actuarial point of view and look at how those structural, deep structural changes of which this contract is part, are impacting our pension obligations. We’ve heard a lot about that. I know members are concerned about that. That is what this CBAC negotiations achieved for the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut. It was like renegotiating your mortgage and put it on plan and getting this paid off and getting paid off obviously, remember these current state employees are making up for the sins of the past, the sins of this legislature and Governors, Republican and Democrat who did not fund pension obligations for decades. Our current employee pensions are actually very well-funded and this agreement and the companion agreements were part of that. So that is a tremendous savings to the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut and going forward as I mentioned those sort of structural
changes. So now anybody who joins this group for example, a new employee that gets hired gets put in that new hybrid pension plan we talked about and work into a 401k and private sector plan. That is a new structural change that these folks have agreed to. These particular employees again have agreed to all those different retirement and healthcare costs and increases that are being imposed upon them. So there is a host of benefits from collective bargaining from these agreements, from CBAC that we’ve talked about and that are embedded in these contracts and frankly from my point of view, I know I’m speaking for myself here, really counsel in favor of continuing that structure in 2021 when I know we’re gonna have this whole debate again and again about collective bargaining and whether we want to continue it or not. But that’s the kind of change that this brings is the structural ability to impose this on everyone. And now these seven, right, they are bound by that. They are bound by those changes that were previously negotiated and
will be negotiated in the future.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

I thank you for that explanation and that brings me to an interesting point and I’d be, you know, if the good gentleman would however in the interest of coming out to Bristol, I would be happy to arrange this, but when I hear somebody or not when I hear, but many of my residents hear that the, $1.2 or $1.5 billion dollars in savings, they sit there and say wow, that’s a lot of money. You know, $1.5 billion dollars. Am I going to get a tax refund or where is this savings to me? That sounds like a great deal and you know, you refinanced because of the pension obligations deals are going to cost literally billions of dollars in the future that’ll hurt, you know, my children and grandchildren but right now you just told me we have $1.5 billion dollars in savings. Could the good
gentleman tell me how I as a taxpayer realize the savings? Am I gonna get a refund check or is it in fact we are spending less that what we happened to pass and in reality it’s not a savings it is a fact it’s a reduction in the amount of money we’re spending on this and again, I’m not talking about the employees, I’m talking about the system and where are specifically the benefits to the taxpayers who really frankly are providing the money to the employer.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

I’d be happy to come to Bristol. Look, I think most taxpayers in the State of Connecticut are sophisticated enough to, most residents, are sophisticated enough to understand that when we talk about the entire budget holistically, they know they are not getting a refund check when we talk about
cutting this from government or savings here, etc.  
I’d like to think for example the parents with kids in the school system in my town of Hamden, the town of Bristol they know how much money their town gets in ECS from the State of Connecticut or for other programs, road repair, etc. from the State of Connecticut and they know that if you got to spend $105,000 billion dollars on a contractual obligation and pay that first, that’s $1.5 billion dollars on that, you don’t have it for something else.  So what I say to my resident is Hamden all the time and they get this, is if you are not spending it here, then we can talk about the money for making sure we’ve stabilized DCS which by the way we were able to do in that 2017 budget.  So there is a perfect example of how because we weren’t concerned about that $1.5 billion dollars over here, we were able to actually look at structural changes to ECS.  That is a direct benefit to a taxpayer in the State of Connecticut whether you’ve got kids in the school system or not because if your ESC funding is there your property
taxes don’t have to make up for any kind of gap. Or you don’t have to make those tough choices between the local level between services and taxes which we are still making obviously because we still have a ways to go here. But these are incredible steps forward that let us stabilize the revenue, particularly on the municipal side but also on the services that we provide in the State of Connecticut, all those benefits that taxpayers in Connecticut get from being here, from a robust healthcare system, from a really strong educational system when you compare us nationally, a good public education system on the state level all those things that we fund and that are benefits the taxpayers of Connecticut. You know, this helps us continue to fund them and not either cut them down to the bone even further, or just make sure that the money is there. So when I think of those savings, yeah, and again I think most taxpayer are sophisticated enough to know, we’re not talking about a refund check.

Through you.
One Governor several years ago, I believe tried that [Laughs] and it was sort of seen as a political ploy. That’s not what we’re talking about. We know we’re not talkin about checks but we’re talking about structural savings that enable a current level of services and then, I mean as we’ve all talked about, Republican and Democrat, stability going forward, taking care of this debt load, making sure we manage it. That sets up Connecticut in the future for even more robust growth which benefits everyone.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much and thank you for that answer. And I would respond in two ways, again I’m trying to find out what to say to the taxpayers who provide the money to the employer in these negotiations. We have an obligation to show them that we made a good faith effort to represent their financial interests as well as make sure that we’re
getting benefit from the services we are paying for. I can tell you for seniors certainly in Bristol and I can’t believe it’s unique to Bristol, seniors live on fixed income and they tend to take a very different point of view as they get into their 70s and 80s who are retired and believe me they notice every penny of an increase that goes along and it means absolutely nothing to them about how much money the City of Bristol gets in terms of ECS if their taxes are going up and they are looking for predictability and stability as the good gentleman said, so maybe you could explain to me how I could answer them when they say, well if you have these savings that you’ve achieved and $1.5, $1.2 billion dollars that sounds great, why is it that we are coming back here year after year hearing reports to a financial deficit, billions of dollars, and how is this turned it around because we’re still facing that over the next couple of years? I’m not that smart to be able to figure out on the one hand you say we’re moving in the right direction, we’ve
stabilized things and we’ve achieved this tremendous savings and structural changes yet on the other hand my taxes are going up, locally and statewide, and I am still waiting to understand or if you will feel or have some kind of tangible benefit feel really good about this claim that we have a major savings. So if the good gentleman could explain to me what I can say to these people that would be a tremendous help because what I’ve been saying is not registering with them. They do not understand it, they don’t feel it. So, oh there he is, he just stepped away, so if the good gentleman could explain to these people who are on fixed incomes and to the future deficits we’re seeing, not only for the next two years but even further out, when does this come in and when we are negotiating collective bargaining how is the taxpayer financially getting relief or some kind of stability now and moving forward?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

Thank you, I apologize I was hiding from the withering cross examination I’m suffering here. Look, I think there is, depending on who you are talking to, I would talk in terms of the services that they get. So with respect to seniors, I’ll bet in Bristol as in my town, there are senior centers, senior transportation services that get some form or state funding. Senior renter rebate relief for example other senior based programs and I think what you can say, what I would say, is look we try to preserve those funds and if instead we were facing a pension contribution increase of a billion dollars. Remember we had that cliff on the state employee pension payments coming up that we smoothed out two years ago. If we were facing those kinds of payments all of that would be in jeopardy to you. So do you like those services? Do you want those services? That is the kind of thing we are able to still preserve for you by virtue of getting rid of a lot of this debt overhang and I think young or old
people will understand that the more you’re indebted the less money you have for other things that may be important to you, whatever that may be. Whether you’re a parent with kids in the school system or a senior who relies on renter rebate relief, you know, that debt payment comes first because it is a contractual obligation. It’s due. And that’s how I would explain it by shrinking that overhang we are freed for more growth, for preserving services that are important to you and that’s one of the things that we’re doing and we’re doing that and our state employees are doing that. They are taxpayers too so they recognize that there is sacrifice required from everybody and they gave and that’s one of the things that they did to help do that. And then lastly I think I mean I say this wherever I go and I would hope everybody says this is a bipartisan fashion that that overhang is the sins of the past. Don’t blame state employees for the fact that for 40 years, in the 50s, 60s, 70s and you know even into the 80s we didn’t put money away. We knew we had
contractual obligations and didn’t save and that’s on everybody in State Government, Republican and Democrat and that’s on, you know, us collectively I think as a society for not doing that and we, Republicans and Democrats are now dealing with those sins and we have to correct that and it’s unfortunate that it falls on us to be the responsible ones. But we are being the responsible ones by dealing with it. I think any taxpayer of whatever ilk will understand that message.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you and I thank the gentleman for his answers and I’m just gonna wrap up with a few comments. The first thing is it has been my observation for the nine years that I’ve been here that we’ve done a woeful job of representing the financial interests of taxpayers. It is a system that we’ve heard many times that is at fault and it has been clearly very one-sided in terms of who’s
benefits and who has not. So again, until we do something structurally with the system for collective bargaining I see no difference in the pattern that has occurred in the nine years and moving forward. We just simply don’t have the money and if we do have the money we have to always go back to the taxpayers including the people, the state employees who are also taxpayers but they can’t be happy because they are having money to shell out all the times for things that we frankly could do a much better job on and we just have not done that. So I feel very strongly that we’ve been underrepresented for sure for the taxpayers in general when it comes to collective bargaining.

The second thing is we can say anything we’d like in trying to explain it anyway we want but for those people on fixed incomes, believe me, they are not interested in hearing an explanation, they are interested in keeping their money and not having their taxes go up or having to make difficult choices. That is the expectation, that is what they
want and that is what they tell all of use and we are not doing that, pure and simple. We are not doing that. we can come up with any explanation as to why that is but the reality is we keep coming back to them year after year and that also applies to the employers in the private sector who by the way are nowhere near able to be able to provide the benefits to their employees that we do in the public sector. So in general I would just like to say it is a system that is badly broke that we are going to continue to pay very dearly for, for a longtime and that is the reason why I am going to be voting against this contract and all other contracts in the future because we have failed in my mind to be able to show the taxpayers that their interests have been represented and that we’ve had to make the changes that have driven the costs of the budget up significantly to fix cost. We have not addressed that and therefor the problem with remain moving forward. So I thank the good gentleman for his answers and I thank you, sir.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had not planned to speak today on this resolution so I apologize in advance for the somewhat jointed nature that my questions and comments are likely to appear to possess. First of all, I would like to address the comment that was just made by the proponent of the resolution in response to the questions from the Representative from Bristol, referencing the history and saying that the state employees bear no responsibility for the situation we find ourselves in with pensions and healthcare costs of state employees. Individually no one of them does bear that responsibility because none of them actually executed the contracts or failed as a member of this Assembly or this Governor to make sure that money was put aside for the pensions. However over all of the years the, 32 years that I’ve been involved in
the Legislature, the decision to not fund the pensions or the healthcare benefits for state employees was something that was either agreed to or acquiesced in by the labor unions, the leadership of which is elected by the membership of the state employee unions. Now I don’t know what they were told in their election campaigns or what they were told in their meetings about who was going to figure out who was going to pay for all of the pensions and benefits that were not being properly being funded in the program that was set up, the trust funds that weren’t being properly funded but as members of those unions and the leaders of those unions decisions were made to allow that to do on year after year, decade after decade, even as taxes were increased for many other purposes and money was spent on many other things, in the immediate time that those taxes were raised, whether it was the income tax or the sales tax or any of the other taxes that were raised up especially in the 80s and 90s. That money was spent but it was not spent to
adequately fund the pensions and I get it. It’s a whole lot more fun to spend money, start new programs and higher new people to work for the State of Connecticut to run those programs than it is to fund the invisible but long-term deadly obligation financially and fiscally deadly obligation of the pension fund. So I take issue with the ideas that nobody on the union side of this discussion has any liability or responsibility or has any blame to shoulder when it comes to how these pensions got to be the way they are and why we now face this fiscal cliff, and calamity and disaster for as far as the eye can see going forward that is afflicting the State of Connecticut’s government.

The second thing is that there really, and this is a point perhaps where the gentleman can argue back and forth with me on this but it is my understanding that for a very long time, certainly going back to the 60’s and until the late 70’s there really was no contractual obligation for the pension and healthcare benefits. Those things were not
subject to collective bargaining. This assembly made some decisions that resulted in collective bargaining being applied to at least one of those two things, either healthcare or pensions. I believe it was during the William O’Neill Administration that the Department of Labor, I believe in the mid 1980’s decided that the other one, and I can’t at this moment that is part of the discombobulated nature of not being prepared really to have this discussion, but one of those two things was imposed by the Department of Labor as an interpretation of what was involved with the contractual negotiations. What collective bargaining was applicable to. It has not been applicable prior to that decision was made by the Department of Labor but after that point it has been treated as applicable. This Legislature starting in the mid 1980’s failed to change the law or to overrule that decision by nameless at this stage in history, administrators in the State Department of Labor but again up until that point, it was not a
contractual obligation because it was not part of collective bargaining. So it’s only in the last 30 years that this has been an issue. Still a longtime and certainly enough and too many opportunities have been missed by this Legislature to address that issue or to fully fund those pensions. The conclusion that was suggested which is that by paying these salaries, by giving these wage increase by as another commented taking care of the people who work for the State of Connecticut better than they get taken care of by many other states. Florida was cited on a number of occasions for that but that somehow helps the economy in the State of Connecticut. The evidence should be at this stage irrefutable and overwhelming that the Connecticut economy is a disaster. It is a mess. We have had sustained failure to grow, failure to thrive for a decade. We’ve had many quarters of economic shrinkage. I remember getting up and addressing a Chamber of Commerce in which I said, well Connecticut’s economy hasn’t grown fast enough to
provide the revenues and so forth and a fellow speaker, a professor from UConn named Carstensen got up right after me and said I thought Representative O’Neill was on the right path until he talked about growth. Connecticut has had no growth. The reason why Professor Carstensen is of some interest is that for many years he was a cheerleader of the previous administrations policies. He advocated in one way or another for those basic policies that were being undertaken. He has subsequently changed his opinions I guess but he spoke in favor of that stuff that was being done in the first years of the Malloy Administration.

So for him to say that Connecticut’s economy has failed to grow is a pretty substantial admission. It should leave it indisputable that there is some sort of growth that has occurred as a result of the policies which we have followed and those polices have been to give fairly steady wage increases and whether they are in the form of steps, or longevity pay or other forms of compensation,
people have been getting higher and higher wages the longer that they have worked for the State of Connecticut over the last 30 years and certainly over the last ten years. The employees have been the beneficiaries of the kind of contract that we have before us today.

I do have a couple of questions dealing with the actual contract that is before us rather than these more cosmic and global points. The first one is and I haven’t been in the Chamber so I hope I am not repeating a question asked earlier. But there was a comment, a number of comments made about the amount of the increase and so forth, what is the salary for the seven lawyers who are the subject of this contract? What is their current salary before this contract goes into effect?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.
Actually I don’t know each seven employees salary, I can endeavor to get it while we’re speaking. What I was able to do was refer to the various rate changes that are included in the backup materials and when looking at that and understanding that many of these employees are 20 year veterans and are likely close to the top step I was looking at the top steps seeing a range from anywhere from $110 to $130,000 dollars at the max sort of level so my assumption was it would be no more than that for most of them but I don’t have each of the seven’s particular stating, actual salary but as we are speaking I am hoping somebody is looking that up and can get that to us.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative O’Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and what is the amount in dollars of the increase for these seven lawyers that are working for the Judicial Branch? The total
dollar figure for that group.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

So if we’re looking, I think to be fair, we want to probably look at those general wage increase and the annual increase. I’m told that the average salary by the way is $95,000 dollars so I was a little high, we’re still getting the numbers but the average for the seven is $95K. The general wage increase for example is about $22,000 dollars in the aggregate and the annual step is about the same amount of money in fiscal year 20 and 21, so roughly you know, $44,000 or so in 20 and 21 as an increase for all seven when you look at the general wage increase and the AI and again obviously that will be broken down evenly among them.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I believe the number I heard was $44,000 dollars which translates divided by seven it would average out to something in the neighborhood of about, and I went to law school too to avoid math, that should be something in the neighborhood of about $6,000 dollars per lawyer, some are gonna get higher, some are lower I assume they are scattered around but that is going to be the average number for them. So that represents in round numbers sounds like about a five or six percent increase during the time that this contract is in effect. I guess, you know, that is more than many of my constituents are seeing as wage increases and they don’t have any relatively speaking job security attach to someone who works for the state government. They don’t have the healthcare benefits that attach to the people who work for the state government. They certainly don’t have the pension benefits going forward that attach to the people who work for state government so I
think that most of my constituents would feel that paying a group of lawyers thousands of dollars, six percent more and thousands of dollars, a couple of thousand dollars a year more it looks like on top of everything. Given the financial condition of the State Government and the economic condition of the State that that is probably excessive. That is what my constituents, if I could just randomly pick someone to replace me here for this, well that is kind of how they would react to the information they have just been given which after all of the discussion of the details of the contract that is really what you’re looking at, how much are they getting and how much more are they going to get under this new contact.

Another question which I would put to the gentleman bringing out the Resolution cause there was a lot of discussion about comparisons in the previous one, not so much this one, with other states. Do we know how much the comparable positions are compensated in the Judicial Branch for
example in New York, Rhode Island or Massachusetts, those states which border the State of Connecticut and in many ways with whom we compete for potential economic development?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D’AGOSTINO (91ST):

In terms of apples to apples I am not even sure if the precise description exists but presumably there are attorneys in the legal department in New York and Massachusetts. I do not know their salary ranges. I can only tell you here again, yes the increase that we’ve got but we’re talking about a lot of hard zeros and no increases for the last eight to ten years for many of these employees.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative O’Neill.

REP. O’NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I guess I would
say that to me that speaks volumes. We don’t know what our bordering states even have for this kind of job whether they are doing anything like this. We don’t know how much those folks get compensated, we don’t know even if they are unionized. We don’t know what kind of healthcare or pension benefits they might recipients of and yet we keep on saying this is fair, this is reasonable but we don’t know what the rest of the world is paying and until I put forward the question that I did a few moments ago, the good gentleman didn’t even know what the salary was and we still don’t actually know, there’s seven of them, what each of those salaries are. And yet we are prepared, this Chamber is going to vote on whether or not to approve this contact without knowing what strikes me as the most basic pieces of information that you should know before you vote to go forward with a contact like this. This is the problem that we have. We have system that is moving forward and we aren’t doing anything significant to try to redirect it, reshape it, reboot it as the
saying would go in the modern economy and so I will be voting no. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Resolution before us? If not will the Staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. 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 members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if 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.
House Resolution 29

Total Number Voting 145
Necessary for Adoption 73
Those voting Yea 82
Those voting Nay 63
Absent not voting 6

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The Resolution is adopted. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions, announcements or introductions? Representative Zupkus.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, Madam. Okay, hold on. [Gavel] Everybody please pay attention, Representative Zupkus has an announcement for us.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to remind everybody in the Chamber and outside of the
Chamber that May 31st, is dress-down Friday. The money that we raise goes for the Home for The Brave which is wonderful cause to build homes and have homes for families of our military for people that served for us, for our freedom. So I encourage you, if you have not already done so, it is $5.00 dollars to dress-down, $10.00 dollars to dress-up or whatever your desire to give above that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative I encourage all of us to participate as generously as we can. Any further announcements of introductions. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 301.

CLERK:

On Page 65, House Calendar No. 301, Substitute House Bill No. 6921 AN ACT CONCERNING DISCRIMINATION BASED ON A PERSON'S CRIMINAL HISTORY Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Question is Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative Porter you have the floor.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an Amendment LCO 9352. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9352 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “B”.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “B” LCO No. 9352 offered by Representative Porter.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):


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

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This will establish the Council on Collateral Consequences of a Criminal Record to study discrimination faced by people in the State of Connecticut living with a criminal record. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Question before the Chamber is Adoption of House Amendment Schedule “B”. Will you remark on the Amendment? Representative D’Agostino of the 91st District. No. How about Representative Fishbein of the 90th District?

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Excuse me, Representative might I go to the
Ranking Member first?

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Absolutely.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you. Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good afternoon, sir. With that just one quick question to the proponent of the Amendment?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Just one quick question, I know that we had talked about this yesterday and the Bill has come back as Amended today. Does this Amendment now include Ranking Member or his or her Legislative Appointment?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, it does.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Poletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, no further questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it.

[Gavel] The Amendment is passed. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Representative Porter.
REP. PORTER (94TH):

Good Bill, ought to pass.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended?

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

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I was looking at the previous iterations over this Bill and as I am looking now, was just handed this version. I’m looking at the list of the people who are on the Commission and I’m trying to as we speak look through it and I see that, I am wondering is there anybody on this Commission that is, that represents the law enforcement community?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I’m actually looking through this quickly. I
will tell you who is on here the Chairs in the House and the Senate for Labor, Ranking Members for the Senate, and let’s see the House and Senate Ranking Members, Undersecretary we have OPM, we have the Commissioner of Corrections, the Labor Commissioner, the Commissioner of Consumer Protection, the Executive Director of Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities and then we have the Executive Director or CEO of Justice Impacted Person, a representative from ACLU and a representative from the Connecticut Coalition of Achievement Now, Representative from Connecticut Coalition to End Homelessness, representative for the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy, a representative from Katal Center on Health, Equity and, Justice, a representative from the National Council Incarcerated and Formerly Incarcerated Women and Girls, a representative from the New Haven Legal Assistance Association Reentry Clinic a representative from the Service Employees' International Union, and a representative from the
Voices of Women of Color.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I’m going through it as we all are kind of quickly and if I may, just ask a few questions about the composition of this commission. I see that, well first off if I may ask what is the. Let me start simple. What is the purpose of this group that is being assembled?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

It is to study the impact on incarcerated people returnin to everyday livin. I would say and the barriers that they face and how we can help them.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It appears that with regard to discrimination it would seem that the commission will be looking into such things as housing, discrimination with regard to housing. Is that correct?

Through you.

Representative Dubitsky.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask, there does not seem to be anybody on here for example a landlord of any type. Is there a reason why there is no landlords or anybody who represents a landlord organization on a commission to look into
discrimination with regard to housing?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Was in the creation of this commission, was there any thought about bringing in anybody who represents landlords?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

We feel that the people we have chosen are those that might be OC or agencies that deal with this community and others that have been directly
impacted whether it be an individual or a group that would have knowledge, firsthand knowledge and experience.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the good Chairwoman of Labor could tell me what is the Katal Center for Health, Equity and Justice?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

The Katal Center is an organization that deals with incarcerated people that have served time and are currently serving time and some of the members are actually people that have been released themselves.

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

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Are they, is that employment or a labor organization of any type?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.
No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are they a human services organization?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):
I’m sorry.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the good gentleman please repeat the question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky please repeat your question.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I asked if they are a human services organization of some sort.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay, are they some type of social justice organization?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Please repeat the question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky, please repeat.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I asked if they are a type of social justice organization?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

They may be considered as such but I am not going to declare that. I can ask them and get back to the good Representative.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you. Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess my question on that one is if they don’t appear to have any relation with labor or public employees I am wondering why they are being appointed by the Chair of the Labor and Public Employees Committee.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter do you care to answer?

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

They are being appointed because of the experience they have with this particular group that is been studied through this.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask what is the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Could the good gentleman please repeat the question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I asked what is the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Could you please ask the good gentleman to give me the line number he is referring to?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky do you have a line number to reference?
REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Line 42.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

I would have to get back to.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I would have to get back to the good gentleman on that.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay, thank you Mr. Speaker. Could the.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Could the good Chairwoman explain to me what the Connecticut Coalition to End Homelessness is?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a coalition to end homelessness in the State of Connecticut.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A coalition of whom?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Employees that are employed by the coalition.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay are they, is the Connecticut Coalition to End Homelessness does it have any, is it a labor or public employee organization?

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter do you care to answer that question?

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Sure.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

No it is not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker I would ask what is the Connecticut Coalition for Achievement Now?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Do you care to respond to that question, Representative Porter?

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I will be glad to give the good gentleman the information on every last one of these
representatives.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay, then I would ask what is the Connecticut Coalition for Achievement Now?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter do you care to answer?

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I’d have to get back to the good gentleman.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

I’m sorry, Mr. Speaker I did not hear the answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter would you please repeat
your answer.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Absolutely.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I will have to get back to the good gentleman.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, through you.

I would ask is any part of this group that is being put together intended to look into discrimination against previously incarcerated people in employment.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter do you care to answer?

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I note that there don’t seem to be any business organizations like CBIA or any organization like that. I was wondering why that was.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

We didn’t choose to put them in the study.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was there any consideration to bringing in any business organization with regard to having previously incarcerated people employed by businesses?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I don’t recollect at the moment.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask what is the National Council for Incarcerated and Formerly Incarcerated Women and Girls?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter do you care to answer that question?

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Yes.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is an organization that does exactly what the title implies. It is an organization built with women who have been formerly incarcerated and girls that help women and girls that have been formerly or are currently incarcerated.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I note that is a National Council, do they have a branch in Connecticut?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I am not sure, I’d have to get back to the good gentleman on that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker in one of the previous iterations I noticed that the SEIU was on, a member of the SEIC was on here. Actually I just found it, line 57, Service Employees International Union Local 32BJ. Which local is that?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Excuse me. Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

This is a Point of Order please. The Mason’s does not allow us to ask question that on their face appear pretty obvious to be answered. So some of the question, I would like to point on this, Mr. Speaker are pretty self-explanatory. I would like us to just please watch that in this Chamber. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

So noted, Mr. Majority Leader. Representative
Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker there are organizations on here that I am unfamiliar with and some of which the proponent of the Bill are unfamiliar with so I think it is perfectly appropriate for me to ask what they are. I’d like that information in order to be educated enough to vote on this Bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please, I know you did have a question before, would you please repeat it.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

On Line 57 and 58 Service Employees International Union Local 32BJ. What is Local 32BJ, what is the subgroup that is recognized by that number?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter do you care to answer
that question?

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is Local 32BJ, I don’t know how else to explain that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

All right. Was there any thought in putting this together for somebody from perhaps the teacher’s union?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Could you ask the good gentleman to please repeat the question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky, please repeat the
question.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Sure, Mr. Speaker. In putting together this group, was there any discussion of having a representative from the teacher’s union?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was there any discussion of having a representative from Probation and Parole?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Porter.

REP. PORTER (94TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended?

Will you remark further? From the 39th District, Representative Nolan.

REP. NOLAN (39TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And through you.

I just want to speak in favor of this Bill. I’ve had many constituents that have talked about housing, and employment, healthcare and insurance discrimination because of their past history and I think that it is time for us as leaders in the State to change that so that we can eliminate that from happening. So I think this study is a great thing
and I will be fully supporting this and I do not have questions for the component that I can look up myself. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Nolan. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? From the 83rd District, Representative Abercrombie. You have the floor, madam.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I rise in full support of his legislation before us. And just for an explanation, you know, we put together a lot of task force, coalitions, work groups the members that are appointed to those groups usually are recommendations from people that know the area better than we do. Just because there is someone on that group doesn’t necessarily mean that the good Chair is isn’t aware of how important they are to the work group and I find it a little insulting when our colleagues are trying to ask questions that are kind of self-explanatory. For example, to end
homelessness. So let’s be a little more courteous. We ask for it on both sides of the aisle. I’m asking for it on this side also. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? For the second time, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And with all due respect to my esteemed colleagues there is a list of organizations on this Bill that not only do I not understand but the proponent of the Bill is not familiar with. So for me to ask questions about the members of this committee or this group is in my view perfectly legitimate because I and the people I represent need to understand this Bill in order to have me properly vote for it. I’ve never heard of some of these organizations and I am sure there are other people in this Chamber who have not heard of them either and it is entirely appropriate for me to
ask questions about the membership of this group.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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? 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 HENNESSY (127TH):

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

The Clerk will please announce the tally.
CLERK:

House Bill No. 6921 as Amended by House “A”
and House “B”

Total Number Voting 145
Necessary for Passage 73
Those voting Yea 108
Those voting Nay 37
Absent not voting 6

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

[Gavel] The Amendment, the Resolution is adopted. Are there any announcement or introductions? Representative Abercrombie of the 83rd, you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I would like my colleagues to join me in saying congratulations to our new proud dad Brandon McGee who had a beautiful little girl two days ago.

[Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Congratulations, Representative McGee.
Representative Tercyak you have the floor, sir.

Okay. Will the Clerk please call House Resolution 30.

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino of the 91st you have the floor, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The Question before the Chamber is on
Acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution. Representative D’Agostino you have the floor.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the last of the three Judicial Department Memorandums of Understanding of this particular agreement accretes 165 employees into the same union we were talking about previously, the AFT Judicial Employees Union. Of the 165 employees about 102 are IT technical specialists, they keep the department, the Judicial Department running and rolling and dealing with all sorts of case-flow and input that they have to manage and there is about 102 of those IT employees. The remaining are spread amongst a number of other functions including network technicians, system developers, principally also auditors and accountants for the Judicial Department. Again the Judicial Department, a large department, a lot of significant needs just like the Legislation and Executive Branches and then there is finally some
assistant jury administrators in this group as well. They really are again the provide all that back office support that keeps the Judicial Department going and I urge members to support the Agreement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle of the 143rd, you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So as the good Representative said pursuing with the Judicial Branch. So we have 165 employees in this unit and do I understand that this is not a new bargaining unit but that they are joining an existing unit?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

This is precisely correct. Joining the same Judicial Employees Union under the AFT umbrella not a new union.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much. And they, some of them are eligible for retroactive longevity for fiscal 19, right?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

Similar to the last two, yes. There is a small subset that will receive and is eligible for longevity, again no one hired after 2011 gets it but there is a group here that gets it and that is going to total about $100,000 dollars in fiscal year 19 to account for those longevity payments.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):
Thank you and then we have also for fiscal 19 a lumpsum payment for each of $2,000 dollars unless they are at their top step and then in that case it is $1,000 dollars. Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

That is absolutely correct and consistent with the CBAC architecture.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and in fiscal 20 and fiscal 21 each employee in each of those years gets a 3.5 percent general wage increase. Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

Correct following the CBAC architecture.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and then there is an annual increment of what we would otherwise call step increases in both fiscal 20 and fiscal 21 and what is the median percentage for that increment?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

Again that is going to vary depending on where the particular employee is. You’re looking, but it stays very consistent in terms of the range as we’ve done with these other agreements anywhere from the two and a half to sort of three and a half percent on the high range, most of them fall in that three percent range.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.
REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much. And there is also, there is an automobile availability stipend also something called an “on-call” stipend. Could the good Representative explain what that is please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

So again for the auto stipend this is similar to what we’ve talked about in other contracts where an employee is required to use his or her car for official business to go around for example amongst the 13 Judicial Districts in the State so some of the IT folks obviously have to go from location to location to location. They would be entitled to the auto stipend. Not every member here certainly is entitled to the auto stipend. It’s only a very small fraction as you can see from the overall cost of that, not every member gets it but it again, only when you are required to use your automobile not a
state automobile for particular job services that you’ve got to provide across the State of Connecticut.

And then the on-call stipend similarly, again for some of these employees, not all, but some do have to come, are on-call after hours and on weekends depending on the jobs that they do. You can imagine for IT when you’ve lawyers and cases going on late, the IT folks have to be available on-call to respond to any kind of technical issues and that is an hourly compensation arrangement that is added to that particular employee when they respond on-call. It’s very limited. It’s really not would you would sort of think about in the private sector of on-call and coming in sort of for a full-hour slate, it is particular ad hoc services that they are gonna provide to support what’s goin on in the Judicial Department.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.
REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and is this, I didn’t ask this with the other two contracts we’ve done so far, but is this group eligible for overtime?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

My understanding on this contract, this Judicial Employees contract is actually the employees here are not eligible for overtime. There might be a small subset of them that are but overall I think 85 percent, 90 percent of the contract that they are going into is a comp time arrangement rather than an overtime arrangement. That is how the Judicial Department has negotiated this particular contract which these employees are accreting and of course, comp time different than overtime, you earn that time and then you can take it later. Again the reason for that, that we
structured that way typically in these Judicial contracts is because of the demands of the Judiciary the fact that management wants a bit more control over when people are taking time off and not taking time off with respect to the comp time versus coming in for overtime and that is how we do it with this particular contract so it is more of a comp time structure than it is overtime.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And so that is useful. Are all of the other items that we have discussed the longevity, the onetime bonus in 2019, the general wage increase, the annual increments and the two stipends one for auto availability and the other for “on-call” are all of those things included in each employees’ salary for the basis of calculation pensions?

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

   Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

   Through you, my understanding is they all are except for the $2,000 dollar. Oh, I’m sorry that is included for the purpose of pension, it is not counted for purposes of accreting the salary going forward but they are all included in pension calculations.

   Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

   Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

   Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. So just to summarize from the cost viewpoint we have a total incremental cost, I am going to torture the Representative again now with math, but I assure him that my, albeit very good master’s degree in French Literature has given me extraordinary math ability [Laughter] and although I didn’t go to law school and I come out with a total increment for the four
years of about $7.4 million dollars. Would that be approximately correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Representative Lavielle is indeed torturing me with the math. That looks to be right. That’s all four years included. I guess that the only two caveats I would add to that is again because this contract goes that extra year into 2022 it is entirely possible that that last year those incremental costs in that last year which are about $3.17 million dollars may change if the contract opens up a year earlier along with the rest of the CBAC negotiations even in 21 even if it does not I am told though that this is all covered in the current budget for the Judiciary for the present fiscal year and the following two fiscal years.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and the other perennial question that barring unforeseen circumstances and were all things to remain the same, this would be an annualized cost for, following these changes, of $3.17 million dollars.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Again, I mean all things remain the same, no retirements, no other changes in the department structure and certainly no other contractual changes that would be correct. I do think that is unlikely but that would be correct.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
And just regarding this contract also the others, when we say that the funds are available in the reserve for salaries account and they will be covered, where does the money come from that goes into the RSA?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

And again I want to be clear because this is Judicial, it is not necessarily RSA that this is actually in the Judiciary budget as I understand it but more generally these other contracts we’ve talked about, the RSA is a budgeted line item. It is budgeted every year in the biennium and it actually rolls over. So I think there is something like $77 million dollars in it right now even including the other contracts that we’ve done, there will be maybe $45-$50 million dollars left in it at the end of the year even including all these
contracts and then we budget each year, the biennium more into the RSA to precisely to plan for these events. It is a budgeted line item and the money from that of course comes from the Operations Budget of the State and ultimately the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I thank the Representative for the answer. It is good to know the money is put away but again this is still money and it’s still money that the cost continues to grow over the years and again we are talking about Connecticut’s fiscal situation which is pretty grim, everyone agrees on that and we find ourselves once again with about a $3 million dollar increase annually going forward over what we pay now. And once again I think it is a very, this piles up, there’s a lot of different contracts. This one is no exception. The employees themselves
are not in question, not whether they deserve it or not, but the fact that we do not have enough money to go around. So again I would urge, I will not be voting for this Resolution and I would urge others to do the same. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you very much. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not will the Staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Will the Members please take their seats, the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Resolution No. 30

Total Number Voting 147
Necessary for Adoption 74
Those voting Yea 88
Those voting Nay 59
Absent not voting 4

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):


CLERK:

House Calendar 633, House Resolution No. 31


DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution. Representative D’Agostino you have the floor.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sorry, I think we had House Resolution 30 before this one, I’m not sure we did that one. So I’m just pulling out my notes on this one.

This is yet another accretion. This moves originally nine employees, we are actually down to seven employees who will be moving into this existing bargaining unit for SEIU. These are, these seven folks, again it is seven now, and there is an updated OFA as well to reflect the loss of two people who have left since this came out of
Appropriations but these folks are plant facilities engineers. They go around the State and run the facilities throughout our entire portfolio. These particular people, we’ve got some housed at Department of Corrections, I believe some are at Veterans’ Affairs as well and I think DSS. So they actually run those buildings and that as you can imagine is a pretty significant job. There are again only seven of them so that the incremental cost here is not too bad, really topping out at $150,000 dollars in fiscal year 21 and again we’re only talking about seven employees and the amounts are well-covered in the Reserved For Salary Adjustment Account and I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The Question. The Question is on Adoption.

Will you remark further? Representative Lavielle of the 143rd, you have the floor.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well we’ve changed branches of government if we haven’t changed
anything else. So these are facilities engineers joining an existing union. Are they all, we’re they all managers and do they all remain managers?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

 Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

 Through you.

 So it’s a good question and I know Representative Davis, this is something that we talked about as well in debate. A manager of course is a term of ours in the statutes and typically that would exclude you from unionization if you were a manager. But in this case these particular employees while they do have supervisory responsibilities do not meet the definition of manager under the statute that as has been determined by the Labor Board again we’ve talked about this, the State does actually challenge these designations when people who were formally considered managers in one fashion or another move
into a nonmanagerial union position. In this case the ruling is that they are not managers and therefore are able to unionize. So while their job descriptions haven’t changed, and they do have some supervisory work at the buildings that they manage the report to other people. They do not have the sort of check the box statutory definition elements of management such that they are excluded from unionization. And so to answer your question they still have the same job responsibilities but they are not managers.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. How does the statute, whether it is a statute or whether it is the contract governing the status of manager in this case, what does it require for someone to have in their job?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is 5-270(g) is the statutory section and it lays out I think four or five different statues or criteria and if you meet for most people you have to meet at least two of them, so for example responsibility for the direction of a subunit or facility division of an agency; development and implementation of goals and objectives for that agency; major role in administration of collective bargaining. Sort of really high level managerial responsibilities that we dictate by statute and of course there is a body of labor law that is developed around those specific criteria and these folks here again, while they are plant facilities managers with responsibility for their building they don’t rise to the level of management in terms of those overarching, setting agency goals criteria and objectives that sort of thing and therefore don’t meet the 5-270(g) statutory criteria.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

So do they have employees who report to them directly?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

I’m sure that they do being responsible for the entire plant facility but again as you can see from sort of the description of some of those statutory criteria that in and of itself while in sort of common parlance might make you a manager it does not make you a statutory manager for purposes of labor law.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.
REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

So does it create any potential conflict at all when something is being, when a decision is being made regarding one of their employees, is there any problem with their being in the same, are they in the same union?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Every effort is usually made so that you do not have the same members of the same bargaining unit doing reviews and evaluations, etc. Where that is allowed and is specifically carved out in contract language I believe in the ANR Contract there is a provision for that but sort of the first step is always is there a different bargaining unit member who can review other, people in other bargaining units do not have that conflict of interest. That is always sort of the touch stone going forward with
respect to any kind of union/nonunion review and that is what we try to do here again to the extent there is a left that is bargained for and there are sort of controls put into place in terms of who is doing the review.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. So if we go to the terms of the contract, again very similar to the things we’ve seen up to this point. In fiscal 19 each of these individuals gets either a one-time $2,000 dollar bonus of $1,000 if they have already reached their top step. Is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

That is correct.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):
And in fiscal 20 and fiscal 21 in each of those years each of them gets a 3.5 percent general wage increase. Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

That is correct.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I’m sorry, Mr. Speaker. And in the fiscal year 20 and 21 each of them gets an annual increment and the approximate median of those annual increments would be?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Again I don’t have the precise percentage breakdown for each one because people vary within their step but the AI again usually fluctuate between two and a half and three percent usually a median around the three percent AI, Annual Increment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and we have the longevity payments going forward and there is also a lumpsum at maximum in fiscal 21. Could the Representative explain that please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Again that is tied with the, right above that, you see the fiscal year 21 Annual Increment so again consistent as the Representative mentioned the other years if you are at the top step you don’t get the
Annual Increment and you get a flat lumpsum of usually $1,000 dollars so that is for 2021 tied with the Annual Increment, some folks are getting the Annual Increment and a number are getting the lumpsum instead of the, they are already going to be at top step at that year.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And then there is also provision for conversion to the step plan under the contact for this particular union. We these managers coming from a different type of step arrangement and what is the conversion entail.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is a good question again, because they
were previously considered management, there is a management salary structure, a step structure for managerial employees in the State of Connecticut at different levels, just like there is in the union contracts obviously not managers but the different step levels and these employees depending on their years of service are transitioning now over to the contractual annual increment chart if you will and so every effort was made in the negotiations to make sure that there wasn’t completed congruence between the managerial pay chart and the union pay chart and every effort was made to make sure that we were moving people as close as possible. So for example for some people in a particular step where they were making $95,478 dollars under the new conversion they’d be making $95,610 dollars. So it is converting some of them over to the new pay scale under the union contract. Most of those, it looks like all of those are indeed increases, they are very nominal as I just mentioned, you know, to the tune of maybe $100 dollars in your base salary when
you convert over but that is what that conversion
cost is moving these employees over from one pay
scale to the other pay scale.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, so that is very helpful and it is
torture time again. The total incremental cost of
all of these provisions 19, 20 and 21 I may be a bit
off because of the, there used to be nine employees
now there’s seven but we are around $240,000 dollars
for the total increments over those three years?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

I’m gonna throw math right back at
Representative Lavielle, yes and if I am going to do
my math correctly when we take out the two employees
it looks to me like we’re looking at about a net
less amount of about $50,000 dollars or so overall over the course of the agreement but excuse me, $150,000, no $50,000 dollars but again that is my math so it is not perfect but that is just looking at the new OFA with the seven employees.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Okay so we will accept the D’Agostino math and call it around $200,000 I guess. And the annual cost going forward something around $140-$150,000 dollars barring unforeseen circumstances?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Yep, right around $150,000 dollars again barring unforeseen circumstances. Again I expect this particular contract does expire June 30th of 2021 so I think you can expect significant changes
to this contractual structure at that time.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So just to summarize like the others we had discussed already this morning, this afternoon we have a set of employees who are getting what amounts to approximately a 6.5 percent raise in the first year and then again a 6.5 percent raise the second year if you simply add them up you get 13 percent but we all know this is cumulative it is a little more than that. And to that we add the, we add lumpsum payments particularly the one in 2019. So that’s just something significant to know when we look at it in the general context of what is happening to people in the working world and once again we are stretching in Connecticut’s current financial context so I will not be supporting the Resolution. I thank the good Representative for his answers and
I urge others not to support it as well. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the Resolution before us? If not will the staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Will the Members please take their seats, the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:
House Resolution No. 31

Total Number Voting 146
Necessary for Adoption 74
Those voting Yea 87
Those voting Nay 59
Absent not voting 5

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The Resolution is Adopted. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Rose of the 118th, you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. ROSE (118TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed.

REP. ROSE (118TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. We’ve all add our fair share of the Internship Program this year but we have one special intern that was not recognized with the rest of the group, she is still here with us working and we just wanted to take a moment to
tell you that this young lady took over a very special position this year for us. It was the first time we ever had a Marketing and Communications intern and I would like to introduce Gina Pelligrinelli who is from Glastonbury. She is a student at Central Connecticut State University and we would just like to thank her for all the hard work she’s done in getting the word out about our Internship Committee on Facebook and getting us hooked into LinkedIn and Instagram and we are very proud of her and we just wanted to give her a warm round of applause. Thank you. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Will the Clerk please call House Resolution 32.

CLERK:

House Calendar 634, House Resolution No. 32

Representative D’Agostino.

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

The Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Adoption of the Resolution. Representative D’Agostino you have the floor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the last of the accretions that we have before us today. These are 60 or so employees in various job functions across the state who are accreting into the ANR Administration and Residual Employees Union, one of our largest in the state, really again do all the, a lot of the back-office functions for the State of Connecticut. The overall cost for this 60 or so employees is 61 or 63 depending on the point in time
which you count it about $300,000 dollars in the first year, $471,000 dollars in the second year, $981,000 dollars in the third. The contract does expire June 30th.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

[Gavel] The noise is getting rather loud. We can’t hear the speakers. Please take your conversations outside. Thank you. Please continue Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

I would imagine that they don’t want to hear us anymore today, Mr. Speaker but this is the last one. And with respect to these particular employees, again just to give you an idea of the range of work we’re talking about, we’re talking about motor vehicle DMV Hub Branch Managers, Fiscal Administration Mangers, Transportation Safety Engineers, people who go out and inspect our bridges, Principle Engineers in the Transportation Department, Property Agents, Military Administrative and Program Mangers, etc. Again anticipating,
Representative Davis’ question these were previously classified as Managers. There were a number of other managers who wanted to be subsumed into this union, the State opposed that, opposed all of these really, and again these particular accretions are the results of Labor Board decisions about who is a manger and who is not. The State successfully kept out a number of other employees in the management field or level if you will who are not part of this, but these are the result of either negotiated solutions or results, opinions from the Labor Board with respect to whether or not they meet those statutory criteria. As Representative Lavielle and I were discussing in the last contract, these particular 60 or so employees can accrete into a union, they are doing so, it is under the CBAC architecture, the money is saved for in the Reserved for Salary Account and I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. In the interest of having discussed this so many times before I will just go quickly through the terms and ask if the numbers are correct. So the 64 or 64 individuals would each get a lumpsum payment in fiscal 19 of $2,000 dollars or $1,000 if they were at the top step. There were also some retroactive lumpsum payments for that year. There are also some retroactive longevity payments. Each employee going forward would get a 3.5 percent general wage increase in both fiscal 20 and fiscal 21 as well as a two percent annual increment in those years for a total of 5.5 percent increase. In addition, longevity payments going forward for those eligible and another lumpsum, not sure what that is in 20 and 21. So is all that correct?

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, correct. Just to clarify those points for some of the lumpsum and maximum because of the way that’s broken up over the year. With respect to these particular employees there were some that payment needed to be retroactive to June 30th of last year because they get their full lumpsum for when they get those payments so that is why that is reflective in here. The two percent annual increment as the Representative pointed out is different. This is a flat two percent for this particular group that is less than what we were talking about with that range of 2.5 to 3.5 with the mean of three for other groups that we’ve been speaking of so that is less. This particular group also has the three furlough days included, the unpaid furlough days in fiscal year 20 because they didn’t do it in prior years so that is in this contract as well. Everything else the
Representative explained with respect to the GWI and other terms is consistent with the CBAC architecture.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much. And so the total incremental cost, last time for this, the total incremental cost over the three years of these changes is about $1.77 million dollars.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is correct and again this contract expires fiscal year 21, June 30, 2021.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and the total annualized cost going forward barring any significant changes and circumstances would be about $1.046 million dollars.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Again assuming no changes and I assume that there will be, assuming no changes, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the good Representative for his detailed answers all through this morning and afternoon, very helpful, wanted to make sure everyone who was listening or who was interested was able to get these facts.

A couple of points I’ll just make in regard to all of this, some of these contracts seem to be
small. When you add up just the ones that we did today the incremental cost for all of the changes in these five contracts come to about $12.7 million dollars across the four years or three years depending on the contract and at an annual cost going forward, barring any unforeseen changes of about $6.4 million dollars and the point to make there is while the changes that we make, in these contracts, effect the upcoming biennium that we are currently doing the budget for and in fact for which we do not yet know the budget, so we are in a way speculatively making decisions on these without knowing exactly where the budget will be even though they are coming out of the RSA, it is still money. These are changes that will remain because when you increase salaries in any discipline that doesn’t go away, you don’t go back and take peoples’ salaries away from them. So these are changes that are for the most part, with some exceptions, once they are made and once they are entrenched, they are forevermore. The other thing I would like to note
is my friend and colleague across the aisle, optimism will get some favorable negotiating terms in the year 2021 and without any disrespect to anyone who may be on the receiving end of those changes, I hope that the State will be in a position to negotiate very, very strongly on behalf of all of the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut who do fund this compensation including the state employees themselves. So again I think looking at this figures which are very significant that it is important not to pick winners and losers, that it is important to recognize that everyone is in the same boat and that while all of these employees are very deserving and they do good work for us and we do value what they do and they are taxpayers, that we have to realize that the State is facing very high hurdles and the continuation of a persistent fiscal crisis that we all recognize. I urge rejection of the Resolution. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Davis of the
57th District you have the floor, sir.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If I may a couple of questions for the proponent of the Resolution?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the kind gentleman’s description in the beginning of how these are management positions and that they apply to union membership at the State, question that but ultimately was ruled that they could become managers or become union members despite the fact that they are management.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I see that an airport manager. Is that all of the airport managers?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is one airport operations manager is my understanding and would be moving over. There were six other classifications in that position and the Military Administrative Officer position who wanted to move over and that’s where the State has objected to those moving over. So right now we are only talking about one airport operations manager. I don’t know if that is at Bradley, Tweed or some other location.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And that individual, is there anyone at that airport that they work under that is, or I guess is there anybody there that would be above them at that airport. I assume that maybe the executive director of the Connecticut Airport Authority but is there anybody that actually is above them that they work for other than the
executive director.

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

    My understanding, at the airport, no. Within the regime of the airport authority and transportation yes. I don’t know exactly the hierarchy but they are the top person at that particular facility.

    Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And that individual sets the times, the work schedules, the operations schedules for that airport, that’s their role?

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I was just actually looking at some additional information I have. This person is at Bradley and I don’t think it is the only person at Bradley. This person is responsible for directing some staff that have a group of operations sections at Bradley International Airport so however they divide the different sections of operations at Bradley this person is responsible for a number of those sections. I believe there’s other operations managers at Bradley because of obviously the size of the facility.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And now if this was an airport that was owned and operated by a private entity, not a quasi-public like CAA would this position qualify for union membership under Federal Law?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I mean the criteria are very similar and under the Federal Labor Laws and I don’t have the exact opinion here that had this person be qualified but I think it is a safe assumption to say that they would be able to be unionized under Federal Labor Law as well as because they qualified under the State given the role this person serves obviously there are not ticking enough of the boxes under the statutory definition of management under State Law which again is typically congruent with Federal Law so it is likely that they would be under private practice as well although again I appreciate the gentleman. He’s raised this issue previously and really enjoy getting sort of deeper in the weeds of this. These decisions all go to the Labor Board and this particular one did not hit enough of the criteria.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I wondered, I know the kind gentleman has said that he perhaps doesn’t know at this time given the specifics of this specific request by this manager to become part of the union but I believe from what I have read and I am certainly not an expert in labor law but that state entities are kind of exempt in certain circumstances than what a private entity would be. So this person might qualify as a state employee for this position but if they has the same exact position in a private organization they perhaps would not qualify and hit those boxes as the kind gentlemen had said.

A little bit different that the contract that I spoke about before, I am wondering when we have a general wage increase that would be based on their salaries so in this case it would be 3.5 percent of
their base salary would be increased in the next fiscal year is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So what, just to put a finer point on it, the other point in the Labor Law it is the state employees that are exempt from Federal Labor Law so that is why there is the separate rubric under state law in terms of whose a manager and again there is typically there is congruence between those two but, yet, the 3.5 percent general wage increase is off of whatever their current salary is that they are coming off of. There is a range for them, for the airport operations manager for example their range is from $90,000 dollars to $123,000 dollars. I don’t know where this particular person falls within that range. I can find out I think pretty quickly but whatever that person’s salary was, which of
course has not gone up in the past few years because we statutorily had our manages, usually along the same wage agreements with our state employees, so the hard zeros, the other no increases that our other employees had been getting, or not getting excuse me, these folks have been at their salary range for sometime and now they will be getting 3.5 percent of whatever it is that they are coming in at but that they’ve been at in the past several years.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So would these individuals also be receiving two percent on top of that as an annual increment within the same fiscal year?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you.

Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So that actually is a 5.5 percent pay increase is a single year, is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative D’Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you.

The general wage increase plus the annual increment for this bargaining unit is five and a half.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So for instance if you took that average that you had mentioned, say
$100,000 dollars they would be getting a $2,000 bonus this year, fiscal year 19, so that is a two percent increase in their pay. Then fiscal year 21 they would be getting another 5.5 percent on top of that so that would be a 7.5 percent increase over this year or current salary and then they would get another 5.5 percent on top of that which would then put them I think it adds up to 13 percent increase over a three year period from what they are getting paid now to what they would be getting paid three years from now.

Mr. Speaker I have not heard from very many of my constituents in the private industry, private sector industries that have received a 13 percent salary increase over the next three years, very few. I’m sure there is some that have gone on to bigger and better things and gotten those pay increased but I would venture to guess very, very few have received 13 percent salary increases over a three year period in this economy and for that reason I will be opposing this contract here today. Through
you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the Resolution before us? If not will the Staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Will the Members please take their seats, the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Resolution No. 32
Total Number Voting 147
Necessary for Adoption 74
Those voting Yea 81
Those voting Nay 66
Absent not voting 4

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

[Gavel] The Resolution is Adopted. Any announcements or introductions? Representative Borer of the 115 for what reason do you rise?

REP. BORER (115TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to send a friendly reminder to everybody that our Fill a Humvee was today and it is over at four o’clock so if you didn’t get out to the parking lot, Representative Rose will be coming around with a hat so fill a Humvee, fill a hat and I believe Representative Vale has also come around seeking donations. So thank you to everybody who supported this worthy cause for both Healthy Hero’s and South Park Inn and as tradition we will collect and add that to the kitty. Thank you
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, madam. Representative Dillon of the 92nd.

REP. DILLON (92ND):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. DILLON (92ND):

Thank you. With respect to the Chamber, I’ve been listening to the debate today about the bargaining agreements.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

[Gavel] If the Chamber could please lower the volume or take your conversations outside. Representative Dillon, please proceed.

REP. DILLON (92ND):

Thank you. I’ve been listening with interest to the debate about the collective bargaining units and we, this is a new topic for us. Previously the details of some of these agreements were gone over
in the Appropriations Committee. We are following a new protocol by doing all these agreements in the Chamber and I would suggest first of all that in general is has been salutary to have more transparency but I am uncomfortable sometimes about the way it plays out and I don’t necessarily have a remedy for it. In research we have a rule of thumb and that if the number of subjects is five or less, then you don’t disclose the results because those people may be identifiable if it’s less than five. Some of the bargaining units that we took up today had a small number of members and in discussion job duties there is a potential that we may be discussing things that are personally identifiable so that the individuals and it may not have been foreseeable by anyone who recommended the change so I have zero interest in blaming anyone. But I really don’t know if it is appropriate to veer into areas that if it was on a local level it might well be taken up in executive session. So I am hoping once we conclude some of our super ambitious goals for
this year that we can reflect on some of our joint rules going forward. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, madam. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 534.

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The Question is Acceptance of the Joint
Committee favorable report and passage of the Bill. Representative Stafstrom you have the floor.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO No. 9337. I ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9337 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 9337 offered by Representative Stafstrom and Senator Winfield.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Amendment does not change the underlying substance of the Bill but merely make technical corrections that were suggested by the Office of the Legislative Commissioner. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
The Question before the Chamber is Adoption of House Amendment Schedule “A”. Will you remark on the Amendment? Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Amendment before us which becomes the Bill does two very important things. First it repeals an outdated 1980’s law that created a crime of spousal rape in the State of Connecticut and instead it institutes a new section in statute that make sure that spouses or those cohabitating are treated the same with respect to sexual violence crimes. In other words, Mr. Speaker right now it is a crime to commit actual rape or sexual intercourse penetration upon a spouse however lesser crimes including sexual assault in
the third degree as we have in respect to other relationships does not apply in the spousal context. This Bill would change that, would fix that and make sure that someone who is in spousal or cohabitating relationship is eligible for the same access under our sexual violence laws.

The second thing that the Bill does, Mr. Speaker is it cleans up, it makes a technical change with respect to the Dominate Aggressor Statute which we passed last session. It narrows the exception with respect to those living on college campus and college owned housing. I urge support and move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Rebimbas of the 70th District, you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I rise in support of the Amendment that essentially becomes the Bill. I also wanted to indicate that this did pass out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously.
And just for clarification purposes.

Through you.

A few questions to the good Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I know that the Chairman in his introduction had discussed that this applies to spousal relationships with again statutorily we have a definition for that but he also indicated cohabitating relationship and I just want to clarify that that cohabitating relationship is not just merely a fact that two people have decided to live together but they actually have to be in type of romantic relationship with one another. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And through you.

To the good Chairman and he did certainly talk about the dominate aggressor and again it is really just clarifying language that it is pretty clear on the proposal or the legislation that currently passed, it was clear about those that were in a relationship on campus, this also then applies for housing that is off campus, dormitories where students are residing. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes it is.
Representative Rebimbas.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so, Mr. Speaker no further questions of the good Chairman. This is, I believe, to be a good proposal, a lot of clarifying language but certainly we should be holding individuals who are in a legal relationship, romantic relationship with each other whether obviously it is spouses or just cohabitating intimate relationships to the same standard as everybody else. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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.

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it.
The Amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? If not will the Staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Will the Members please take your seats, the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll, Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll, Members to the Chamber. The House of Representative is voting by role, members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7396 as Amended by House "A"
Total Number Voting 147
Necessary for Passage 74
Those voting Yea 147
Those voting Nay 0
Absent not voting 4

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The Bill as Amended is passed.  [Gavel]

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and if I can a brief announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

I want to thank everyone in the Chamber and with help from the Veterans’ Affairs Committee we just raised $441.00 dollars for the Help A Hero [Applause] just within the last 15 minutes in the Chamber and I just wanted to thank everybody.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Representative Vail.  Representative
REP. ORANGE (48TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am. I would just like to wish our Nick Neeley, where did you go Nick? Nick, today, he sits in here from the Senate and spends a lot of time with us in the back of the room and today is his birthday so I am hoping that we can all wish him a Happy Birthday. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Happy Birthday. Will the Clerk please call Calendar NO. 368.


DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.
REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment LCO 8951. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be grated leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 8951 which will be designated House Amendment schedule “A”.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 8951 offered by Representative Sanchez, Senator McCrory, Representative Gibson.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative Sanchez you may proceed with summarization.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker this Amendment combines the Bills on African-American studies which was formerly HB 7082 and Puerto Rican and Latino Studies HB 7083 into one Bill 7082. The Amendment requires all school districts to add African-American, and black, and Puerto Rican, and Latino studies into the curriculum beginning with the years 2021 and 2022 school year. The Bill requires the development of an African-American, and black, and Puerto Rican and Latino studies in high school course and by 2022-2023 the school year the Bill requires each local board of education to offer the State approved high school course in African-America, and black, and Puerto Rican and Latino studies. The Amendment removes parts of the original Bill that added the cost of the fiscal
note. Mr. Speaker this Bill went into Approps as two separate Bills, came out as a combined Bill and it had a really high fiscal note and I am happy to say that the fiscal note was brought down substantially on this Bill. This also had plenty, plenty of support during public participation. We had people here from the Southern Poverty Law Center, the Jewish Federation of Greater Hartford, Con Cam. Has great support from our Commissioner of SBE. We have support from students all across the State of Connecticut and I just wanted to share a personal, real quick. I want to share a personal, something personal that happened to me about three years ago. Actually it was about four years ago in a high school when I went into a lecture hall and there was about 400 students in the lecture hall. And the majority of them, it was a very diverse group of students, and I asked them about the Borinqueneers. The Borinqueneers is the 65th Infantry that served in the Korean War many, many years ago and these men and women were forgotten for
a longtime and it was 2014, it was Senator Rubio and Senator Blumenthal and President Obama who came up with the Gold Medal of Honor to present these gentlemen after almost 60 years of not being honored. I was very surprised when I asked the group of children about this group, only about four or five hands went up. So that led me to believe that there is so much about Puerto Rican history and African American history that is not being taught and so I am, you know, very happy that this Bill is in front of us and I look forward to the discussion and I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Will you remark further? Representative McCarty of the 38th District you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Amendment before us but I will reserve my comments on the Bill after the Amendment is adopted. Thank you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Would anyone like to comment on the Amendment? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying, aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:
Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
All those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:
Nay.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
The ayes have it and the Amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Representative McCarty of the 38th you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And as I said I rise in support of the Bill which is a strike-all Amendment but I do have a few comments and a couple of questions to the proponent, to our Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you and to the Chairman of Education. I first would like to say thank you very much for all of the work that went into the compromise to get this Bill to the place that it is in today but I would like to, with you, go through the Bill so that there is a complete understanding of what we’re talking about as far as the curriculum, the phase in and the course itself. So the first question would be is there oversight on the curriculum development?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes there is. There will be oversight by SVE and the development will be done by CIRC together with BSE.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):
Thank you and for those that may not know CIRC is the state resource center which is an arm of the State Department of Education and they have expertise in development in curriculum. One the curriculum and the course are designed that will go back to the State Board of Education if I am understanding correctly to be reviewed so that it has rigorous standards and is in alignment with curriculum standards. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you. And then it is also my understanding that the course itself, once the course is designed, that it will go through a few
phases through the high school and could you please repeat for us what the first phase is and what the second phase is for the course itself?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Yes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Again the Bill requires the State Education Resource Center and develop the one credit school course in Black and Latino Studies and this is for at the high school level. In developing the course, CIRC may utilize existing and appropriate public and private materials and including persons and organizations for the subject matter. No later than 2021 SB must review and approve the Black and Latino Studies high school course development, developed by CIRC, SVE must approve the course. If following a review SVE determines that the content is rigorous and aligned and state approved curriculum guidelines
and in accordance with SVE approved subject matter constant standards and then not later than January 15, 2021 SVE in consultation with CIRC must submit the education Committee a description of the Black and Latino Study Course which includes a scope of sequence and course objectives and report on the development of the course. The phase in of high schools course for 2021-2022 school year the Bill allows any local board of education to offer the State approved high school course in Black and Latino Studies. And by 2022 and 2033 the school year, that school year the Bill requires each local Board of Education to offer the State approved high school course in Black and Latino Studies. For the school’s years 2022 and 2023 through 24 and 2025 SVE much conduct an annual audit to ensure that the Black and Latino Study course approved under the Bill is been offered by each local and regional board of education and then SVE must annually submit a report on the audit to the Education Committee.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative McCarty.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Yes and I thank you very much for that very detailed explanation about the phase in but I just want to make it clear here today that what we are saying is that we are going to have a course prepared but there is no mandate on the student to take that course for a high school requirement. It is saying to the boards that we will have the course prepared and then that it will be offered and then the audit would take place in I believe it is 2023 to see how our students are doing, if they are taking the coursework. So I would like to thank the Chairman again and I may just make a few comments.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you. I think this is an opportune time for us to really add this to our schools. As we know some of the schools do offer studies African-
America studies during the year but it is not a complete study. This would be a much more inclusive and comprehensive addition to the curriculum and I think it is appropriate that our students are able to identify with their heritage, with their history and I believe this will be a good addition to our high school curriculum and studies. I can tell you that the State’s Department of Education is full agreement with this addition and I look forward to listening to my colleagues’ comment but I am in 100 percent support of this idea. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Nolan of the 29th District.

REP. NOLAN (39TH):

Thank you.

And through you, sir.

I am in full support of this and I thank you for the last speaker recognizing the lack of full teaching in the school in regards to African-
American and Puerto Rican studies and I am just so happy that finally people are recognizing the need for our students to learn our true culture and know what things their culture created, what things that were taking from their culture in claims I think that it is time for use to open our eyes to lettin our children learn where they came from, how they got here and the things that they went through, a full teaching of those things. So I’m just so glad for the proponents of this Bill, I thank you so much. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Gibson of the 15th District.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I would just like to make a comment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to first
start off by thanking Senator McCrory and Representative Sanchez for their leadership but more importantly I’d like to also thank Representative McCarty for her leadership in this as well. This Bill is a great Bill and I’m askin for all my colleagues to give bipartisan support. This Bill is bigger than just the teaching of the history. And this Bill is not just for one particular student, this is for all our students. We had several forums and we’ve had hearings and a lot of work has gone into this Bill and every forum and every hearing that we attended it wasn’t just young folks, it wasn’t just old folks, it wasn’t just black, it wasn’t just white, it was a variety of people who came out because of the importance of this Bill. The importance of this history because this history is all of our histories. I think here in this Chamber we understand that we need to know more about each other. I know we all value education. But we have to have this education so that we can understand one another, so we can understand our
struggles, we can understand what we’ve gone through and the more that we do that, the more that we can understand, we can love one another. Black history can’t just be for one month. It is all year round and it is all of our histories. And so I thank everyone on the Education Committee, I thank everyone on the Appropriations Committee. I thank all the colleagues who have sent in letters of support. We had over 200 people attend the Public Hearing back in March. We had over 200 pieces of letters and e-mails sent in, so many people understand how important this Bill is. So I just want to thank you guys for this Bill. I encourage you to vote for this Bill. As a teacher I can just tell you the images that all of our kids see are gonna change because of this Bill. What are kids both black and white and Hispanic, the identities that they have of themselves and what they see as the world is evolving and what the world is to them, will change because of this Bill. It is not a mandate, it is an elective. It is a Bill that our
children can chose to take and the next step after this Bill is passed, hopefully my colleagues, is that we can encourage our students to take this Bill. This is a very good Bill and all of our kids will benefit from it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker I would like to definitely thank Representative Bobby Gibson. He brought this forward to our Committee along quite a few months ago and the outstanding work that he has done on this Bill and getting the community involved and going into different parts of the State to talk to people about this Bill was just great and I just wanted to take this moment to thank him for all the work he has done.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Candelora of the 86th District.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I had a couple of questions on the Bill. In the first section as I understand it there is the State Department and the State Department Education Resource Center is developing this curriculum which I think is certainly appropriate that our State Board of Education be charged with these type of activities because I think that they should serve as a clearing house for all of our schools throughout the State of Connecticut and to serve as a resource for them to be able to teach courses. But specifically I just want to drill down a little bit in the mandate and how that applies for our local and regional boards of education. In Lines 136 through 138 where specifically in 2022 requiring that this course be offered in grades 9 through 12. And my question is, you know, broadly, what would this course look like. I think back to my son’s experience in his history class in particular with AP history which was a very robust course that included and entire framework of American History
and is certainly included black and Latino studies within the curriculum. Does that count toward fulfilling this requirement or are we looking at this one credit course that is going to be developed by the State, that one credit course to be offered by each board of ed?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you.

This is a specific course that will count towards social studies. Yea, that’s it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I appreciate that answer. I do appreciate the work that has gone into this Bill. One of my concerns generally however is that us as a state mandating for every school to be
providing a particular course of education I just personally recently had a child that graduated from high school and is now serving in his first year or college who has pursued an engineering and physics degree and we come from a small community, it is fairly rural and the school finally struggled to put together an AP Physics class which I think sort of was able to advance him into competing for more competitive school. My family’s background is, you know, I’m of Italian descent but my family did not go to college. I was first generation. My son is now second generation and I am proud of the fact that he managed in the small town to work his way into an Ivy League institution. We didn’t have the money to pay to get him in to those schools but in that challenge I think one of the ways he got there was the ability to take these very challenging courses like AP physics which sadly our school the very next year had to eliminate and he came back and spoke to me about the science classes and the lack of preparedness that they provided for him in ninth
grade for instance. You know, we’re still teaching basic science at that level and he talked about, he actually went back to our school system to try to get them to incorporate a more rigorous science program and for my small community offering a course like this while it is certainly laudable is going to have a financial impact on my school district and the fact that time and again we continue to struggle with getting enough dollars to our districts, you know, I supported an ECS formula in the last budget cycle that took away money from my community to provide more money into various districts. For instance we incorporated second language learners and prioritized our state funding to go to school districts that have second language learners and I think we almost unanimously in this Chamber recognized the priority of providing those dollars to districts. And now I struggle with the fact that my district is going with less and will continue to go with less, we potentially have a shift of teacher retirement costs being put on to our communities and
I come from a town that has a very small tax base. A third of our district is nonprofit with the regional water authority that provides all the drinking water for New Haven. Our district gets very little drinking water from this facility and we are carrying that burden of not getting any tax revenue from it. And somehow we’ve got to figure out how to implement this curriculum and I can’t reconcile that. So as laudable as it is, I think this program should be developed by the State Board of Education, I would support this, that piece of it but I just need to stand in opposition to Lines 136 and 138 because I know my school district in the upcoming years isn’t even going to have the resources to provide those so important courses that I know helped my son get into a good school that I am not sure those courses are going to be there for our next generation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Case of the 63rd District you have the floor.
REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions to the proponent of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I do appreciate and I looked through the Amendment. If the good proponent can help me understand when we talked about this Bill and we had close to $8 million dollar in one year and a little over $8 million dollar in the second year which is out of the Bill now, how do we get that from that high of a level down to next to nothing?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is because they were gonna develop a model curriculum which would then command a lot more
resources and a model curriculum would be then used statewide so that now it is just brought down to a course and the course and to develop the course is $400,000 dollars.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And it also speaks in the memo, which is now the Bill, so it basically $120,000 salary for a new employee to put this together?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Yes, the $120,000 dollars is for an employee with CIRC.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Okay.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So the last lines of the fiscal note it says state mandate to local and regional school districts, this cost up to $25,000 dollars. So we are, this is a “shall” in this or mandating this to our districts. Are we going to help them on State level or is it up to them to put it into their local school budgets and the local taxes pay for it?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I don’t know where they are getting that $25,000 dollars from but currently the FVE says that they have the materials that they can share with our municipalities and they can also do the training. So I’m still questioning that $25,000 dollars.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):
And I thank you and when you do get an answer I would love to hear it. Thank you. So reading through the Amendment and the Bill and I usually have this question on the floor when these education Bills come out. All the way through it says for “local and regional school boards” this Bill does not include any of our quasi-semiprivate schools does it?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

No, I don’t think it does.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

So those three quasi semiprivate schools that we have here in the State of Connecticut that have our public students this will not be offered to them?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Are you talkin about the endowed academies?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

They are called Endowed Academies at times yes, but they are also semi quasi-private, they come with private dollars and local dollars.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, that would include them.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):
If a quasi-semiprivate school is overseen by its own board of education, this say “may assist local and regional boards of education” it doesn’t say a semi-quasi private school board of education.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

They are going to get the same exact curriculum through SDA and I would imagine that they would work with SDA to offer that curriculum.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope we can get some clarification on how a local school board will put that information through to a semi-quasi because not all the time does the information go from a local board of ed to one of these schools and there’s three of them which is Norwich Academy, Woodstock...
Academy and the Gilbert School. So sometimes in legislation I know in the past we’ve made it a point to put them in it so that they do have those studies within their school system because they are somewhat separate for the time being. And just to the point of my good colleague before me, it is a mandated because the word “shall” is in here and I’d just like to make sure that our school districts are ready for it and covered for it because right now we are having the darnedest time getting education budget passed in any school district and I think if we are going to put a mandate through we need to follow through with the dollars from the State of Connecticut and I know the good Representative wasn’t sure where the $25,000 dollars came in the fiscal note but I’m sure we will be able to figure that out and hopefully the local boards of education and others can also figure this out and when we put something through we don’t put a mandate without the dollars to follow with it. So, I thank you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Fishbein of 90th District you have the floor, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Mr. Speaker, some questions for the proponent if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

I know that the question was asked earlier and I didn’t hear the answer but the original fiscal note, which is like $8 million dollars, what did that anticipate as opposed to the Amended language that is the Bill right now.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.
REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

We were talking within that $8 million to basically $10 million dollars it was in discussion of 12 different model curriculums and then we were gonna form one model curriculum which then came up with this substantiate cost in fiscal note.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And how does that differ from where we are now because I see that it still requires that a curriculum be made available. How is where we are now different from that previous situation?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

They were basically, it was to cover the K
through 12, or K through 8 but now we’re talking about a one course curriculum in high school and that is where they come up with the $400,000 dollars to develop that course.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So am I to understand that process would be generally the same, it is just the amount of students or age groups that would be applicable has changed thereby decreasing the amount of funding needed?

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

    Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I am totally in favor of, you know, the curriculum being developed as I believe Representative Candelora shared. My concern is where do we go from there. You know with regards to the fiscal note, you know, unfortunately the Bill is on the Board and you know, if the fiscal note is wrong, then somebody maybe should be doing something about that cause that would make me feel a lot better about this. But I am hearing orally that it is not a mandate yet I am reading the document created by nonpartisan staff that we pay money to issue reports and that clearly says that it is a mandate and clearly says that there is an expense related to that and I can’t in good faith go back to my town and say, well yes I read that report but they told me not to believe it. So that is what I’m stuck with. So, you know, as I said before I’ve no problem with the curriculum. In my many years I know there’s issues with understanding of certain communities and education. I have no problem with that but the second half is a little troubling where
we are. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Reyes of the 75th District.

REP. REYES (75th):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker I just have a few questions and a few comments for the proponent of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed.

REP. REYES (75th):

The first question I have for the proponent of the Bill is the fact that we’ve expanded now to include Latino and African-American studies and from what I understand it is now a high school, I just want to make a clarification, so it is a 9 through 12 situation right now?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Correct, high school

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Reyes.

REP. REYES (75th):

And Mr. Speaker, $400,000 dollars that has been allocated on this project to develop the curriculum the extent of the curriculum I would like to know to what extent it will include the Latino studies and the Latino community and the cultural aspects of the Latino countries?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That will be developed through CIRC and SDE combined and then they would of course get to look through the curriculum to see if it is an appropriate one. Of course, I mean to see that it is appropriate one that they can send out then to
the school districts.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

   Representative Reyes.

REP. REYES (75th):

   And I would like to thank the good proponent of this Bill. I want to make a comment on the, when we talk about Latino curriculum, Latino studies this Country. I’ll start with this State, this State has an increasing population of Latinos but in particular the Puerto Rican community that has been here for over 100 years, it has served in every war and I stand here as a very proud Puerto Rican and always talk about the Latino culture but also the Puerto Rican contribution to the United States of America and I think, Mr. Speaker that it is time that we acknowledge and understand the contributions of the Puerto Rican community to this country for over 100 years and for us to talk in a way where maybe this maybe a burden on some communities I would like to offer that this would be an opportunity and an expansion for all of us to
broaden our horizon a little more and I think that sometimes we review and think that these exercise should only be for the large municipalities but I would beg to differ that I think that all municipalities and towns in the State of Connecticut would benefit from such a curriculum that would expand on African-American and Latino and Puerto Rican culture. So my complements to the Chairs on the Education Department Senator McCrory, Representative Sanchez and I would be remiss if I did not complement my colleague Representative Gibson for introducing this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise as a longtime educator in the City of Hartford, 35 years teaching in the Hartford Public Schools, my wife taught 35 years between the two of us we gave 70 years to the
students of the City of Hartford. And I’ve read this Bill and I really want to congratulate the leadership of the Education Committee and the Committee for bringing this Bill forth. When I was much younger I remember taking American history and America history seemed to be a long catalogue of kings, presidents, generals, a few industrialists and a couple of inventors and that was about it. Everybody else seemed to get short shrift in American history. And when I started teaching I taught American history, geography, civics what we used to call the social studies which seemed to be getting the short end of the stick in our local budgets in the last few years which is really a tragedy when you think about, you know, civics actually makes good citizens, geography lets us know what our place in the world is physically and America history should really be American history. Unfortunately religious, racial and ethnic groups, women, minorities, labor, unions all these movements in America, the Jewish community they were lucky if
they got one or two lines in most of our history books, a quick mention, almost as if these were insignificant. Native Americans were seen more as an obstacle to the development of the country as the original inhabitants of this area and there were also Anglocentric, I can’t even say it was Eurocentric, because the French contribution, Spanish contribution other Europeans, Italians and others contributed were also given short shrift. I was mostly an Anglocentric history and, you know, lately we’ve been hearing more and more about the importance of textbooks to include a really more broader diverse picture of American history and I think it is a positive thing that has been happening and now you have this Bill before you. I think it is a good Bill because despite all our efforts to desegregate our schools, to integrate our students, we haven’t really succeeded. It seems to me that there is more segregation now than before Sheff v. O’Neill and many of the desegregation efforts were begun. And there seems to be ramped ignorance out
there. It is unfortunate, it is an embarrassment to a state like the State of Connecticut that so much ignorance prevails. I remember talking to some Mexican friends who used to say, many of us did not cross the border, the border crossed us and a lot of them were offended when they would say they were from Albuquerque, New Mexico and people would say do you need a visa to go into New Mexico and wouldn’t even realized that it was one of the 50 states of the United States. Same thing happens to our territories. People here in Connecticut think and are still surprised to learn that Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States, that we’ve served in the military, that we’ve served in every war and that we can move freely between states. Recently when we had the hurricane Maria in Puerto Rico, after that tragedy, a couple of summers ago people came in droves to Orlando, Dallas, Houston, Texas. They came to Connecticut, New York, New Jersey trying to escape the ravages left by the hurricane, the island and people were surprised how quickly
thousands of Puerto Ricans came into these different communities and it happened simply because Puerto Ricans are U.S. Citizens. And it is something that Connecticut school children should know. Every child in the State of Connecticut should know these are thing that we should teach, this should be part of our curriculum. So I think this course if it helps, if it helps us understand one another a little bit better so that people can understand the African-American experience and the Puerto Rican experience, two huge communities here in the State of Connecticut I think this Bill goes a long way to integrating that into the curriculum and we are actually asking our State Board of Education to develop this curriculum I believe it will go a long way in helping us overcome a lot of ignorance that exists. And I urge my colleagues to support this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Mastrofrancesco of the 80th District, you have the floor, ma’am.
REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you very much. I don’t know if you’re familiar with, I believe in Bridgeport right now they already teach an African-American course. Are your familiar with that course, it’s called the Perspective on Race course?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

No, I am not familiar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. I just happen to pull up an article
today and I guess starting with this year’s freshman class, there’s 21,000 students in the district and obviously most of them are Latino and 35 percent are African-American and they have to take a semester on African-American studies as well as the Latin American studies and I was just curious to see if the model that the State Board of Education or the curriculum that they will put together or would model this exact program that they are offering now in Bridgeport call the Perspective on Race course.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I would believe that SBE and CIRC would like is stated in the Bill, they would look at other resource so I would imagine they would reach out to Bridgeport and see exactly what they are doing when they are developing this course.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you.

And through you Mr. Speaker

And so it is possible that the State of Connecticut could mode the exact course that they are using there in Bridgeport?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

It can be possible, cause I don’t know much about the course itself but that would basically be up to the SDE and CIRC when they are trying, when they are combined to develop the course and I know that they are going to be out and about looking to see what other states and other cities are doing when they are developing this course, so there is a possibility.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.
REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you.

And Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So if the State of Connecticut develops their own curriculum for the high school students would the current program that is offered right now in Bridgeport will they no longer be able to use that curriculum?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

We are just proving them with the curriculum course, they are not mandated to use it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, I didn’t see that in the Bill. So you’re saying the State would provide a curriculum, but a specific town could create their own.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Local control states they can use their own curriculum.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you.

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

I didn’t see that in the Bill. Would you be able to point that line out to me?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I know it’s in statute but I’m not exactly
where in statute but the local municipalities have control over what curriculum they can provide.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess my question is that this particular Bill as you mentioned states that the State Board of Education will create the curriculum and that would be different than what you had just mentioned allowing the towns to create their own curriculum so I am looking for clarification.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So we are mandating them to use a course. We are not telling them exactly what, which one they can use cause we’re gonna provide SBE and CIRC will
be providing them this course but if they find it, if they believe there is another course that is better, that they would like to continue with then they can do that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. And that is good to hear. I think it is wonderful that the students in the school learn about every culture and I know this one specifically for African-American and Latinos. Is there any provision in this Bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That would allow for other cultures to be offered in the school, maybe, let’s just say the Asian community, you know, Jewish community and so forth?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It doesn’t preclude them to use, to look at Asian Americans or any other ethnicity group. This one just specifically is stating that it is African-American, and Puerto Rican and Latino studies.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you and.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So is it correct to say that a school can offer this particular curriculum through Latino and African-American and would they need any type of permission from the State to offer any other type of cultural curriculum maybe from European or Asian, so forth?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you.

So through you, Mr. Speaker.

Based on what you were telling me, if the towns can certainly offer their own type of curriculum and design it on their own they can certainly offer a curriculum on any nationality, why would we have to put language together, a statute together, to mandate it?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Because we want to insure they are offering this. It is a matter of them offering this course. We are not gonna, we’re not forcing it on them. We are basically telling them here is a course that
we’ve developed and we’d like you to offer it and if they do offer it, that’s great. It’s specifically on like I said it before on the African-American and Puerto Rican and Latino studies.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you.

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to clarify because based on what you’re telling me that you want to make sure, the State wants to make sure this is being offered but I don’t understand why the State is not making sure that we offer for everyone else I guess is my question. You seemed to clarify that towns can certainly put their own curriculum together and they can certainly offer it on their own but it certainly not required by the State like it is with this particular program. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Can the kind lady repeat the question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco could you please repeat the question?

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can’t remember it at this second [Laughter]. I guess what I’m trying to understand is why the State could, should mandate that a course be offered on a particular culture and it is not mandating it that we offer it through about every other culture. It is specific to just two. We can certainly do it on our own but the State is saying, okay you can do it on your own but we are going to mandate that you teach, that you offer these two and they are excluding everyone else and I was curious to know why.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So this course is a “shall offer” but doesn’t limit the district from creating their own in addition to it. So any district creating a course would supplement not replace the course.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. I’m sorry.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess right back at 'ya and I’m not doing it on purpose but would you mind repeating that answer?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So again, this course is a “shall”, “shall offer” but doesn’t limit the district from creating
their own in addition to it and I just want to remind my colleague that last year we passed the Holocaust Bill and this is similar to that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. And yes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I am familiar with the Holocaust and the Genocide Bill that was passed last year I thought that was wonderful. But again this is a “shall” that “it shall offer” a curriculum with African-American and Latino which is great, we certainly want kids to learn about every community. Can you tell me is this an optout program for the towns? Can a town, it is a mandate on the towns, and that certainly is a concern of mine, on my town particularly is going to be losing education funding through the State based on the Governor’s plan. It is a mandate on the town and it will cost them something, I was wondering if they can certainly at
this time until their finances are in order optout of this?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

This course is a couple of years out so it gives everyone time and they won’t have an optout because they would have to offer this but the original Bill had the outyears, well it didn’t have longer outyears so we compromised to push this out more so that the course had time to be developed, SDE and CIRC had the time to audit it, take a look at it and make sure that everything was correct before they offered it the district. So and I still don’t see where it would cost the local district any dollars because they are going to be providing the materials and they are going to provide the training of the teachers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you.

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

The OFA on here does say that there is a cost to the town, I trust that they are doing their homework. There is a cost to the teachers, somebody needs to teach the course, it is possible that maybe that schools doesn’t have anybody available to teach that particular course so I do see a cost to the town which is my concern. The other question I had is going back to the plan. So let’s just say right now you’re telling me a town can put their own curriculum together to teach Latino or African-American studies and I want to just refer to the plan they have in Bridgeport and this is another concern of mine. I want all of our children to learn about every culture. I think it is wonderful. The more they can learn about every culture I think the better off we are, the better we are more integrated and I think it is wonderful. But to the
course particularly in Bridgeport, it is bear with me one second, so the Perspective on Race Course examines current issues and dynamics of select minority groups in the United States. It not only looks at race but religion. That is the particular course that is going on based on the article I am reading in Bridgeport. So it looks at race and religion. Is that possible to look at the religion aspect of it in a school?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is gonna be be developed by CIRC and SDE and at this point I wouldn’t know if religion would be included.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. I just wanted to confirm that
because it does say it looks at race and religion and I though there was a conflict that certainly wasn’t allowed so I just wanted to clarify that. And the other thing that concerns me about towns probably doing their own type of program or curriculum is this particular one I guess the kids were asked to talk about an article and they were talking about the Kaepernick issue and they wanted to get their point across and it was debating more personal issues of what is going on in today’s society, in today’s world as opposed to the history of their culture. Those are the things that concern me when a curriculum is brought in. It somehow seems to bring politics into it and I want to make sure that doesn’t happen and we are truly learning about someone’s culture and not bringing in any type of political views that’s going on today. So that is a concern of mine. I applaud the Committee for trying to integrate this and put this program together but I do have some concerns that it is a mandate on the towns, like I said before, my town
will be losing funding. I don’t know if they would be able to make up this to add this portion into their, when it comes with a mandate I do believe the town should be compensated for it. So, I think that’s all my questions for now. But I thank you for your efforts and I apologize if I put you on the spot at all just certainly trying to get to the bottom of what the intent of this was. And I would hope at some point in the future that other cultures are not singled out. We are here to support everybody, it’s not just about one community it is about everybody and I think the more we can do that the more together everybody will come. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Lavielle of the 143rd.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I want to acknowledge the really grand effort of Representative Sanchez with whom I’ve enjoyed
working with the past eight years and Representative McCarty and Representative Gibson and the others who participated in this. I am not going to ask Representative Sanchez any questions because I just wanted to offer a few comments.

I have thought about this a lot, not just in the context of this particular Bill that others that have come up from time-to-time. This is my ninth year on the Education Committee. I’ve been here ever since I’ve been in the Legislature and one of the first votes I cast in 2011, my first year here, was on a Bill that had something to do with high school requirement. What had happened was in 2010 there was a big education reform Bill that Connecticut put some things in place in order to be eligible to apply for Race To the Top Grant and one of those things that had to put into place was a whole long series of requirements for high school courses. Required high school courses and it was big jump for a lot of our high schools and Connecticut put it into statute and then didn’t get the Race For the
Top Grant. So in 2011 we were faced with having this expensive thing that we had to do and no means to do it. So we voted to delay imposing the requirements. That was in 2011. We voted again in 2012 to delay the requirements. And then two or three years later we voted again to delay the requirements and it got so bad and so difficult that finally I’m not sure when it was 2016 or 2017 we put a group of very experienced educators in charge and Representative Sanchez will remember this and I think Representative McCarty will too to finalize this thing once and for all, make a decision, what are we going to tell the high schools to do. And the consensus and these were all the education stakeholders, the consensus was let’s let the district have as much leeway as we can possibly give them. Let’s make the requirements very large and vague, let’s confine them to categories and let’s stick with that and leave it up to the district. The kids are gonna get a good education. And what that gave us were things like you gotta take one
year of a foreign language. I don’t know anybody who can say anything in a foreign language when they had one year of it. It just doesn’t happen. But that’s what we got. And I voted for it at the time because the arguments were good. I liked the idea of a local district having its own leeway to make decisions because they do know best what their kids needs, how much of it they need, and all that kind of thing. But at the same time we were over all those years and you’ll see in the existing statute in this Bill a lot of the things that got entered into the curriculum and there is a real range of subjects in all areas. You’ll see them they’re in the Bill. And that was fine except that there were an awful lot of mandates and so when we finally voted on these requirements the kind of framework for requirements for high school courses the notion of having a lot of mandates went away. It was like okay, now we’re gonna leave a lot of leeway to the local districts. That started to change again last year. I really admire the way that the team worked
together on what we have today because what we saw in appropriations was so different from this I voted for this on the Education Committee but I voted against it in Appropriations cause it was to get the two courses into existence it was something like $14 million dollars, I mean it was just incredible. And they have found a way to make this workable and I really applaud that.

I’ll just say a couple of things. One is that I think with what we’ve done over the past ten years we kind of sent a mixed message out from the State to the districts. Should the State be telling the districts what to do, should it not? Should the districts have a lot of leeway or should they offer alternatives? This is a good way to offer an alternative and I think we just have to be aware of that. And I think we at some point have to make up our minds. But I think that when you look at the subject matter of this course what it says is more broadly is, you know what, the American experience is multifaceted. There are a lot of different
thread that come together to make it what it is and they are important, and to understand each other we have to understand these threads and that makes perfectly good sense. As somebody who lived abroad for many years, I know Americans have never been very good at that but also I would say a word of caution that at some point the aim must really be to look at it as just that, many different facets of the American experience. We are looking at the history of people who are here. They are not somewhere else. They are here but they’ve lived a very different experience or their history has been very different from that of other people. And all of that comes together to say we’re all people who live in the same place. So at some point we have to get really good at presenting this on a common landscape because we don’t want to work towards something that makes some people seem other and the rest of the people seem us. That’s really key and so I hope that, you know, the message coming from this is that we’re looking at a whole lot of threads
that come together to weave one fabric of experience that has many, many different threads and it’s those threads that make us interesting. And if that’s what we get through this, that is where we should be aiming and I hope that our State Department of Ed, as you know, comes back together is going to help offer some guidance in that regard and that it will fanout to the school districts as appropriate. But thank you again all of you for your good work on this and I think it has ended up being something that fiscally and otherwise we can vote for. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Hill of the 17th District.

REP. HILL (17TH):

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

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.
REP. HILL (17TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From the perspective of a very small district, I am concerned about the logistics of implementation of this Bill. Typically in our very small district we have a high school of about 500 students. If an elected class is run that only has maybe five to ten students that sign up for it, ten seems to be kind of the critical number, typically that class just won’t run. There aren’t enough students that we can afford to then have the FTE time to have that class go forward. So if this class in included in the program of studies, but then is not run either because of lack of enrollment or inability to fund a teacher will the district still have complied with the requirements of this Bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Yes, the district would comply, would be in compliance.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Hill.

REP. HILL (17TH):

Thank you for that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I serve on Education as well and I saw the first iterations of this Bill and I do like to see the changes that were made. We any discussions held about the possibility of this being fulfilled through on on-line offering. I know our district uses the Virtual High School Program to provide access to classes that as I was stating earlier that we simply can’t afford to run. Has there been any discussion on on-line offerings?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
No but that is interesting. We had no discussion on on-line offers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Hill.

REP. HILL (17TH):

Okay, so that concludes my questions, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. As I said I represent a very small district and we struggle to offer and have enough students to enroll in many of our elective classes and our unable to fill them and are struggling at times as the good Representative Candelora was saying in his district even with some of our AP offerings and other academic requirements to have the funding for the FTE in order to actually gun those classes. So I think the content of the class is something that we need to strive for, I think it is critically important but I do have real concerns about the ability of my district to be able to move forward with this. But I do appreciate the work that was done to improve the Bill. So, Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Hall of the 7th District you have the floor, sir.

REP. HALL (7TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in full support of HB 7082 as Amended. As a student matriculating through Hartford Public Schools, a district which is largely black and Hispanic, there were very few opportunities to access either African-American history or Puerto Rican or Latino history. I was fortunate to have two parents who insisted on me understanding that history. But I knew then as I know now that every child isn’t that fortunate. So I decided to do something about it. I decided to become a teacher. Not just any teacher, but a history teacher. So I went to Norfolk State University, a historically black college located in Virginia to be trained so I could come back to my community to insure that at a minimum the students that took my class would not be denied the opportunity that I was. Not every school district
has a Joshua Hall, they should, but this Bill as Amended gives students the opportunity to engage in leaning they may not currently have. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Scanlon of the 98th District. No. Representative Wilson Pheanious of the 53rd District.

REP. WILSON PHEANIOUS (53RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in full support of 7082 and I rise as a young girl in the Ashford, Connecticut School System. I rise as a mother and I rise as a grandmother who went through the curriculums that this State has to offer and always found myself left out. I remember an assignment that I was give when I was a teenager where I was, at this was at E. O. Smith, I was to trace my roots back to the European country from whence my family came. And I struggled with that assignment and I went to my history teacher, Mr. Marlin, and he is the one who took me aside to help me understand my roots didn’t come from Europe so I wasn’t going to
be able to complete the assignment as planned. Other teachers had told me, well just pick a country, and trace your roots back. When my son came along about 20 years later, 25 years later, he was given a virtually identical assignment in his Mansfield classroom to trace his roots back to the European country from which he came like the rest of the class. By then I was fairly angry about that assignment because it completely negated him, it negated me, it negated the entire history of people that look like me. Well you can imagine when I had grandchildren and in Horning, Connecticut, this was in California but essentially they received the same assignment and I wondered to myself how can it be that someone could look at me and people that look like me and assume that a Eurocentric education was going to fully meet my needs. I’ve heard people in this Chamber wonder why such a curriculum should be necessary. Shouldn’t we all be included, shouldn’t it be such that the entire fabric of our American society should be braided together and treated
equally and that everyone’s culture and history and contributions should be recognized and understood. And I certainly agree with that. It just hasn’t happened. It just doesn’t seem to happen. Some of us are consistently left out of history. There was an appalling lack of knowledge about the value and the contributions that have been made by people of color in this society whether they be black, Puerto Rican or others many people in this society admittedly but it out of an appalling lack of understanding of what contribution has been made and all children have a right to this knowledge. All children need to understand it so they can understand who they are as Americans. And it does not happen I tell you. Teachers teach what they know. Teachers teach what they see. Teachers teach the things that are important to them. And perhaps by history and culture and the history and culture of Puerto Rican people in society didn’t rise to that level out of no particular malice on anyone’s part but you ask why it needs to be mandated. It
needs to be mandated because it has not happened for, I’m 68, for 68 years it hasn’t happened and I do not think it will happen until someone develops a curriculum that can be uniformly provided so that teachers can understand. You don’t need to hire a black teacher to teach black history or a Puerto Rican to teach Puerto Rican history. You simply need to understand the history of this world and of this nation and to treat all cultures equally and to blend them in and it is a shame that we should have to single one culture out and teach just that culture. It is a shame that we had to have a Holocaust Bill a year ago before I was here to try to teach that it is part of our history, it is part of American history and it impacts every single thing that we do and yet it doesn’t seem to rise to the occasion of importance. And so I look at the arguments that I am hearing against the curriculum, well not against the curriculum but perhaps a small district not being able to quite afford it, or the fact that something similar may be being taught and
should it need to be replaced and all of these things and I just feel like somehow the point is being missed. I am an American. My family has been here since before the American Revolution but why did it take me until I was in my 60s to know that. Because it wasn’t taught, because I did not understand and admittedly it was school children in Guilford that found my history for me. It was the Witness Stones Project and children who actually learned by doing what American History is. That is not, it doesn’t seem to me after the quality of the lives that have been given to this country that has been lost in saving what we have and what we value in this country, it doesn’t seem like so much to ask but yet it seems to have been. We shouldn’t have to mandate a specific curriculum for specific cultures because there ought to be such a full understanding of what America is that it is done naturally and effectively. But that is not what happens. And so you come through your life and things like the Colin Kaepernick situation comes up or the phrase black-
lives matter and people take offense. Why, you know, why do black lives matter more than others? They don’t matter more than others they matter as much as others but people don’t seem to know it. And the reason they don’t know it is because they have not been systematically exposed to the value of that culture to the work that has been done on behalf of America by these cultures and until we get that into the curriculum somehow I don’t see it happening considering that I’m 68 years old and now dealing with the same kind of empty assignments for my grandchildren as I dealt with as a child. Sure, you get some black history around the time of the Civil War, when you’re looked to be the problem, once again save the slaves, so there’s a problem or you get to the Civil Rights Movement when people are offended because somehow they have to move aside to give rights to people who should have had them 300 years before and I wonder when we think that is going to happen. Until teachers understand that all cultures need to be taught equally and this is one
of them, but it is one that has consistently not been taught, has consistently not mattered. And I say to you that you wonder why people are treated in certain ways why some people matter less apparently less than others. And it is largely because people do not understand, people are not exposed, people don’t learn. We have to make that happen. So my hat is off to the people that have worked so hard to pull this Bill into line to make it so that it is fiscally possible but I just want to ask the people in this Chamber when, when is it going to be the time that African-Americans, Latinos, other people in this Country when their culture is recognized and given the same weight as European culture because it hasn’t happened yet. And although there are inroads in various schools like I said, in Guilford, and in other places there are some wonderful courses but they are just in those places. They need to be universal. We need to have the Department of Education develop a curriculum that can be modeled in other schools, can be utilized by all as a
baseline for teaching but of course what ought to be taught. This is America and we shouldn’t have to be standing here in this time and space still trying to braid in cultures that have been here since before the Country was a country. So I don’t have any questions for the proponent, my question is for the members of this Chamber when? When are we going to perhaps, I don’t want to call them excuses because they are legitimate concerns but when are you gonna step over those and start looking at bringing our children along so that we are all of equal value, so that all of our history is understood and appreciated so that all of our contributions count and then we won’t have to have people screaming that their lives matter. I thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Scanlon of the 98th District. I see you’ve resumed your Chair. You have the floor, sir.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And it is actually
quite fitting that I am going to follow
Representative Wilson Pheanious cause I wanted to
speak about her very briefly in the context of this
Bill. I represent the Town of Guilford as
Representative Wilson Pheanious just eluded to. We
are 0.7 percent African-American and yet in my
community of Guilford we have an incredible program
that Representative Wilson Pheanious just eluded to
called the Witness Stones Project where every year
the children of the eighth-grade class of Guilford
study the folks that were enslaved in my community
in a darker time in our Country. And last year was
the ceremony that I actually had the first time to
meet Representative Wilson Pheanious because she
came to the school and she gave one of the best
speeches I’ve ever heard given by another person
describing her history and how she came here and how
somebody who was a descendent of a Guilford slave
was now going to serve in the Connecticut House of
Representatives. And I just rise today folks to get
up and say that I’ve seen this program work because
I saw the eyes of those children again, 0.7 percent of our population is African-American and there wasn’t a single kid in that room that didn’t look at my colleague, Representative Wilson Pheanious with amazement at her story and the fact that they learned from it. They would never have learned if this was not part of the curriculum. And so as somebody who represents a suburban community that is not diverse and certainly not as diverse as it should be, I think there is an incredible thing that we’re doing today and I really commend Representatives that are here today, Representative Gibson I know introduced the Bill, Representative Sanchez, everybody else because I’ve seen the power of what this does in terms of changing minds and influencing minds and changing the way that young people process things and in a community like mine that makes a really big difference as those kids go out in the world. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Baker of the
124th an urban district.

REP. BAKER (124TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill and more of a comment rather than a question.

As I look at today’s date and also I look in the news on a daily basis I see all the things that are goin on in the world, confusion, violence, disrespect for each other and our cultures, our religions and I look at the content of this Bill and I realize that this is the same content as a Bill that I voted for last year, you know. When I sat on the Education Committee I reviewed that Bill and I looked at it and I said, do you know what this does, that Bill gives a good understandin of the culture and the events of the Holocaust that took place and that Bill was trying to educate people of that event that took place many years ago and I shared those concerns with one of my colleagues and we talked about all the different cultures that also experienced that same horrifying event that took
place. You know, I’m kind of confused at some of the comments that are being made in regards to the questions being asked from some of the, my colleagues here in the Chambers and I’m just trying to just process everything and it’s become very difficult to kind of put together. I though we were trying to move this State, this Country in a direction of harmony and respect of each other, respect each other’s cultures, respect each other’s religions and get an understanding and I know my grandfather used to always, used to read, he was a Baptist minister and he used to read a lot of the Holy Quran he would also read Watchtower. I remember, you know, some of the Watchtower the Jehovah’s Witness would come to his door and he would embrace them, he would enjoy havin ‘em come in so they could dialogue and get an understanding of their religion and their doctrines and stuff because one of the things he wanted to do was have a greater respect, he was about world peace, world harmony and stuff and knew the only way that we could do that was to understand other
peoples cultures. He might have believed the
details of others but he wanted to understand it so
he could have some respect, so he could be able to
live together with them. And that is what this
world should be about, understanding each other
cultures and embracing them. You know, we have a
lot of work to do. I know some of the things that
we spoke about, about Bridgeport, we have a lot of
issues goin on in Bridgeport and we have violence,
we have family issues and one of the things I’ve
found is that our kids in Bridgeport they don’t
really understand their history. That they don’t
understand their culture and if we are going to be
able to take them to another level they need to have
that true understanding and we need this, this
curriculum not only in Bridgeport but throughout our
State so that we can be able to get a true
understanding of where our, each individual ethnic
group has come from and where they’ve gotten to the
place they are. So I’m askin, you know, my
colleagues to not, to look at this actual
legislation as a step moving forward, peace, harmony so that we can continue to grow and embrace each other’s cultures and we can be able to live together. It shouldn’t be about the dollar amount, it shouldn’t be about the one district over another. We need to be able to come together to support each district, what their likes, what their dislikes are and how they need to be able to grow. So I urge each of my colleagues to fully support this legislation. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Linehan of the 103rd. You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I actually have a question for the proponent of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you.

And through you, Mr. Speaker.
To the good Representative I am not sure if this was asked and answered when I wasn’t in the room so I apologize if there is some redundancy but first would this be included in all districts?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much.

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

To the good Representative do you believe that the inclusion of these studies would contribute to a holistic approach in improving race relations in districts which may not be so culturally diverse?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That concludes my questions. But that does bring me to a statement. I rise in support of this legislation. I am one of those legislators who represent a suburban district which is not that culturally diverse. I represent three towns two of which have recently had some race relation difficulties within our high schools and even our elementary schools. This has been very, very concerning to me and I’ve been working with my district to find ways to provide training regarding cultural bias and to just have better community conversations surrounding race in our district. But there was something that Representative Wilson Pheanious said and she said
that children need to systematically exposed to
value of other cultures. I could not agree with
that more and as many of you may hear in the coming
days, because I will be very open about it, I did
have a young child in my district, a sixth grader,
die by suicide at the age of 11 years old. And one
of the things that we’ve heard come out of this is
that she was bullied for being a Latina. We need to
do everything that we can to insure that doesn’t
happen again. We need to do everything we can to
make sure that race relations are not just an inner
city, a thing that we solve in the inner cities, it
is in districts like mine, where it’s so pervasive,
where we need to get it where it lives. I stand up
in support of this for that reason as well as the
other reasons that the other urban legislators have
said that the kids in their district need to know
who they are, need to know where they come from.
All of this together as a holistic approach to
solving many of the problems that are happening in
many of our communities today. So I will be in
enthusiastically voting for this and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Johnson of the 49th District.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I rise in full support of this legislation. I want to thank the Chairs of the Education Committee and the Members of the Education Committee for putting this forward and also Representative Hall for his remarks and also Representative Wilson Pheanious for her remarks regarding this legislation and everyone else who has spoken in favor of it.

I am a member of the NAACP in my district. I have a very diverse community. One of the things that we found though was some of the surrounding communities aren’t that diverse and our NAACP Chapter has been going around to the region and we have been providing education to the Town of
Scotland, to the Town of Killingly. We have gone around, we have a wonderful president in Leah Rales and she has taking on the initiative to try and educate the northeastern part of Eastern Connecticut to try to make sure that people really do understand black history and not just have black history month but have issues and information going into the community all throughout the year because our education system hasn’t quite made it yet. This will help us do that. This will help us prevent bullying in schools were people are unfamiliar with people of other races and then they have people who come to the school systems that are different than they are and they don’t have any information about their backgrounds or the history. This makes a huge difference when people understand who they are dealing with, what the history of those populations are. How we got to be America. How we got to be so diverse. This is the history of our Country. This is who we talk about who we are all the time. We are a diverse Country. We are a Country who accepts
people of all different types and this, the only way we can do that is to make sure that we actually understand who people are, what their history is, how our system evolved. These are thing that will help each and everyone of us. So I just want to thank everyone for their hard work on this and I also will be voting enthusiastically in support of it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    Thank you, ma’am. Representative Rosairo of the 128th District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. ROSARIO (128TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

    Thank you.

REP. ROSARIO (128TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of 7082 as amended for many reasons but one of them is because I believe that the State of Connecticut, the children of the State of
Connecticut and many of our members here in this Chamber and beyond need to know about the contributions of African-Americans and Puerto Ricans and Latinos in the State of Connecticut. Many times people ask me how did Puerto Ricans, how did you end up in Connecticut? You know, my father was a carpenter by-trade and back in the 70’s, early 70’s and early 80’s trade and manufacturing was big in the Bridgeport area so that was a place where he was able to find work and settle down. I also have family members that are farmers and many of them ended up settling in northern Connecticut to work in the tobacco fields. So they came here to help improve the economy of the State of Connecticut. So I believe that each and every day as these kids sit in classrooms and they hear about history whether it is in Connecticut or across the country, I may be standing in front of you but I feel invisible. I feel invisible. Like we don’t have heroes but I’m gonna give you guys a little history right now. Mr. Charles Tisdale, young man, African-American, we was
the first Democratic nominee for mayor in the State of Connecticut. He came out of Bridgeport Connecticut. Went on to work for the Carter Administration and then ended up running and founding ABCD a community action network where a young man got his first summer job by the name of Chris Rosairo, not bad for a kid from Bridgeport. Amerigo Santiago former Representative, father of our late colleague Ezekiel Santiago. He was a pioneer in civic engagement in the City of Bridgeport. Do you know he was the first Puerto Rican, Deputy Secretary of State in state’s history? I’m pretty sure not many people knew about that. Gil Hernandez, another gentleman, came to Bridgeport in the 50’s, was a pioneer helped provide housing and other opportunities for Puerto Ricans and African-Americans and was the first city councilmember elected to the Bridgeport City Council who was Puerto Rican. I’m pretty sure that kids across the state should know about that. Margaret Morton the State’s first African-American State
Senator shattered glass ceilings. I’m pretty sure children across the State of Connecticut need to know about Margaret Morton. Joleen Johnson, there’s a school, one of the schools in my district is named after Joleen Johnson, a pioneer one of our first African-American teachers, woman teachers in the City of Bridgeport. Willie Matos a civic engagement leader part of the Young Lords back in the 70’s and 80’s when we were growing up on the eastside of Bridgeport, when we didn’t have heat, living in substandard conditions and people like Willie Matos would go to city hall and fight for us and make sure we had food, we had lunch, we had breakfast. I’m pretty sure children in the State of Connecticut need to know of our people like Willie Matos. So as we continue debating the Bill and I know in the LOB there is a Wall of Fame there are not many people that look like us on that Wall of Fame but I’m pretty sure that the reason why they are on that Wall of Fame because they had some help along the way from people that look like us, blacks and
Hispanics. So I urge my colleagues to adopt this Amendment. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a lot has already been said, I don’t have any questions. So you can rest. A lot has already been said this evening on this particular measure before us and so I just again have a few comments. I first would like to thank my colleagues namely Representative Bobby Sanchez and Bobby Gibson for really advocating for such policy that is extremely important not just important to black and brown communities but to all communities in this Chamber and communities that we represent. I know the previous speaker the kind gentleman from Bridgeport shared a little history first and I would like to throw several other names and then I will have my seat. I can recall names or individuals like Furman Milner from Hartford one of
the first black mayors in the northeast. I could also think of Carrie Saxon-Perry the first black female in northeast and you cannot talk Hartford politics, organizers, civic engagement folks without speaking of Latinas like Maria Sanchez straight from the City of Hartford and it is those individuals that I believe our children of all walks in life should be reminded of, should be taught about and I am so delighted that this Chamber is having this conversation with respect to African-American and Latino or Latinx history and I think the more we talk about not just the bad in both histories but talk about the contributions that these individuals have made will make, I think, a better conversation when you begin talking about race, race relations, race equality and many of us will begin to be a bit more comfortable talking about race here in the General Assembly but I know this Bill will help many of our children throughout the State of Connecticut and I am really, really encouraging every single person in this Chamber to support this measure and
again thank you so much to the Black and Puerto Rican Caucus and to our Chair or Co-Chair of Education, thank you so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I stand in strong support of his Bill. When we talk about the fabric of this Country we have seen that the fiber has changed because of contributions of African-American, Latinos and Puerto Ricans, their contributions to this Country and how this Country has evolved to a place that is welcoming of all groups. When we think about learning and history about the contributions to the Puerto Ricans we think about Augusto Rodriguez who was an office in the Union Army in 1841 right here in the State of Connecticut. Many of us did not know that but we have fought side-by-side with others to ensure the safety and protection of this country. When we
think about Puerto Ricans we think about Borinqueneers who fought in the Korean War to save American lives, all of our lives. Children need to understand the history of Latinos, Puerto Ricans and African-Americans and their contributions to this great nation. The only way that we educate our children and increase their knowledge so they can change that hostility that we seen in current administrations where it creates hatred for people of color, hatred to Latinos. We need to educate our children to insure that these individuals have contributed something positive to this Country. Mr. Speaker, to me is no common sense that the more knowledge our children have the better adults they will be, the better citizens they will be because they will be able to relate, to relate to a group of individuals that had done so much for this country and once you understand their struggles, once you understand what they have gone through, you’re better able to sympathize with the population that has been oppressed for many, many, many years and I
think, and I think in reaching the knowledge of all of our students we will make Connecticut students more powerful, better equipped with more knowledge to compete in this competitive society. That needs to happen and I think this measure that is before us is a measure that ensures that knowledge is transferred to all our students that our students are better able to appreciate the contributions of all U. S. citizens, their contributions not only to the State but to this Country. So for those reasons, Mr. Speaker I stand here strongly in support of this measure. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this Bill. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Mr. Napoli of the 73rd District you have the floor, sir.

REP. NAPOLI (73RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this legislation. I’d like to thank Chairman Sanchez and the Ranking Member for their hard work
especially Representative Gibson who crisscrossed the State to really make this Bill happen. This Bill is long overdue and in order to truly understand the struggle of our Country our students need to understand the history of all it’s people. This Bill does that. This Bill is fair, it’s just and it gives students an opportunity to learn about their own cultures and their own values. Therefore I am honored to support this legislation and I urge all my colleagues to adopt this Bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Felipe of the 130th. You have the floor.

REP. FELIPE (130TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this legislation. Everyday that I’ve been here I am taken aback by the fact that I am here. I’m taken aback by the fact that a young Latino kid from Bridgeport was able to make it have one of 151 seats in this Chamber and that is something that I am very proud of. But growing up
in the public school system and the history class they don’t teach me that I belong here or that I’m supposed to have a route or a path to get here. That I’m supposed to have a route or a path to get to a boardroom or to be at a summit of U. S. leaders or world leaders and I’m here. A lot of us are here. A lot of us are in boardrooms, at those summits and I think that it is important that our students learn our African-American, Latino students learn that they have a path there and all the other students learn that they should be comfortable with having us here because we have contributed so much to this country and to the community around them and now we want to teach them exactly what has happened and how we can help them moving forward. So I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative McCarty of the 38th District. You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I rise just for one point of clarification if I may to the Chairman of Education?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you. I believe you did answer this earlier but I just want it for clarification because I have heard some concerns that we know in 2023 the local districts will be required to offer the course but we want to be on the record, so if we only have a very low enrollment two or so they would still be in compliance by having the course there but perhaps not teaching it until we can work that out?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative McCarty.
REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you and that allays many of the concerns on this side. I would like to say that I was very impressed today listening to all the contributions that our Latino and Puerto Rican and our black and American colleagues have stated today with the how the studies will be a part, a central part of our American history going forward and I’ve enjoyed it very much and it’s been again indeed a true pleasure working with the Education Committee and I look forward to this Bill passing today. Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Stallworth of the 126th District you have the floor, sir.

REP. STALLWORTH (126TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Bill and I want to thank this Committee and all of those I’m sure on both sides of the aisle that would work to make this Bill come to fruition. I don’t have a question but rather just a
few comments.

I support this Bill for many reasons but mainly because of the interconnectedness of people working together for future generations to come. This is not just to put African-Americans, Puerto Rican’s or Latinos into a historical perspective but rather this is to show that all of us have played a great part in the founding of this Country and will play a great part in the future of this Country. Often I hear people in conversation sayin when I see people I don’t see color. Well not to see my color is not to see my journey. It is not to see my culture; it is not to see my understandin of life and what I’ve been through and the people that I’ve become a descendent of. Last month I went to my home state of Alabama and I stood the Pettus Bridge that we know many years ago was the matter of Bloody Sunday and also went to the parsonage where Dr. King lived and stood in the kitchen where he had his kitchen experience and also stood in the poor pit of the Dexter Church and even went to the 16th Street
Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama and I thought we celebrate this but we celebrate it in the past because we are behind rather than in the future. And I just hope we can support this Bill so that we can move into the future and we can understand and to know that all of us, it takes all of us to do this together, we cannot leave out anyone. I was born in Alabama and my mother would cook biscuits every Saturday morning, that was one of the great joys of being in my home to look forward to my mother’s cookin up biscuits every Saturday morning but she could only cook 12 biscuits. If she needed 13 she would have to cook another batch of 12, she could only cook 12 at a time and often I would say to her, mother what do you put in the biscuits, just put a little more of what you put in to make more and she would always respond with the same response, “I simply put in enough.” Until we come to a place in which all of us can put in what has been given to us, we will all be lackin somethin and I hope this Chamber to come together to make sure we put in
enough. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Comey of the 102.

REP. COMEY (102ND):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know districts like mine which is Branford we have a really growing population of minorities in our community. We actually have over 40 languages spoken in Branford and we also don’t have a lot of teachers that reflect the population of our town, the residents of our town. So I think that if we can bring some education to these kids, make them feel as though they are reflective and a part of our community by doing this through the education, through exposure to this curriculum I think that it is the least that we can do for these kids. And so, I rise in support of it and I am honored to cast a vote for that. thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Porter of the
94th District. You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise to say thank you to the Chairs in both the House, Representative Sanchez, Senator McCrory, Representative Gibson and for all those that have stood in support of this Bill as I do. I do realize that there is a lot to be desired when it comes to the education and not just in the State of Connecticut but nationally and the only thing that I will add to what has already been said is, you know, this is not just about teachin black and brown children, their history, this is about teachin all students about that history and the great contributions that have been made. You can’t know where ya goin unless you know where you came from. And I believe that it is a huge part of the struggle in the black and brown communities, especially now. Our kids are lost in so many different ways, but if they are mandated to go to school, K through 12, every day except Saturday and Sunday I believe that
that should not be where they fall short but that is knowledge that they should have. We know that knowledge is power and when we empower them with their history and I’m talkin history outside of slavery, history outside of February and Black History Month, this history is 365 days a year and they need to understand the importance of the contributions that they’ve made past what happened when they came here almost 500, well our ancestors came here almost 500 years ago. I think that’s important. So I stand in staunch support of this Bill and I believe that the Amendment is good. I wish that I actually wish that the original Bill was what we were debatin and lookin to pass because I do believe that this should be a requirement in order to graduate and that is a sad statement to make but as Representative Wilson Pheanious said, it is necessary because it hasn’t been done and if she can stand as a grandmother and talk about the education that she didn’t get as a child, and look decades down the road and see the same thing happenin with
her grandchildren I think as lawmakers it’s our responsibility to make sure we change that tide so that all boats really do rise. So thank you so much for all your work Representative Sanchez and I encourage everyone in this Chamber to support this Bill. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Gucker of the 138th. You have the floor, sir.

REP. GUCKER (138TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support for this Bill but also to make a statement. You know as somebody who grew up in a small suburban town where we did not have a Latino population, we did not have a strong African-American population the only African-American in my entire town was my neighbor. And as I got to know him he would talk about some of this history and what I was angry about was the history I wasn’t taught when I went to school. To find out later that this man was a war hero. He was one of the Tuskegee Airmen not knowing
what that meant. Not knowing the important role that they played in breaking segregation in the military. Fighting against all odds to be, to show who they were, to say that there is no difference, we are just as brave as you are, we are just as strong as you are and we are here to fight for our Country and it is something that’s sadly, I learned about after he passed away to where I couldn’t go back and talk to him about his experience. I couldn’t go back and talk to him about his contributions to this country. So I think teaching our kids about everybody’s history, putting this legislation in there so we begin to understand each other much more than we do now. Maybe we can breakdown some of that hatred that we are seeing coming up so prevalently these days. Maybe we can learn that if we are all the same and we are all here equally that we can all work together and we can all embrace each other’s history. So I rise in strong support of this and I want to thank you for bringing this Bill forward.
Representative Exum of the 19th District, you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. EXUM (19TH):

I also rise in strong support of this Bill. I am so grateful that this legislation is being brought forward and I tell you I was thinking as I was listening, there are so many powerful stories shared here today. Several years ago, I live in West Hartford, and we have part of the curriculum in the fourth grade where we have historical figures represented and there is a wax museum that takes place in that classroom and it was pointed out to me that there weren’t any people of color represented as individual in the wax museum. We later went to find out that the teacher said they just didn’t have time for it and that it took much work. It wasn’t something readily accessible. So they weren’t seeing themselves being represented year after year. I had three boys, three sons that went through the fourth-grade curriculum and unfortunately I didn’t
notice it because it became something that we were so accustomed to and later they had searched, parents came together and found notable people from Connecticut for our students to be exposed to. And with that in mind this is just a first step. The teachers welcome the help. They need the help and assistance. This is one important step forward and there is so much more to know and unless you see yourself you don’t recognize yourself and the students who are in that classroom would not have the opportunity to see themselves and understand contributions from other cultures. So I really appreciate that this is coming forward. I am sad that it has to come forward in 2019. It is an important first step and let’s continue onward. Thank you so much for doing this important work.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Morin of the 29th District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon.
DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. MORIN (28TH):

I rise in support of the Bill. I have no questions but maybe a perspective that I would like to offer. I grew up in Wethersfield, the town that I represent and as a young man there were very few people of color in our community, that’s just the way it was at that time and, you know if I wasn’t raised by a mom that valued culture and diversity maybe I would have had a different opinion or I would have turned out a little differently. In getting us to where we are now I look at young people today and I go to my granddaughter’s daycare and I see little kids, lots of little kids playing and they don’t all look alike but you know what, they play and they are together and they don’t look at each other in any other way except with love and friendship. But it’s when we get older that we seem to develop problems and my daughter, I heard one of the Representatives talk about how, you know, the
English language learners, you know, have some problems squeezing out classes well my daughter teaches English language learners at the high school and middle school level and while it may not directly relate to this proposed legislation one of the things that brings people together is when people can share their cultures. People can share how they were raised, what matters are important to them, what foods they like to eat, what they do at different holidays and when she talks to me about the joy that the different children see, they’re not children, they’re young adults, but the way they interact and how they start to learn about each other it helps them gather respect and learn to treat each other and value their differences because we all have these differences and it doesn’t mean we are better or worse it just means that we have differences and it is how we relate to each other and accept each other’s differences and this type of legislation which will enlighten people of all races. I don’t want to look at this, I’ve listened
and I know I’m not as eloquent as the Reverend behind me and some of the other people but I am going to say when people of color are looking at this they are going to see some value. I think that people that look like me are gonna learn and they are gonna see value and if it helps people in our school systems, young people learn to value the differences in our cultures are what bring us together, what makes this Country great, I think that is wise and a smart way for us to invest in our education and growing the Country to be a better place. So I want to thank the Chair of the Education Committee and all the members of the Education Committee that kind of worked together to make this a better Bill. I know often times Representative Porter mentioned she wished we were voting on something else, well I think every Bill we vote on in this Chamber I bet you there’s some of us that said, boy I wish we were voting on something else, a little stronger, more of what I wanted just not the reality of what we are but what this does
show is that the Chair of the Committee and the Ranking Member and others recognized maybe I’m not gonna get everything I want in this Bill but darn we’re gonna get something that’s good and we’re gonna start moving forward and doing what we think is best for the young people to grow this country into a better place that my grandchildren are going to grow into and others, so sorry to take too long, but I just wanted to thank the Chair and you for giving me the indulgence. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Garibay of the 60th District you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. GARIBAY (60TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also enthusiastically support this Bill and I commend all my fellow legislators. Having married someone from Mexico and living there for ten years, and my two oldest children being born there, we had to educate them here on what was happening there. I don’t know we were never taught the color TV was invented in
Mexico. The birth control came from Mexico. I can’t even pronounce it barely but catalytic nanomedicine and one of my favorites chocolate. So there’s so many that have happened and all these countries and people and the African-American culture that we don’t know about and I was a history buff and I didn’t know them. So I enthusiastically support it and I’ll just end with a story from Saturday. Representative McGee and myself we marched in a parade in Windsor, it’s called the Sad Derby Parade and as we walked down the streets, Windsor is a very diverse community, and it was lined with people and you would see people, families of color sitting on the roadside, etc. They didn’t know Representative McGee but when they saw him their faces lit up, they were so excited to see someone they could relate to and it just goes to further prove the point that this is important. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Rebimbas of
the 70th District. You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you for the opportunity to just a few comments regarding the proposal that we have before us. I had the pleasure of listening to everyone sharing their stories and their thought processes in support of the proposal that’s before us and I think it is important for us to have this dialogue so that people understand again with a purpose behind this proposal, all of the iterations and changes that were made to it. I was also listening to the exchange of questions regarding some of the ideas that weren’t considered, the options for online and things of that nature and when I look at something like this I certainly absolutely see the value. There is absolutely no question in that regard and certainly I can see from my personal experience and I think, you know, I want to take the opportunity to do the same thing because people are sharing their stories and why they support it and I’ve also heard why people weren’t
supporting it. As somebody with a family that is just as colorful as the rainbow and specifically having my own children and husband who is a Latino, me being Portuguese descent, and proud of the absolute beautiful fabric that I have in my family and all the contributions that every single history that we have that has contributed worldwide from explorers to the U. S. to the State of Connecticut to the little borough of Naugatuck. I take pride in sharing my story. I take pride in learning about our ancestors and I to sat in history class and wondered why people of Portuguese descent explorers their names were changed because then I was not able to relate with them and only much later did I realized, wait a minute, this is someone of Portuguese descent, maybe I could have had that connection early on. But this proposal falls slightly short of allowing the little Portuguese girl, the little Italian child whatever the case is, all the other ones maybe having the same opportunity of asking their school board also to put a
curriculum together that would meet the needs maybe of that community. I think this education is needed, no question about it but I also need to trust my school board to not continuously put additional mandates on them that maybe if we get together, parents, teacher and go to them and ask why we need certain curriculum, so that’s where I’m at right now because unfortunately this actually wouldn’t help me personally, I’m proud to say that I did take African-American studies, it was in college but I did and I will never say that I’ve learned everything because everyday of my life I continue to learn of all cultures including my own. But what I do have to look at, what kind of an impact this may or may not have on a school district from small to large and again I think it is important, I think it is needed, school districts may already have something and other may not. But when I look at all history, all communities, all ethnicities, all races then I really have to think twice to whether or not right now as I stand here I want to support one that
may address one or two although it is a large umbrella so not to limit it to one or two there is a large umbrella of history that would potentially come in this curriculum. I’ve heard individual highlight some of the contributions done of specific Connecticut residents. That may never even appear in these type of curriculums so the hopes of those individuals being highlighted may actually just only happen in this Chamber and not actually be the curriculum that comes out. So the curriculum may be vast and different, our expectations of what this curriculum is going to have is going to be vast and different but I do want to explore the idea of having these as online options. I should be done in this proposal, unfortunately it is not going to be done. But again I do think at the same time we need to be sensitive, that we’re not just hailing one over the other as much value as everybody has. But with that said, I’m just going to defer again to my board of education and for them to make the decisions as to the mandates that are necessary in
our community but I felt that is was important enough as we have this dialogue that I respect every single individual in this Chamber that we all come from different perspectives, we all come from different ideas and communities as to why we may or may note be supporting a particular proposal and I thought, Mr. Speaker that it was important for me to put that on the record.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Butler of the 72nd District. You have the floor, sir.

REP. BUTLER (72ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Bill HB 7082. I’d like to thank the Chairs of the Education Committee Representative Sanchez and also Representative Gibson for his contributions. I could probably stand here for some length of time to talk about just what this means to me as an individual as it relates to an African-American Representative but as the previous Representative spoke of this is beyond just, you
know, one race, one ethnic background, it is about everybody who has made a contribution. It’s just that some of us in our communities feel that we’ve kind of been left out. As a student growing up, I’ve heard a lot about, explorers from Europe, especially Portuguese, Italians that you hear about how they discovered, you know, all kinds of lands around the world, even though there was already indigenous people that lived there but somehow these places were discovered [Chuckles] but I guess what I’m trying to say is just going back to the beginning, the meager beginnings. I’m a little envious of some people who have a culture that they can trace back to a town in Ireland or a village in Italy and they can trace their roots back to, you know, that far for generations on end. One of the reasons that this is important to us today is for a lot of the blacks there initial introduction here was on slave ships and when you tried to go back and trace your ancestry it literally ends at a plantation somewhere. I can’t go back to my meager
beginnings in some other place in the world that was stolen from us. That was stolen from us. I can’t begin to tell you how much that means when you try to trace your ancestors and you hit a deadened in this day when there is so much technology that people can go back so far. And that is why this is important because at least we can go from the recorded history we have of our relatives and members of our race and culture and look at the contributions they made in the short time they’ve been here, what they’ve done to contribute to making this Country great. And for some people who kind of look down on other people and again many cultures have gone through it whether it was the Irish, the Italians, anyone that migrated here I guess, everybody when through somebody treated them unkindly but we’re a little different then some of those even because we were forced into servitude. But even from the meager beginnings all the firsts, all the inventions, everything that they’ve contributed to this Country in terms of service in
the military and science, and teaching, in law those are important things to not only African-American, Puerto Ricans, Latinos but as been mentioned here today to all people of all ethnic backgrounds because if you can see how some people who have raised from just slavery to get to be a president of this Country, an ethnic group can actually go that far that tells anybody of any ethnic background that in American you can truly achieve everything and we need to give those examples of people in history who made those great contributions and strides so that everyone of every color that see that anyone in America can actually rise to those heights. And personally, personally I could tell you that growin up in this Country in the 60’s at a very volatile time in Civil Rights. And Representative Stallworth mentioned no life in Alabama, back then there was church bombed where four girls died and race relations was really volatile and fast forward to today, and look at what’s going on in today’s world with the shootings, the bombings, the fires, I’m
tellin ‘ya I’m a little discouraged because as a young man, a little boy growing up I thought that race relations would by this time would be pretty much a moot thing that we all learned to get along. Somehow that did not materialize. But I will hope that learning something about people of another culture that somehow when they start a discussion and they start people to think, you know, those people aren’t so bad if it’s somebody of another race. And maybe we can work together to make this Country better but beyond that there’s humanity. We should think about humanity this is a first step of actually looking at everybody has to contribute to humanity. That should be our mission and this is one step along that path of achieving that. So I say to everyone, no it’s not what we could have done to be, you know, more inclusive, get more results but it is a first step and my wish and my hope is that by learning more about each other and by our young folks who actually get to see what others have done before them, hopefully they will see a path
that they could contribute to our cities, to our states, to our Country but more than anything else this world needs young people to contribute to humanity. There is a hope for us. Let us learn about each other and what we all have to contribute and value that, that’s what we should strive for. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Santiago of the 84th District you have the floor, ma’am.

REP. SANTIAGO (84TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In listening to the conversation here today has been very interesting and I agree with Representative Rebimbas we should start teaching also Portuguese history. My daughter did her ancestry.com and she turned out to be 27 percent from Portugal, so how that happened I don’t know [Laughter]. But that’s history. But Puerto Rico, we became citizens in 1917 through the Jones’ Act. That was forced on us by the Spanish-American War and we became citizens and that is one of the
main things that we learn in history, in American
history. We learn about Puerto Rico becoming a
Commonwealth in 1934 that’s part of the history.
But there is a lot of us that still don’t know that
Puerto Ricans are citizens even in this
Administration, even 15 years ago we had a candidate
in Meriden that ran and made the statement that
Puerto Ricans couldn’t vote because they weren’t
American citizens and they spoke Spanish. This was
just 15 years ago. And Meriden, yes is a diverse
community but when I moved into Meriden from New
York City from Brooklyn, it was a culture shock for
me cause growing in a very diverse community with
Jamaican’s, Italians, Polish none of us spoke a lot
of English back then, everybody still understood
each other with blacks, and you come into a town
where there is only a dozen of us in high schools
that are Puerto Rican I had to take Puerto Rican
history so that I could learn about my own culture.
I had to take Puerto Rican history in college so I
could learn about my own culture, I had to take
African-American history so that I could learn about my culture. This is something that even today is not being taught in the schools, it is not being taught that we have authors, scientists, writers, world leaders even an astronaut. Everybody knows who Roberto Clementi is because he was pretty famous and anybody that knows sports knew who he was. But does anybody know who Enrique Laguerre Véle is? He was a novelist of the 20th Century. Luis Lloréns Torres, Puerto Rican poet the only one that might know that might be Representative Vargas cause he studied a lot of history. Manuel A. Alonso Pacheco (1822-1889) was a writer and a poet and a journalist. We all know who Ben Franklin is, we all know who wrote the U. S. Constitution, we know that by heart because that was taught to us from elementary school, middle school, high school and even college. We all know who Nathan Hale was. Everything in Connecticut is named Nathan Hale just about. Casimir Pulaski, Orville H. Platt in Meriden those are just some of the elementary schools and
high schools in Meriden and we appreciate what they did. We appreciate all the history that they gave this country but there are other cultures that also gave to the American history, to the American culture. This is supposed to be a nation of immigrants, this is a nation where there is a melting pot and people learn from each other. We had the abolition of slavery in Puerto Rico in 1843. I didn’t learn that until I was in college because I took the time to learn what my history was about. This is something that if we start teaching our kids from elementary school, middle school and high school then I think people will be more tolerant with each other because it’s not just us them boasting about what is being taught in American history but they can brag and talk about people that look like them that were also famous. This is basically this Bill which I am in support of is just teaching social studies a different way, not just teaching the basic stuff but teaching other cultures and other inventors and other historians that are
part of social studies curriculum today. We live in a global economy so that kid that is in a suburban school is gonna learn, is gonna go to college in another town, in another state, it might be Harvard, it might be UConn it might be anywhere else but he is not gonna stay and study in his own town. So it would be nice that this child who is graduating from high school who wants to be an engineer somewhere else or mathematician or whatever his heart desires that he know how to deal with other cultures then he is not afraid to talk to them. We need to expose our kids from the time that they are small. This Bill only teaches Puerto Rican and African-American history and Latino history in high school but we should be teaching that in the elementary school. We shouldn’t be segregated. It should be a history for all. One little tidbit of history that I learned about Puerto Rico, we have this doctor in Meriden who has a German last name and I was very surprised that he was Puerto Rican, he was my mother’s orthopedic doctor and I said where did you
get a name like Axtmeyer and he says well I was born in Puerto Rico and Puerto Rico was one of the islands that people, the pirates came through from Europe and they all stopped in Puerto Rico and Haiti and in Santo Domingo and they all stopped there and a lot of them ended up living there, that’s why we have Irish names, we have English names, we have German names, we have French names. We also have a large Jewish population that is thriving in Puerto Rico for many, many years so we are multicultural and in the Island of Puerto Rico we all tend to accept each other for who we are. Half of my family is Polish and Irish that when we came to Meriden they fell in love with people from other cultures, we can’t stop that but we need to be more tolerant of who we re so we can better get along to get to know each other better and if it is a board of ed issue, if there is no money, then it is up to us a legislators to go back or our boards of ed and instill in them that this is very important. We can’t keep segregating our kids from
other cultures because when they go out there into the world, when they go out there to New York City, when they go out to Boston, hopefully they will stay in Connecticut but they go out to other cities they will be able to get along with other people. When we had the Hurricane Maria in Connecticut a lot of people in Connecticut didn’t even know that Puerto Rico was a territory and had the same rights as any other territory to get the same right help, FEMA money, the same kind of assistance just like Houston and just like Florida and its said that there are still people that don’t know that Puerto Ricans are citizens. So why I support this Bill because it’s important, it’s important for us to be more tolerant of each other and it’s important for us to learn other cultures. The United States is the only Country that I know of that wants to mandate English as the primary language. People that are born and raised in Europe learn two and three languages, four languages and they are very proud of that. They learn other cultures, but in United States we always
seem to separate and segregate all our cultures and we shouldn’t do that. Yes, I believe it wasn’t until I learned about the Holocaust when I was in college. I didn’t learn about the great Irish famine until I was in college. These are things that they should be teaching our kids in school, in elementary so that they can become more knowledgeable about everybody else’s culture and can be more tolerate. So want to thank the Chair of Education. Want to thank Representative Gibson and hopefully, maybe next year we will be voting on a Bill so that they can start teaching Portuguese history cause I might have a little bit of Portuguese in me too. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Dubitsky of the 47 District you have the floor, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker when I was growing up I never really understood certain things about different neighborhoods. I never understood,
I grew up in New York and I asked my mom why are there neighborhoods that are, that black people live in and neighborhoods where white people live, aren’t we all just Americans. I didn’t understand that. I developed by heroes and I didn’t really care if they looked like me, if they didn’t look like me, I still don’t. One of my hero’s when I was growing up was Roberto Clementi and it was before I even knew he played baseball because I knew that he did work that helped people that were hurting. Crispus Attucks one of my heroes from the Revolutionary War and the fact that he was an African-American played absolutely no part in my seeing him as a hero. If you go into my office in the Legislative Office Building right now, up on my walls are some of my heroes including Martin Luther King, Harriet Tubman, Clarence Thomas, Sitting Bull, they don’t look anything like me but they are my heroes. And it pains me greatly that in the Country that I love there are people who feel segregated and feel separated and don’t feel like they are part of our
whole community. I never felt that. But I know that there are people that feel that way, people in this Chamber, people all over our State and all over our Country that feel that they are somehow made different. We shouldn’t live in a Country like that. American is a place where people that look like me should have heroes that don’t look like me. People that don’t look like me should have heroes that do look like me. Maybe one day somebody will think I’m one of their heroes, I can always hope. But clearly we haven’t got there yet. I sure hope one day we will and I know that I will do whatever I can to make sure that we get to that point where we don’t need separate histories for every racial group in school. That we will have a single history of Americans where everybody can look at everybody else regardless of what they look like and say, that’s an American, part of my history. I hope we get there. I really do.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Gibson of the
15th District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I will be brief and I will just say I want to thank all of my colleagues who spoke in support of this Bill because, Mr. Speaker to be very honest with you, this was a very simple Bill but it’s such an important Bill and as a teacher, you know, I’m listening to some of the debate, what’s happening here and I want to make sure some people understand, my colleagues what is really being asked in this Bill, we’re simply asking that this history, this course is offered. My daughter is in high school and she is signing up for her courses for next year and her guidance counselors are dealing with her right now and asking her what courses she wants to take and she says, dad I want to take chorus. She can’t take this Bill because it hasn’t been passed yet but it is an elective. This Bill, this course will be an elective that kids can take at their choosing. An important piece of
history that we are offering to our students as a course and so as a teacher, you know, I was talking to one of my other administrators and he was like, I hope this Bill gets passed and if they try to say that teachers can’t teach this, don’t take that because teacher’s job is to teach. And so we go through professional development and every school district has money set aside for professional development. I was a science teacher and I got my certification a long time ago and when I got my certification STEM wasn’t around but I had to go to professional development, money that my school district already set aside for professional development and I had to learn how to teach STEM. Each school district does this anyway. As a matter of fact some school districts will ask you what do you want offered in professional development? And so the whole idea of this being something that we’re forcing on school districts, that’s not something we can buy because this simple idea of this course is going to be an elective that’s offered. You know,
one of my other colleagues mentioned, you know, about history and I talked to my daughter and some of my other students and the question does come up, where are we from, what country are we from, what language can we speak, what parade can we participate in and I have to stare at them with a blank answer cause I can’t answer any of those questions. This is a great Country and we have all come together and what we’re doing in this building is we’re coming together to make it even greater but out of all the immigrants who come to this Country, African-American are the only ones that were brought here against their will, they didn’t punch a ticket, they didn’t ask to come here, they were brought here against their wills so this history that we are teaching is something that needs to be taught. In this Country slavery was abolished in 1865. Do you guys know, in this very Building which we are making laws that would be to the betterment of the people of the State of Connecticut this Building was build in 1872. That means when slavery was abolished this
building was being built. This building was built by the hands of free slaves. This history needs to be taught. This needs to be shared. After slavery was abolished the people, anyone in here know about the term Jim Crow? Jim Crow became a law in this Country, where a group of people were put down and were not allowed to act and to contribute like everyone else. This history need to be taught because this is the history of our Country. I’m holding a brand-new American history book, brand spanking new and if anyone wants to see this afterwards, feel free, because I have paperclipped the pages in which African-American history is taught in this book, it’s less than a quarter of an inch. The history is not being taught in our schools and so many contributions have been given to this Country, to this State by African-American and by Latinos and so my plea is this. Colleagues, my friends, let’s not make excuses on this. Let’s not say oh this is a mandate, and this, that and the other thing. Everyone needs to hear this history.
Even if your school district does not have one African-American or Latino in your school district, our charge is we want our kids to go to college. It’s a shame that they will go to college and meet up with someone of Latino, African-American descent and not be able to relate to them, not be able to understand their histories. This history is for everyone and one of the most segregated states in the Country we would be doing an injustice to our children if we didn’t do our part to help them to understand each other more. This Bill is about history but more, as I said before, this Bill is about love and understanding for us all. So colleagues I really hope that you listen to my words and the passion behind and I hope that you will vote in the affirmative for this Bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Candelora of the 86th District.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think just to sum
up, I think there are members on this side of the aisle that plan to vote against this Bill and, you know, I’ve listed to the debate today and I think both sides have made some important points but, you know, there are times in this Chamber we seem to talk at each other and to each other and I think both sides have made some very important points to this particular Bill. But the fundamental issue, I think that members of this side of the aisle have with this Bill is that we are going to be mandating a one credit course, yes it is an elective, but it is mandated one credit course by every board of education in the State of Connecticut. It is unprecedented the way we have gone with this legislation. I think that it would probably be more beneficial if we incorporated this curriculum into our current social studies and history course work that the high schools provide. Having had two children now going through the cycle it is very difficult to fill all of your electives, I’m sorry all of your required courses in order to graduate.
And adding in an entire one credit elective is gonna be very difficult, it is not practical for students to even take in high school. So I think that the Bill is certainly well-intended but I don’t think that it is structured in a meaningful way that boards of education could implement it and I would hope that we take a look at this again and properly incorporate it into our curriculum which some of it is already done because this one credit mandate I think many districts are not going to be utilizing and therefore I need to vote against it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to thank Representative Gibson for all your work and Representative McCarty. I know we’ve been back and forth on many, many bills and this one you have been very helpful and I want to thank you for the work you have done as well and Senator, Oh, I almost
called him Representative, he’d kill me, Senator McCrory my Co-Chair. And you know history is a funny thing. I just learned recently that I may have some Arabic blood in me. I know I’m Puerto Rican. I know that my grandfather was from Corsica, France so that makes me part French and I know on my father’s side he has African-American roots and Tieno [phonetic] roots, so I am one mixed person. And I want to know more about my roots and about that history and going into, and when I was going to school I learned a lot about European history and the American history in regards to black and Hispanics in general but very minimal. So I am hoping that one day we can all stand here and say, wow, our educational system is teaching all types of history, Portuguese, Italian, whatever it may be. Everyone needs to know about everyone’s background and I think that is what we need to be doin moving forward and I’m just grateful that we got this Bill in front of us, we can do lot more and I hope we can get people to support it and I want to just thank
everyone again and for the time or course we took quite a few time on this and although that supported it and helped us with it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? If not will the Staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Will the Members please take your seats, the machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. Let’s be quiet.

Mr. Clerk will you kindly announce the tally.

CLERK:
House Bill No. 7082 as Amended by House “A”

Total Number Voting 146
Necessary for Passage 74
Those voting Yea 122
Those voting Nay 24
Absent not voting 5

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

The Bill as Amended is passed [Gavel]. Mr. Clerk kindly call Calendar 349.

CLERK:

On Page 27, Calendar 349, House Bill No. 7113
AN ACT CONCERNING EDUCATION ISSUES, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on Acceptance and Passage. Will
you explain the Bill, sir?

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Mr. Speaker the Clerk has an Amendment LCO 9342, I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Clerk is indeed in possession of LCO No. 9342 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9342 designated House Amendment Schedule “A” and offered by Representative Sanchez and Senator McCrory.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Gentleman asks leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there any objection? Hearing none, Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Mr. Speaker, this is a strike-all Amendment replaces the underlying Bill. The Amendment makes
the following unrelated changes in the Education Statutes. It makes a technical change, it adds climate change to a public schools’ required program of science instruction; it removes from the current law a provision that allows a tenured teacher or administrator who later takes a job in a priority school district to earn tenure in a new district after only teaching for one year; it establishes a working group to study issues related to implementation of preservice teacher performance assessment known as edTPA and it allows the non-Sheff magnet school that is not in compliance with the State’s enrollment requirement for minority students to continue to be eligible for magnet school operating grant. I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule “A”. Will you remark? Representative Sanchez anything further? Representative McCarthy, McCarty, I apologize, I mispronounced your name. I’m sorry.
REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise in support of the Amendment but I will reserve my comments until the Amendment is adopted. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Certainly, ma’am. Representative Vail. On House A.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Did all the information and this language that appears before us in this strike-all Amendment did it receive a Public Hearing?

Try.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Many pieces of this legislation in front of us came out of another Bill in Approps that did have a Public Hearing so many pieces had a Public Hearing.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Thank you for that answer. So originally this would be what we consider a placeholder Bill and they were taken some of this stuff came from other Bills but not all of it. Is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on
REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a follow up on the last line of questioning. Did Section 2 of this Bill concerning climate change have a Public Hearing in the Education Committee?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman for his answer. And a followup question to that
would be the Bill we just discussed, this Amendment Section 2 refers to that section of the Bill that we just went over, the same mandate if you will, different curriculums, and isn’t climate change included already in the statutes? Why do we need this?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, this climate change in being taught in our school system through science.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m somewhat confused because I thought I read it in the last, while I was reading the last Bill I thought I read that this was indeed already in our statutes and I put a Bill in to try and offer some sort of further discussion about climate change in our curriculum and my Bill
didn’t go anywhere in environment and I’m sorry about that. I voted in environment for everybody to hear, everybody’s Bills as colleague courtesy and for some reason my Bill didn’t make it through there. So it was somewhat misinterpreted what I was going after but when you mention climate change this is where we get into a very complicate problem here with our science studies and the problems start with Common Core. You know we did Common Core a few years back. Common Core is a somewhat, well it’s a national curriculum, but our State Boards of Ed are in charge with setting up the actual standards of what teachers will teach. You know, some of us resisted the Common Core concept thinking that curriculum was better set under our local Boards of Ed and we knew best what to do with our students and arguments to that effect and let the teachers teach, give them the freedom to teach and not tie their hands so much with exact verbiage of what they should be teaching on each subject. And in fact teachers were having quite a hard time with it and
we went to a many forums and, you know, they were just downright distraught, some in tears when this was being offered. But this is the problem. It mandates that climate change be included in the science standards with the next generation science standards. That’s the Common Core chapter of what teachers must teach in the climate change. And if you go to the attachments, the curriculum that’s actually submitted to the teacher it’s, if I can be exact, its with “a curriculum on earth and human activity” and in that they have disciplinary and core ideas and in that disciplinary and core ideas they mandate that “teachers must teach human activities such as release of greenhouse gases, carbon dioxide is a major cause of the earth’s warming surface global warming of the earth’s surface temperature global warming.” And that is what they must teach that manmade greenhouse gasses are a major source of global warming. I submit that is debatable in science, there is a very rigorous debate doing on now amongst scientists and if you
just mandate that they teach one side of a scientific debate the teachers are losing that freedom to be able to use it as a teachable moment, to teach that there is a debate, let’s go through it class, let’s study both sides of the issue here, but if you teach one side it becomes indoctrination and it’s not teaching anymore, it’s not learning. And so I always had a problem with that and, you know, I don’t how we go about amending that. I don’t know, I was thinking, I was trying to get an Amendment going and I wanted to try to just amend that one correction of the MS form, MS-ESS3 to just correct that one sentence. I don’t mind, teachers should be teaching climate change in a lot of different areas of science cause it effects a lot of different areas of science, physics, chemistry, all different areas so I wanted teachers to have that kind of freedom to do it. This ties the hands of our teachers so I just wanted to try and get some sort of an amendment going that would correct that, just correct that one sentence to something like and I would plagiarize
one of my constituents, he is what we call a climate alarmist, I’ve had a lot of correspondence with ‘em, well not a lot but I’ve been in correspondence with him and we’ve kinda gone back and forth on the issue and he writes that, you know, there is continuing scientific debate on just exactly how much global warming is human induced and how much effect that has on our global temperature. He would even admit that there is a debate on this. I have volumes in my office, Mr. Speaker and on my computer of encyclopedias on every aspect of climate change and I can attest to the fact that it is a legitimate debate and this, I just want to go after this. I want to bring it to the Chamber’s attention and I’m voting no just because this is in there. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GOFFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on House “A”. Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to
in support of this Bill and support of the Amendment. I appreciate the change of language. I believe that we’re in a critical time, with critical issues in the planet and it’s really time to “clean things up” and we need to work on educating the youth in terms of what they will be facing and what they will have to do to face what’s coming. I think that climate change is debatable but it is not deniable. Thank you and I urge this Chamber to vote in favor of this Amendment and this Bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I rise in wholehearted and enthusiast support of this Bill. I want to thank Representative Sanchez in his leadership on this. I’ve been thinking a lot about the arc of our understanding about climate change and the environmental movement really can trace back as far as 1948, as early as right after World War II we
were starting to recognize the degradation of our environment. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act was passed in 1942. A few years later in '53 Jacques Cousteau astonished the world with his underwater photography and we started to respect the oceans. In 1955 we had the Air Pollution Control Act and then in 1962, when I was six years old I received a copy of Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* for my birthday. That was the beginning of climate change denial. Right away the chemical industry denounced Carson’s book as a “gross distortion of actual facts.” Fortunately President Kennedy charged his Scientific Advisory Council to study it and to make a recommendation. The committee confirmed the dangers of DDT and other things that were in Carson’s book and it was eventually banned. Let’s move up to 1970, three significant things happened in 1970. We invaded Cambodia, people were shot at Kent State and the Beatles broke-up. I’m still recovering from that last one. What also happened in 1970 was the first Earth Day and we
started to talk about the beginning of the end of pollution or the beginning of the end. So for the better part of 70 years people have been discussing the environment. We are now talking about concepts that were introduced then like sustainability, recycling, globalization and since then we have seen systematic progress but right now, all of those bipartisan efforts that for decades protected our environment are being questioned and under the current administration stripped out, rolled back and decimated. So what do we do about it, we can talk about whether or not climate science is real, whether scientists disagree, the fact is they don’t. We disagree, 98 percent of peer reviewed climate scientists agree that science, the destruction of our environment is manmade and can be reversed if we get going on that reversal. In the meantime, unfortunately only 30 percent of middle school teachers and 45 percent of high school teachers in this country are fully aware of that fact, 98 percent of scientists agree on the phenomenon of
climate change. So my heart breaks every time I talk to a young person who is afraid of getting cancer because of airborne carcinogens, who doesn’t see the point of buying a home because they are so afraid of tornados and hurricanes and floods. And when we talk about building up our workforce and invigorating our economy more than 45 percent of millennials cite climate change as the reason they are delaying or choosing not to have children. That is a serious problem in our economy. This winter over one million students in 120 countries marched against what is happening to our environment. There are doing it again Friday. They took to the streets because they understand what is at risk. A couple months ago I had the pleasure of being asked to speak to third and fourth graders in New London at a wonderful school called the Interdistrict, Interdisciplinary Magnet School. And I thought I would fool these kids when I was talking about carbon. I was trying to get a sense of what they knew. And we all know or most of us know that
carbon is degrading the environment. But in its purest form carbon is both graphite in pencils and in diamonds. So I thought I would throw that out to the kids and see what they would rather have, a ton of diamonds or a ton of pencils and they said predictably a ton of diamonds. And I thought ah ha I have you and then one of them raised their hand and said we answered diamonds because we want to sell a ton of diamonds to get ten tons of pencils so that we can write Congress to stop what is happening to our environment. These were third graders. Why, because that school teaches climate change.

Connecticut has a change to be a leader nationally in this. If enacted this Bill would make us the first state in the Union. And just this week I received an e-mail from some advocate in Colorado because the Colorado legislature is considering enacting a similar bill and they wanted to know what our language was. So we have a chance to be a leader. Teachers want it. I was a high school teacher for ten years. Teachers love their kids,
good teachers care about their kids’ futures, their health, their welfare. Teachers want to teach this subject. I spoke with Greg Anderson who is a professor at UConn about whether or not this Bill made sense and he said, yes because it is in the absolute best interest of children to teach this early, they are the ones who need to know about it so they can decide what to do and he suggested that I ask anyone who is opposed to the teaching of climate change to say, are you willing to put your children at risk because you chose not to believe science. I for one do not have the arrogance to question what 98 percent of peer reviewed scientists believe. So I would urge all of my colleagues to vote for this Bill. It is the morale thing to do. It is the economically smart thing to do and it is the only legislatively responsible thing to do.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):
Good evening, sir and thank you. I rise just briefly to make a few remarks. I sit here and I listen to the debate on the last Bill and on this one and I’m really troubled by something or at least from my perspective. I personally don’t feel qualified to tell others as to what should be in a curriculum and what should not be. I can certainly offer opinions and thoughts but as to what should actually be in that curriculum I don’t believe falls in the jurisdiction of what we are supposed to be doing. I thought the State Board of Ed, I thought the teachers who teach, I thought they would be the ones who would develop a curriculum that would produce the best education for our next generation and current generation. For me to pick and select and choose courses that should be part of a curriculum based on either personal belief or whatever I think is well beyond what is expected of the legislature and certainly not fair to the people who have to teach the courses. I make no judgements about ‘em, I just don’t believe we can sit here as a
body and do this year in and year out. We could be taking these courses up every single year and be adding and deleting and modifying and is that really what our job is. If it is then what are we doing with the other things that are happening around the State. Why do we have a State Department of Education? Why do we have all these local Boards of Education? Is it not their job, their responsibility to try and provide the best curriculum or are we going to insert ourselves into that process. I honestly don’t believe that is our role, I don’t think we are qualified for it and that is the reason why I will be voting against it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And through you.

I have a couple of questions for the proponent of the Bill. Are we still in the Amendment, sir?
DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

We are still on House Amendment “A”.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Okay, a couple of questions to the proponent of the Amendment, sir.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, sir.

Through you.

I’m listening to the debate and I read the Amendment and I also spent my undergraduate training in biology and chemistry. I spent my masters’ degree in fishery biology and I certainly agree that the earth is warming. I think it has been warming for some time. I think we’ve gone through cooling
periods as well and I think there are natural cycles that the earth has been going through since the beginning of time. My concern.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

And a question to the proponent the curriculum for climate change has that curriculum been written and is that standardized and it is currently being taught in our schools in Connecticut?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez do you care to respond?

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, you’re correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And through you.

In the writing of that curriculum does that curriculum present both sides of the argument or
does the curriculum strictly support the idea of anthropogenic global warming?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe it does support both sides of the argument.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you. And could the good gentleman across the aisle and I certainly thank him for that answer, is it possible for him to give an example of how both sides of the argument would be presented?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez is it possible.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

I would like to direct that question to
Representative Palm, if she has the answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ferraro you have the floor. Do you care to ask that question of Representative Palm in lieu of Representative Sanchez?

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And through you.

I would be very happy to redirect the question to Representative Hwang, did you say? Palm. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you.

Representative Palm, my question is since the curriculum that is being presented in our school system today has been represented to present both sides of the global warming argument, could you give me an example of something within the curriculum that is being taught on both sides?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
When we say both sides are being represented it is generally taught that there are those who question the veracity of climate change. However since scientists do not disagree on this we are currently teaching our children that there are two sides anymore than we are saying some people still believe the world is flat and that has a legitimate basis in science. So respectfully I would say that the argument that climate change is we’re just in a regular cycle that is historic and we had the ice age and we had the ebb and flow and the other theories that I’ve heard, it is not being taught as sound science.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good lady for her answer and I will continue directing questions.

Through you.
To Representative Palm.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So if I heard the good lady correctly, she says both sides of the argument are being presented but one is being presented as the truth and the other as is being presented as incorrect and bad science. Is that correct, sir.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

My understanding is that reasonable science teachers again, would pause it that while there is disagreement among some quarters again 98 percent of peer reviewed scientists believes that climate change is real and is caused by carbon emissions primarily from human activity. Again if you were looking at how do we teach the history of science, probably they teach that once upon a time, before antibiotics we used leaches to get infections out of the human body. It is not being taught that it is
an equally valid way to cure infections. Similarly, we are not teaching children here in Connecticut that the denial of climate change is as legitimate as the belief in it, the empirical evidence of it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

And I am really sorry to see the dialogue go to a debate on whether or not the science being taught or the peer review of 98 percent supports climate change and human activity as being the cause of it and everything being a denial or a climate change denier because quite frankly there are plenty of studies out there that have shown errors in the hockey puck theory for example on climate change. There were not only errors in the studies but deliberate misrepresentations, peer review boards not allowing those who had an alternative view to express their views, many scientists have come out and said that global science or global warming as a
result of anthropogenic causes is faulty science. The 98 percent peer consensual or whatever it is, has been proven to be a number of PhD’s not necessarily climate change or climate scientists and so the, you know, it’s garbage in - garbage out. It’s basically what you put in a statistic can say just about anything. So my concern is that since the science is not really settled there are a number of prominent scientists who disagree with the dogma shall we say of anthropogenic global warming and I don’t believe that it is fair for a student to be taught, I mean critical thinking is what we are trying to establish in our students, I don’t think it is fair to teach that one side of the argument is an error and it belongs to a group of people who are climate deniers while the other side is settled science and it is 100 percent correct because it’s like the good lady said, at one time all the scientists in the world did believe that the world was flat and it did take further exploration to prove that the world was in fact circular. There
are scientific discoveries right now of antimatter and things like this and superstring theory that are setting the current physical world apart from what was believed to be dogma over the years and I just believe that if we are gonna bring our children up and we are bring them up in a way that they are critical, their thinking is critical and it is open-minded and we allow them to make decisions for themselves, I think we should present both sides of an argument in a way that gives respect to both sides.

Now, I started this conversation off saying that global warming is a reality. It is a fact that the earth is warming. I am not quite sure nor are many scientists quite sure that the case is through anthropogenic causes. Also it is often that carbon is the culprit but when one does the research one finds out that the most prolific greenhouse gas is actually water vapor by far and the effect on global warming with regards to water vapor is being totally ignored. So with that being said I’m fine. I do
appreciate the good woman’s opinion on the other side of the aisle. It does appear to me that we’re talking about a very emotional subject in which lines have been drawn. But I am thinking that we have children and their minds at stake and we really, really should give them the opportunity to look at the science on both side, let them determine which science is correct, show them the errors that have been made on the global warming side, show them the errors that were made on the side that says, global warming is not caused by anthropogenic sources and that way I think it is a fair depiction of the argument as it is being presented. But right now I find it hard to believe that we are gonna teach climate change in our school system and anybody who doesn’t agree with what is being taught is a climate denier. To me that’s so negative, it eliminates a huge portion of our population, it discriminates against a number of scientists who have come out and had produced credible papers that demonstrate that global warming is part of an earth
cycle, it’s a part of the cycle that has been going on since the beginning of time and it is gonna continue years and years and years into the future as well as future global cooling, future ice ages and with the coming changing of our magnetic pulls I am sure the environment, the climate and the environment is gonna change even more radically going forward. So with that said, I will listen to the debate. I’m not sure at this point if I can support this Bill, I am disappointed in the curriculum. I would love to see a summary or an outline of actually what is being taught in our schools. I don’t have children any longer of the age where they would be attending school, I do have grandchildren. I would like to see what it is they are being taught and if the good lady on the other side happens to have a copy of that outline I would love to see it.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank you for giving me the time.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):
Thank you, sir. Representative Zullo.

REP. ZULLO (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not have any questions for the proponent just a couple of comments. If the proponent wishes to take a seat and relax that is perfectly fine.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, I sure he appreciates that.

[Laughter]

REP. ZULLO (99TH):

I don’t mean this to be an affront to the procedure of this great House but I think it is troubling that this Bill went from six lines and limited in scope to a generic study of education issues to 194 lines specifically target toward the study of a very specific issue, the deployment of the study and the mandate of the teaching of a very specific issue and not many of us were aware of that. I want to emphasize that I think it is very noble in fact necessary that we study issues like multiculturalism, emergent topics like climate
change, certainly important. But let me tell you something, we operate internships every year in our law firm. We take on high school students. I had a year that a high school student didn’t know where the stamp when on an envelope. I had a year where a high school student didn’t know how to sign in cursive because they don’t teach cursive necessarily everywhere. I had a student that didn’t know how to sign their check or how to process a paycheck and I had a student who didn’t know basic formatting of a form letter. These are basic skills that you need to function in our society. So I mean I could go on and on. We have $1.5 trillion dollars in student loan debt outstanding. Our students don’t understand debt management, credit management. Newsweek reported in February 2019 that 12 percent of people, 12 percent of respondents could not identify the Vice-President of the United States. That extrapolates to 30 million people in this Country. So again I think it is noble that we want to mandate the discussion and the teaching of these
very noble topics like climate change but I think if we are going to mandate the teaching of these topics we should be mandating the teaching and the reinforcement of these basic life skills. And if I had the time right now, I would reintroduce an Amendment to do that. But I think going forward maybe in this session or the next session we should very much consider that because again I don’t want to get into an intellectual debate of climate change, it’s certainly been hashed out well enough today but these are certainly consideration we should be thinking about. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise with a few questions for the proponent of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.
REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you and my questions are not at all to dispute the particular topic but through the last Bill and this as well I’ve texts and calls with our Board of Education and our Superintendent who certainly are concerned and because we have over mandated and potentially underfunded school districts. So my questions are really just to understand this. Could the proponent please just clarify for me what grades are we talking about, is this just in the secondary school, is this from kindergarten all the way through? If we could get that clarification I would appreciate it.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Can I defer that question to Representative Palm.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Devlin is that all right?
REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, certainly.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm. Representative Palm if you push your button, thank you. Okay, there we go.

REP. PALM (36TH):

All right, sorry about that. Yes to the good Representative. The question is, could you restate it please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Certainly. So what grades would this impact, does this require from kindergarten on, are we just talking secondary school what are we talking about in terms of impact in science curriculum for our public school students?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
Yes, thank you for that question. The Next Generation Science Standards which Connecticut adopted in 2015 recommends that the teaching of climate change begin in the fifth grade. So of us feel it should be earlier than that but the Next Generation Science Standards is a wonderful guide. I emphasize guide, it is not a mandate. It is not in statute. It is a curriculum and pedagogical guide and their recommendation is beginning in fifth grade children should be made aware of this.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So through you.

Just so that I am perfectly clear, is this Amendment then mandating that starting in fifth grade students will be taught climate change as part of their science curriculum or is it a suggestion?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Yes, thank you for that. It is a mandate. Currently the statutory language says that here in Connecticut we must teach science which may include climate change as per the NGSS. What this Bill would do would change that language so we must teach science including climate change per the NGSS.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So, through you.

Again for clarification purposes, I am not a science teacher, I am not familiar with what is in the curriculum but what I do hear from my board and from my superintendent is that everything that we add on takes away from something else. So if this is a mandate to be included what is to be removed or to make room in terms of let’s say for the sake of
simplicity an hour of science education, what is gonna give away in terms of this mandate to include?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Yes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

The simple answer to that is that teachers are already teaching science, they teach a variety of different kinds of earth sciences, biology carving out sometime to teach climate change doesn’t add to their burden, it simply shifts part of their curriculum which, and I have spoken to many of them, they are very eager actually to do. So it isn’t adding a new entire subject matter, it isn’t telling an English teacher to learn how to teach math, these people are already teaching science, it simply means spend a week, a month, whatever on this subject.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):
Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And while I appreciate that answer, again I am not a science instructor but what I do hear from by board member and what I hear from my superintendent and what the good Representative just shared to me sounds like an opinion that in fact we can just take away a week of something else and include this. Again, nothing against the topic that we are talking about we could say it’s apples and oranges, whatever it is, the point is that our schools are currently already overburdened in terms of what is being required of them.

So through you, Mr. Speaker.

Does the specific curriculum exist that schools starting in grade five will be mandated to include or do they just include whatever they might feel is necessary whether it takes a week, or two weeks, or three days away from they are currently trying to teach within the limited time that they have?
DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess I would prefer that we saw this as an opportunity to enhance our curriculum rather than as a burden. I spoke with the people in the Department of Education and learned that districts who do not teach climate change do not perform as well on that portion of the state tests and therefore they fall short on the accountability index. This is a way of empowering them actually to do better.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again I appreciate the opinion shared by the good Representative but the fact is that currently our districts already have requirements and what we’re asking them to do regardless if it is dog training, climate change, or
how to select different molecules for whatever reason it is taking away from what is existing in a curriculum. So does the curriculum exist or are the instructors just to come up with something that might meet this criteria? I just want to understand clearly so that when I speak again with my board member I can let them know crystal clear what is going to be required.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding the State Board of Ed will help with curriculum development and also the very competent and expert advise from people such as the Connecticut League of Conservation Votes, Reforest the Tropics, the Audubon all of these groups are willing to help with curriculum development and go into schools and help teach climate science and in fact many of them are already doing it in some of our schools.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But just so that I am clear, for a given school district are they just to come up with whatever they think might be appropriate or will there be a prescribed curriculum that might include these groups that they could reach out to and again nothing to do with the topic what I hear about is that we are already overburdened so it is a wonderful topic to include but what is being expected and what is being provided?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Current in our statute we must teach science. So this is a branch of science which can be incorporated and currently in the Next Generation
Science Standards which again are a pedagogical tool, they teach both methodology and content, climate change is already in there, so the curriculum exists and the State Department of Ed is at the ready along with the groups I mentioned to further that curriculum should the teachers or the districts so chose, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So while the good Representative said should they so choose I understand this is a mandate so they have no choice. But do I understand it correctly that the curriculum exists that they can pull from to meet this new mandate?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.
Through you.

Currently in the NGSS there is a curriculum.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And is there a requirement that based on pulling in a new piece of curriculum where some teachers may already be including this or not, but again we’re talking about a new mandate on our schools starting at grade five in addition to other things that we’re asking them to do, is there opportunity for teachers to be trained in this new curriculum or is it up to each school district to just seek this out and them figure it out on their own?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I don’t know the answer to that, it is a very good question. I do know that I’ve spoken to
several people who are willing to help districts do exactly this.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

   Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have 169 school districts, most likely, if not more so I hope there is more than a few people who are willing to help. Is there a fiscal note?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

   Associated with this?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

   To whom are we addressing this?

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

   I’m not sure who that question would go to, but whichever of them will take it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

   The question is a fiscal note because it comes within the file, do you have questions on the fiscal note.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):
Yes, my question is, is there a fiscal note for implementing this mandate on schools starting at grade five and onward.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

I think Representative Sanchez would do.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SDE would provide information and training because it is already a curriculum that exists. So although there, it does stated there is a fiscal note here for the regional school district, I believe that it’s somethin, I had spoken to people at SDE and they said they can do it within appropriated funds.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Okay, that’s great. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and then one last piece of clarification and I’m not sure who particularly like to answer this so we
could start potentially with the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

    We’ll figure it out.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

    So I understand and they can correct me if this is not correct, that the curriculum exists. So when is this mandate in place that is starting in grade five our schools need to include this in their curriculum?

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

    Representative Sanchez?

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

    July 1st of this year.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

    Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So what I would share is that is going to be extraordinarily difficult most likely for most schools who have their
curriculums developed and now if they need to include something else. In general I don’t support new mandates on our schools but at least maybe there could be some consideration to potentially pushing that out a little bit further so that our school districts might be able to more easily absorb this within their existing framework. So that is all, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just to start with a comment. You know I’ve been quite involved with renewable energies and others who believe there is a value to those energy generations and, you know, using less fossil fuels and many other things. I happen to be going to our DEEP, we have a great awards ceremony that we actually provide awards for new fish caught, and larger fish caught records and I was and it was why do we have so many new fish categories and they said, well it is because the
waters are warming and we have new fish up our shoreline so we are catching new fish. Whether that has to do with climate change or a cyclecar issue taking place in our world, I’m not sure. But I was proud to be Ranking Member of Education, started with the good Chair at the time, Representative Fleishman and we did, I think some pretty good work. I wasn’t really for any additional work for our schools but I wanted to really focus on the nuts and bolts of what their job was and so I don’t really support a lot of new additional mandates because there is only so many hours in a day and there’s only so many dollars to go to educate our youth.

But a couple of comments that were made kind of bothered me a little bit in the dialogue that we had and the good Representative Palm, I appreciate her answers and her dialogue on this but there was a mention that we are failing in areas of our State tests in this particular category and I am kind of concerned on that comment because when I hear that we are failing on certain areas on the test, I am
pretty sure that our curriculum design that is required should fit the State test requirements so if by chance I could get clarification on that through the good Chair or did I mishear that comment, or and I didn’t think I did because I’m hoping that our curriculum is designed for the criteria of the testing that we’re doing?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Can the kind gentleman repeat that last part of the question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Acker if you could clarify your question.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so it was kind of long but I guess what I had heard in the dialogue is that during our State testing, which I
believe would primarily be in the high school area, that our students are not doing well in that area of the State testing and it is because we are not teaching the curriculum that fits the State test and I don’t believe that we would be having, I hope, we’re not testing something that the school does not have in their curriculum.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH): I am going to defer it. [Cross-talking]

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to defer to Representative Palm.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

That’s okay with you, Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you to the good Representative for that
question and I apologize if I was unclear in any way. What I am trying to say is that according to the State Department of Ed the Next Generation Standards recommend teaching of climate science and districts that do not do that do not do as well on the assessment and accountability guide that NGSS sets up. So what we are trying to do here is codify into law, Best Practices, that the NGSS already recommend.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So for clarification it is not a State, the State required testing that we’re doing, that we are not. We’re not talking about the State mandatory testing per year that our students have to take that their not getting the curriculum for that test, is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I’m sorry, Mr. Speaker. I’m not entirely sure again what the question is. Would you mind repeating it?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate this. We will work it out I think. I’ll do my best on it. But I’m just makin sure that the required testing that we’re doing in the State, that our students must take, that the curriculum that is missing that we are trying to include in this language is not currently, that we are not testing to this climate change curriculum.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Maybe that is not as clear. I’ll try it again. So I heard we weren’t doing so well on tests in our school because we’re not teaching climate change. How can that be if we are testing to something that
we’re not teaching, I guess?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm. Is that better?

REP. PALM (36TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. And thank you

Representative. Currently according to the Next Generation Standards we should be and are teaching a plethora of scientific inquiry including climate change. There is an accountability index according to the State Department of Ed on which districts are assessed and those that do not have this in the panoply that they teach tend to fall short.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’ll take that as a solid answer and I appreciate the good answers from the lady, the good lady. I guess what I mentioned going back that I believe in our science classes
now, because the curriculum has been, and you know, when I heard a little bit well they’re gonna develop the curriculum, the curriculum should have been developed many, many years ago and I sure hope it gets updated as it should be and their classes are teaching some portion of it. I guess the question I’d ask for the ones that are teaching this class and maybe somebody knows of the classes what percentage of the school calendar year is focused on the climate change portion of our science classes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

I don’t know that answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Fair enough, Mr. Speaker. Probably be a
science teacher if you’re teaching it. You know, we just had a great award ceremony downstairs E-Smart Program and I’ll tell ya what, more of our youth know more about what is going on with renewable energy and climate change and maybe some of the bodies, the folks, the bodies in this Building or the concept of it, so I’ll hold my comments again. You know, I believe that, you know the addition times that it may take in the classroom, but I hope that the ones that are out that there is some additional hours being spent but when you look at the overall school class and timeframe I always am apprehensive for mandating something that may take additional hours in a school day or school year that we just don’t have. I appreciate the good lady’s answers and the good gentleman, the Chairman for always his continued work in the education system. So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I rise in serious concern of the proposal that we have before us. I think through this dialogue it leads me to have additional questions. So if I may, I heard quoted and I know I heard it on several occasions, “Teachers are very eager to do this.” Is there anything that prevents those teachers from doing this now?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Perhaps you can hint as to where we are directing the question, which one.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

I would be happy to, Mr. Speaker. That was quoted several occasions by Representative Palm.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

We will go to Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I believe the answer is no, there is nothing to prevent teachers now from teaching this.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So through you, Mr. Speaker.

To Representative Palm with all due respect why are we legislating this?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Because this would codify into law Best Practices of what many of our districts are currently doing and it would give it the gravitas of State Statute.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
As the current language that I see here, it allows them already to do that, so if districts are doing it already and others are choosing not to, this would therefore be a mandate, correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you.

Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Why do we have the State Department of Education who is supposed to coming up with the Best Practices in Curriculum for our students yet we are legislating it?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
I’m sorry can you repeat the question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would be more than happy to repeat that. Why do we have the State Department of Education that is supposed to be determining the curriculum for our students if we are here legislating it.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Again I think that with the approval of the State Department of Ed we are trying to codify Best Practices for our children, our students, and to recognize the districts that already do this kind of teaching are enhancing their children’s education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And this will be posed as question, I don’t know if Representative Palm or others but certainly I have heard on several occasion from Representative Palm that the State Department of Education is in support of this. As I read the testimony that was submitted during the Public Hearing on HB 7113, and I quote, “Regrettably” from the State Department of Education, the commissioner specifically, “Regrettably we are not in a position to take on this type of additional work without additional resources. We are struggling to meet our existing statutory requirements with a rapidly diminishing workforce and budget. Therefore currently do not have the capacity to take this work on.” And I believe it was admitted early that there is a fiscal note associated with this.

So through you, Mr. Speaker.

If the good Representative can explain the differing representations versus the testimony.
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the good Representative the State Department of Ed is in favor of the NGSS which we adopted along with 18 other states and the curriculum from development resources would be made available through this, through this Bill and again there are other resources available to help should we need them.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I appreciate the testimony the good Representative and certainly I take that as the Representative’s understanding of what she believes is available but I have to take the actual testimony of the Commissioner of the State Department of Education and unfortunately it conflicts with that understanding. I am also very concerned if the good Representative could provide
statistics regarding the representation earlier that there are districts that are performing badly on State tests as a result of not having climate change specifically in their curriculum, if the good Representative could share some of those statistics.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I do not have statistics. One of the problems with not having this in statute is that it is very hard to codify or to assess who is and is not actually doing this. According to policy people at State Department of Ed who again, are hold up the NGSS standards as the standard of what we should be doing, local districts there is no fiscal note to local districts to have curriculum development because we have the resources to do that. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Rebimbas.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to thank the good Representative for her testimony. I have grave concerns. We are once again mandating something that teachers can already do. We are mandating once again something that each and every Board of Education can already do. In fact we already have in statute that this may already be allowable, why are we now mandating it. We’ve got information without statistics claiming that some school districts that don’t have climate change is performing poorly but we have no statistics, yet at the State Department of Education the people, the experts, not legislators, but the experts employed specifically for this duty and responsibility to tell us what type of curriculum we should be providing but yet we have legislators saying what they believe is best and should be mandated on those districts. We have actual testimony saying that they don’t have the resources for this but yet we have other testimony that says the opposite. We
have an actual effective date of July 1, 2019, that is an impossibility for those districts that don’t have it. What’s gonna happen? They are not gonna meet it. We are passing legislation that is impossible to meet. This is very concerning. We have poorly performing districts, we have an alliance districts, the Borough of Naugatuck is one, we have students that are performing a variety of different areas under average. It is not based on climate change. And I must say that Representative Zullo did an excellent job highlighting the many areas that we are falling short that are actual areas that, in my humble opinion is, when they graduate high school but for going into sciences, they might be going to a technical high school, maybe going on for college, or straight out to the workforce of actual basic skills that are needed but yet we’re gonna tell the Department of Education what we believe they should be mandating on each and every Board of Education throughout the State of Connecticut. I think this is sorely, sorely lacking
any common sense or responsibility to be passing mandated legislation where it is already allowed by any teacher, any school board and something that is not even going to met July 2019. I would be shameful of any Board of Education that doesn’t have a curriculum already made in that regard prior to that. Mr. Speaker, I raise in strong opposition to this for the future of our students, for the future of the State Board of Education, why even have them if we are going to be legislating what they should be teaching in our schools. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

    Thank you, ma’am. Representative Perillo,

House “A”.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

    Good evening, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.
If I could as a few questions to I guess the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

    Which proponent?

REP. PERILLO (113TH):
The introducer. I’ll ask the question, the individual who feels they can answer it can answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Well I need a little more help than that but ask the question maybe that’ll help.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Okay, so I understand that I am a little late to the party. I missed part of this discussion so I apologize in advance. But I understand that obviously we want to introduce this into the curriculum. What exactly would climate change curriculum look like, what would a teacher who embraces this be teaching?

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

It is my understanding that they are currently teaching climate change. How it would look like, I would imagine that what they are presently teaching. What this Bill does instead of them, instead of a
“may” it is a “shall.” It does mandate them to include it in science. Unless Representative Palm has another answer, that’s all.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

I appreciate that and the gentleman acknowledged that this is something that is already being taught. But I would like a little more detail. What exactly do we expect these teachers to share with their students? And I appreciate the gentleman giving me the best answer he can give but if I can get some more detail that would be helpful.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I am not sure if Representative Palm may have some of those details. If I can refer.
DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo is it all right if we redirect the question to Representative Palm?

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Positively, thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you. Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It would be really very difficult to read through the entire Next Generation Science Standards. You know, they cover motion and stability, forces and interactions, motion and stability 2, molecules and organisms, the earth systems, etc. Human activity, it is developed by grade to what children at that certain age level are appropriately able to handle, so I can’t possibly summarize the NGSS right now but it is “The” standard for how to teach science and we believe it should be followed.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):
Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker and I can appreciate that. Would a teacher teaching this class be able to teach that we are currently in a global warming hiatus, is that something that a teacher could teach?

Through you.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe so.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, I appreciate that. Would a teacher be able to teach that we are actually in state of global cooling?

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe so.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you. Could a teacher teach that we are actually experiencing natural volatility in our environment that will change actually overtime, could that be taught?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe so.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could a teacher teach that sea level rising is currently being caused by costal erosion and not global warming?
Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That answer I don’t know.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, I’ll direct that to whoever can answer it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

I don’t see any volunteers, Representative Perillo. Sorry, no answer.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

The proponent of the Bill can’t answer the question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

He said he didn’t know.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

No one else in this Chamber can answer the question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):
That would be up to them, not to me or you. Doesn’t look there’s any volunteers. Representative Perillo you still have the floor.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you. So let me ask a broader question. Given the Bill and it’s wording right now, could a self-proclaimed climate change denier teach what they believe consistent with their denial of climate change, would that be permitted in the Bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I don’t believe, I mean these teachers will be trained or have been trained on the current climate change curriculum so it is my understanding that whatever they have been trained in that is what they will teach.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):
Okay, so help me understand that. So we’re not just saying what they have to teach, we are also saying what these teachers have to tell students. Let’s go back. One of the reasons why we have teacher tenure is that teachers are supposed to be able to teach in the best way they see fit. We give them that freedom as teachers and a teacher teaches what they believe and we give them that freedom and they are protected by tenure. So if a tenured teacher were to teach global warming doesn’t exist, that climate change doesn’t exist are you suggesting that would not be permitted?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I don’t know the answer to that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does someone in the Chamber know the answer to that question?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

I see no. Representative Palm are you volunteering? Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I think what we have here is a basic difference between subjective and objective approaches. We have the humanities and we have the sciences. And the sciences are not subjective. They are based on empirical data. We could agree that Robert Frost was a poet, we might agree that he was a great poet, we might not agree. We might think he as a bad poet but we would probably do well to study blank verse iambic pentameter then we can decide if we like those forms of poetry. Science is an empirical study. I don’t believe a science teacher is given to the vagaries of opinion. They are taught and they then teach their students responsible science
which is fact based. It is not subjective. So I don’t believe that a climate denying science teacher would be responsible in passing along that opinion when again, to repeat, 98 percent of peer reviewed which is the K-peer reviewed scientists agree that this is caused by human activity and therefore could be solved by the cessation of certain human activities. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that and the Representative actually leads me to another question. So 98 percent of scientists agree on this. What exactly to they agree upon if there could be a little more detail then I would appreciate that. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

According to the National Center for Science Education, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration and numerous other experts, they agree that carbon based emissions that are degrading our environment are primarily caused at this point by human activity and that we have about 12 years to start to reverse that trend if we have the wisdom and the knowledge to change our behavior.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So to clarify 98 percent of scientists we have 12 years to solve this problem, is that correct, is that what the Representative just said?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm do you care to repeat yourself?

REP. PALM (36TH):

To be clear 98 percent of peer reviewed scientists believe and agree that climate change is caused primarily by human activity. There are those
who believe that we have about 12 years to start reducing our carbon emissions before we have irreparable damage.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We got to be careful when you throw facts around as the Representative said, you know, science is largely about facts but if we are going to use facts they actually have to be accurate. So let’s just be careful when we’re throwing around 12 years because that is something we hear a lot about and I have not seen anything that documents that 98 percent of scientists believe that 12 years is the number that we are talking about. But again let’s sort of talk about facts. The Representative stated, the Representative whom I’m speaking with right now stated previously before I spoke that, I want to make sure I get this right, if I get it wrong I hope she will let me know, 45
percent of millennials are not having children because of their concerns about climate change. Is my recollection correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Fourth-five percent of millennials are taking climate change into consideration when deciding whether or not to have children.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Representative could clarify exactly what that means, taking into consideration. What does that phrase mean, taking into consideration? I would like some clarification.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

That the legitimate concern and fear for the future of the planet gives them pause about bringing
another human being into it.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to share a few concerns the foremost of which is that I just don’t think that we should be telling teachers what they should teach. I don’t think we should be telling Boards of Education what they should teach. That was actually my only concern before I started asking questions. But I have a new concern. My new concern is that we’re not just telling teachers what they should teach from a subject matter prospective we are also telling them what they need to say, how they need to say it and what they need to leave out and that’s a concern. We have an education system designed to ensure that teachers can teach what they believe to be accurate to the best of their ability and we give them the freedom to do that and we give them that freedom through tenure. And what I’ve
heard in the back-and-forth with the Representative is that is actually not true in this case. You know, the Representative believes a certain thing whether she is right or wrong, honestly in some ways in immaterial because that is not my point. But what the Representative wants teachers to teach is what she believes about climate change.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Let’s be careful about implying intent to another Representative. Thank you, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

And I knew you were going to say that. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker for correcting me, I appreciate that very much.

But facts matter. Facts matter and we heard it very, very clear today that members of this Chamber have certain beliefs and they feel very strongly about them and that’s admirable but I don’t think that we should be forcing teachers to teach certain things because they are what we believe and because we are passionate about them. Our education system
here in the State of Connecticut is designed intentionally to give teachers the freedom to teach students in the way they see fit and whether you agree that climate change is a problem or not, regardless of your belief on the issue I believe that what is in this Bill before us flies in the face of that freedom that we are supposed to be giving these teachers. Mr. Speaker, you can’t tell ‘em what you want ‘em to say. We can’t do that. That is not what we’re here for and I think it is a shame that we are doing that here in this Bill. I could say more, Mr. Speaker, it’s just shameful. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

    Thank you, sir. Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to rise in support of the Amendment before us and just clear up a bit of misinformation that was shared earlier, probably accidentally and I can understand why. So the good Representative from Naugatuck read earlier
testimony provided by Commissioner of Education which she quoted, “regrettably we are not in a position to take on this type of additional work without additional resources and we are struggling to meet our existing statutory requirements with a rapidly diminishing workforce and budget and therefore currently do not have the capacity to take on this work.” So that was actually taken from her testimony on the Bill before us, House Bill 7113 but actually the climate change was first introduced in House Bill 7352 in which the Commissioner was silent on this issue. So just to clear that up for the Chamber. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I have, one of the things I do quite often, I represent a lot of towns, so I have a lot of superintendents. I represent nine towns and I have lots of superintendents to talk to, and lots of teachers,
lots of principals and when I talk to them, they tell me that they are mandated up to their neck, that they simply cannot take another mandate from the legislature without something else falling out the back and they’ve got to cut something in order to get something new. Now what this Amendment does is it compels those that have chosen not to address this particular issues, it compels them to do so. So my question rhetorically is what are we gonna loose now? We’ve mandated all sorts of things that the legislature believes is very important to teach in the schools. Well adding this as a mandate will require that something else is lost. Now I am obviously a scientist, I’m a lawyer and I am perfectly honest to say that I have absolutely no idea if man is causing global warming. Now you can quote me on that. I don’t know, just don’t know. I’m not a scientist. But I do a lot of appearances, I go to a lot of places and I talk to a lot of people and a number of years ago somebody came up to me and challenged me and said and yelled at me for
not adhering to the global rhetoric and I said, “Well I don’t know, I’m not a scientist,” he said, you’ve got to believe that man is causing global warming, you’ve got to believe that this is happening. Like well, at the moment I don’t believe one way or the other. I don’t know, not a scientist. So I have to admit that I’m a bit of a geek sometimes, I don’t sleep a lot, I don’t play golf and I don’t watch TV. So that give me a lot of time to sit at my computer and read all sorts of arcane things including crazy peer reviewed global warming studies. Believe it or not I sit there and read these things. They will make your eyes roll back in your head. The charts and the graphs and the conclusions and the techospeak but because this guy challenged me, I figured I should bone up and try to figure out what was goin on. And you know what I figured out, I figured out that I’m a much better lawyer than I am a scientist cause I can’t understand most of what those studies say. But one thing I was able to determine was there is no 98
percent of them that say that man is causing global warming. There’s a lot of ‘em that say that man is causing it, there’s a lot of ‘em that said that man is not causing it. I don’t know where this 98 percent comes from but I’ll tell ‘ya I’ve gone through dozens and dozens and dozens of these studies. I’ve got stacks of ‘em in my office at home and there are some that says, yes and some that says no. Peer reviewed, top scientists, top universities, top institutions. Some say yes, some say no. Which one do I believe, no idea. I’m a lawyer not a scientist. But I can tell you from my experience that 98 percent that’s been quoted over and over in this Chamber, outside this Chamber, on TV that 98 percent is not accurate. There’s plenty of people out there, good strong scientists that say man is not causing global warming. There’s people that say there is no global warming at all. There’s people that say that we haven’t had any global warming or sea level rise in decades. So from my experiences, 98 percent is not true. There is about
even, maybe even a little more that says global warming is caused by man, okay. But lets assume for a second that 98 percent is right and that there are only two percent, two percent of peer reviewed established, respectable scientists, two percent that say global warming is not caused by man. Should we not, at least listen to them and not demonize them.

This amendment mandates that a specific ideology be taught essentially. When Newton, Isaac Newton was figuring out what light is, Newton said that it was a particle and he thought that light was little bunches of particles that zoom by real fast but all the other scientists of his era said it was a wave, not a particle. The consensus at the time was that it was a wave, it’s not a particle. So Newton’s idea that it was a particle kind of disappeared and everybody thought light is a wave. For over a hundred years, 200 years I believe, light was well-known, the consensus it’s a wave until one guy, one of the two percent in this instance, I
guess, his name was Albert Einstein, he said, you know what, I think it’s a particle. Completely against the consensus that it was a wave and today what do we know about it, today we believe that it is both a wave and a particle. So we don’t, science does not operate on consensus, it operates based on the scientific method and even if there is one, one individual person who says, I have a good argument, a good scientific argument that you can peer review all you like that says, that the consensus is wrong, we need to encourage that person not demonize them. That is what the scientific method is. The scientific method is you take a set of facts, you come up with a hypothesis, you test the hypothesis, you challenge the hypothesis and you try to defeat the hypothesis with new facts, new investigation, new theories. We do that with every single aspect of science, medical science, with mechanical science, with physics, with all kinds of science we encourage new people to come and challenge the status quo, challenge the consensus to develop new
ideas, new theories, new hypothesis, new mechanisms of learning except when it comes to global warming where we have said, the science is settled, anybody who doesn’t believe is a heretic. And that is what this Amendment would have our teachers mandated to do. I just can’t support that. thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the good gentleman of the 47th, Einstein realized the theory of light when he would walk by the river, he would think about, and think about it and do all his tests when he finally saw the light, that’s when it really helped his scientific method. But I have a question to the good Chair of Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Please proceed.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So most towns, I know in my town I called up by
Board of Education chair this evening and we teach this now and I think most towns teach if. If this were to pass, do we have to change our curriculum?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

I didn’t see that in the language, I just wanted for legislative intent. And I want to piggyback on one of the questions that one of the Reps earlier, this will be implemented in July of 2019, a month and a half, two months. Is that true. I mean I see 2019 and I see 2020 for schools that aren’t doing it there is no way logistically they are gonna be able to do it.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

I’m not sure which one of those statements was a question, Representative.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

The question is if this was to be passed, probably will be passed, and schools that do not have this in their curriculum now, the language says July of 2019 and then I see later down October of 2020. Which date is it because if it is July 2019, there is no way towns are gonna be able to implement this.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my understanding that the curriculum is available and that many of the school districts are teaching it already so there is nothing really to develop.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):
I appreciate that but if a town can’t abide by, and I do think most towns do teach it, they can’t make the July 2019 deadline is there a penalty, what will happen?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I don’t believe there is a penalty.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

For the towns that don’t do it, that want to eventually participate I think there should be some reprieve or extended date, maybe a year from now because I think we all know that most towns do teach it now, so to do it in a month and a half, I think it is a logistic nightmare for teachers, Board of Ed’s, students, but I do think most towns teach this now, so I would hope they would get some reprieve,
at least a year, but next school year. I don’t know if you are amenable to that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez do you care to respond?

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe it starts next school year. I mean it has the July first date but it will be in the fall of the next school year they would teach this. I’m not too sure that they will be penalized if they can’t.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

So I appreciate the answer. I’m reading it, July 2019 and then I see October 2020 is that when it would start or, I know they would get the notice by July 1, 2019 but if you look further down in the Bill, I apologize, June 30, 2020 on the Amendment, for fiscal year ending June 30, 2020 and June 30, 2021.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):
Representative Yaccarino could you give Representative Sanchez the line number.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

The line number.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Make it a little easier.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Lines 191, 192.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is reference to a different part of the Bill in regards to Magnet, to the Magnet Schools. It has nothing to do with the.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

So thank you for that answer. So for the record, it’s July 2019 if a school doesn’t implement it by September first of 2019, they are not going to be penalized but they will obviously be encouraged to implement, is that fairly accurate?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you.

Yes. I mean it’s supposed to be available, it is available already. So if the Bill does say on July first, that we’re talking about the upcoming school year in the fall but if they can’t do it at that point, I don’t believe that SDE is going to penalize them.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

I appreciate that answer, I just wanted to clarify. I called my superintendent, my apologies, my Board of Education Chair and she called some other Board of Educations and most towns do teach this now, I just don’t want it to be a mandate on the town that teaches and they have to change their curriculum. So thank you for the answers and we’re on the same page on that. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Yes, we are.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Horn.

REP. HORN (64TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a couple of questions for one of the proponents of the Bill just to clarify in my head exactly what we’re taking about. My understanding of this Bill, particular the part of the Bill that relates to climate change, is that we are suggesting that the science of climate change be taught in schools. Is that correct?

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Correct.

REP. HORN (64TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, excuse me.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Horn.

REP. HORN (64TH):

Thank you. So my understanding, I like many of my colleagues here I am also a lawyer. But as lawyers and as legislators we are asked with frequency to interpret scientific data and at the basis as some of my colleagues mentioned a moment ago, at the basis of teaching a science is a scientific method which is about teaching the entire science and the process of doubting something, asking questions and teaching about the consensus as a whole. In my quick reading of the science of this, there has been some discussion of whether there is 98 percent acceptance or not and there seems to be some chatter in scientific circles about whether it is 98 percent but the lowest number that I have found that it is over, in excess of 85 percent of scientists who agree that includes
organizations like the chemical organizations, you know, the chemical manufactures, Exxon-Mobil, American Chemical Society, American Geophysical Union, and the list goes on and it is my, if the idea here is to expand our children’s minds so that they look at this science even though they are not scientists, even though they don’t go into the field of science, if they are going to become citizens and we are going to hand them the problem of global warming whether they like it or not and so the idea that we are taking that science and ensuring that the entire science is being taught to children starting in fifth grade has to be a positive thing and by that I mean, in my view, teaching science doesn’t mean teaching a belief system, or teaching a particular conclusion but teaching the entire range of conclusions but that also includes not creating a false equivalence between a theory that is held by two percent of scientists and a theory that is held by 98 percent of scientists. So I applaud the principal behind this Bill and the idea that it be
included amongst the science that we are teaching to our young people, so I thank the proponents and those of you who worked on it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I don’t have any questions, I just have a few comments. I’ve listened to this debate and to me it seems like how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, many people will have an opinion but no one is going to know. And from my point of view, this Bill is totally unnecessary. In 2015 the Connecticut State Board of Education adopted the Next Generation Science Standards. I’ve looked at those standards and every single grand level in their science standards from grade give through 12 includes global climate change and human impacts on climate systems. Our school systems are already doing this, in fact the State Department of Education on its NGS website
has a plethora of fee modules, free learning tools both for parents, for teachers, for Boards of Education that already do this. I’ve been in communication with my superintendent, our school district is doing this. So my feeling about this Bill, we don’t need to do it, it has already been mandated in our schools therefore we are wasting our time in mandating them to do something which is mandated anyway. This horse has left the barn whether we agree or disagree on the subject of global climate change and human impact on that, climate changes it always changed whether it is from the internal combustion engine, whether it is from the sunspots or the lack of sunspots, whether it is from volcanos, climate is gonna change. Should we be as kind to the planet as we can, absolutely. Should we embrace technology that helps us live a cleaner life, absolutely. On the other hand, we are burdening our children with a fear that doomsday is upon them. I remember growing up with the cold war and hiding under my desk, that wasn’t a fun thing.
We have record levels of anxiety, depression and mental health problems in our children. Surely a better use of our time here is discuss how to raise healthy, mental sound children to fight the scourge of mental disease, mental illness, rising suicide levels as opposed to talking about whether or not we are going to mandate the teaching of climate change in schools when schools already have to do it anyway. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to clarify some of the things within this Bill and was just commented on by a previous speaker. So in lines 38 through 40 am I correct to say that what we are talking about with this climate change has changed from a “may” to a “shall” so it is mandated?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Sanchez.
REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So I’d just like to get the record straight cause I just heard somebody question to say is this a “may”, that maybe taught and this is a mandate and I thank the good Representative for answering that we did go from “may” to a “shall” so it is a mandate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. For the second time, Representative Rebimbas on House “A”.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker for the second time. I certainly acknowledge that I also want to take the opportunity to always acknowledge a good Representative who attempts to make clarity for the
record so I just want to take the opportunity to thank Representative Currey for his comment regarding the quote earlier of the State Department of Education and with that I certainly want to note that is the, you know, challenge even in individuals who look at the Bill numbers so the layperson and push their support behind something we really don’t know the evolution of Bills so I think it is important obviously to note that. So I will also take this opportunity once again based on his representation that the State Department of Education stayed silent on the climate change issue that was taken from another Bill. I do just want to remind everyone that the State Department of Education’s responsibility is to service 149 local and 17 regional school districts. It also serves as a Board of Education for 17 regional tech high schools and legislatively we’ve asked them to establish educational policy, prepare legislation proposals, academic standards for teachers and students. So once again they certainly have
provided testimony on a variety of different legislation proposals and have participate both in person as well as submitting them and the fact that they were silent on this very one, that I would implore and encourage my colleagues to stay silent as well and take no action on this proposal because once again I think this dialogue is very evident that this is something that already can be done and all this is that we’re doing right now is to say that this is an additional mandate to the Board of Education and also literally sub our nose to the Department of Education who stayed silent on it but yet we want to advocate on something that many people differ on for a variety of different reasons and most importantly I think we all should be unified and no more mandates if we are not providing additional funding. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma’am. The question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule “A”. Will you remark further? I am going to order a roll call.
Staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Members take your seats; the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all members voted? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

And the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A”

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY (110TH):
The Amendment is adopted. [Gavel]

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended. Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I’d like to go back to a discussion we started on the Amendment which centered around birth rates and millennials, so I kind of want to talk about these millennials and kids again. So if I could a few questions to again whoever is willing to answer the questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So to the best of my ability tried to read through as much literature on millennials having children, choosing not to have children and the eight or so pieces I’ve read not one of them has mentioned climate change as a reason for that. So I would just the Representative if she
could, cite her source.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

And, Mr. Speaker if she can’t cite it I understand maybe it’s just something she came up with.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The Chair will be at ease.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I’d be happy to cite that. I need a minute please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The Chair will be at ease. The House will be at ease. The House will be back-to-order.

Representative Palm. Correction stand-at-ease. The House will come back to order. We would like to remind everyone that this [Gavel] debate may become very heated and emotional and just like to remind everyone that we need to treat each other with respect and cordiality and abide by the rules of the
legislature. Having said that Representative Palm, you have the floor.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was a bit ago that I did some of this research but I’ve reviewed my notes and some of the sources that I consulted are Business Insider, wire.com, NBC News, The Denver Post, The Epic Times and National Public Radio.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all let me say I appreciate your comments, I take them to heart. Second of all I appreciate the answer to the question. As I said my research did not reveal that so I appreciate that it was clarified for me. And at this time I will allow many others on the board to ask their questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative McCarty.
REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

You’re welcome.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

I certainly learned a lesson tonight. I must say that I did not speak on the Bill yet, I spoke and said I would make my comments after the Amendment was adopted and for that reason I was not able to voice my opinion earlier. So I would like to just clarify where I stand and really I’m not trying to say to anyone here tonight whether you’re pro-climate change or anti-climate change but it was my understanding in looking at this Bill that we were looking at many technical changes.

The first section is just purely a technical change with special ed. The next section and I’ve been communicating this evening with the Department of Education, this Bill and this section about climate change tonight is just putting into language what current practice is going on throughout the
State in most of our districts. Many, many districts are using the Next Generation Science Standards and so the schools had climate change in those standards as Representative Cheeseman pointed out earlier. So this is practice that is already occurring throughout our districts and this piece of language was to codify that catch-up what the practice is with the statute. That was my understanding as we went through it and that is not to give my opinion, certainly not saying everyone is entitled to their own beliefs about climate change but this is something that our State Board of Education adopted in 2015 and the schools rely on that curriculum and so our schools are currently doing that. But if I may I would like to move on to another part of the Bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

To the Chairman.
Through you.

Can you just tell me in the section on tenure, we’re looking at changing the tenure requirements in the priority school districts for teachers in priority school districts to gain then tenure? Can you just clarify that piece, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Here we go. So that section about tenure, it just removed the current law provision that allows a tenured teacher or administrator who later takes a job in a priority school district to earn tenure in that new district after only teaching for one year. So current law generally requires a teacher who moves to a new district to teach there for two years before earning tenure. So it has basically gone back to what the general law is two years.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative McCarty.
REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

So what I’m hearing is that it bring parity to those tenure provisions and the rest of the section on tenure stays the same so it’s current law. If we may go to the next section, going through the Bill, there is established a working group to look at the performance assessment called edTPA within our teacher preparation and there will be a working group and if I recall there was much discussion throughout the Education Committee testimony that we had that there are different universities that have different opinions so the working group is to really come together so we can find out what the Best Practices is. Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative McCarty.
REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you and then the last portion of this Bill refers to interdistrict magnet schools grant monies and if the district is not in compliance with Sheff O’Neill that there could be a penalty and I believe that this portion was put in so that we could protect the New Haven School District and their funding of $32 million dollars if I am not mistaken. Could he please clarify for that for me?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, and through no fault of their own and I believe that they will put a compliance plan in place to the Commissioner so that they would,
this money is already in that funding so we’re not asking for additional funding, this is just to protect the district so that they could receive that funding and as we go forward they will have a plan in place.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

I appreciate those answers and so for many of those reasons that I’ve just pointed out aside from the discussion that we had earlier on climate change I will be supporting the Bill as it moves forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, ma’am. Representative Piscopo, you
have the floor.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

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

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Can you, in Section 2, can you give me a definition of climate change how it is used in this statute or just the general definition please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I will defer that question, she’s coming

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I will defer that question to Representative Palm.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Piscopo, is it alright to defer
the question to Representative Palm?

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Certainly, Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you. Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I’m sorry, can you ask him to repeat the question I wasn’t in the room?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Piscopo, please repeat the question.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question is and start out at the basics here, in Section 2 a definition of the words climate change?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I believe the definition of climate change would be what is in the NGSS Science Standard.
Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the NGSS Science Standards states that, “human activities such as release of greenhouse gases from burning fossil fuels are a major factor in the current earth’s mean surface temperature, global warming.” Is that the definition that you would refer to?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you.

If that is the Generation, I mean the definition in the NCSS that is what the State of Connecticut follows.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And it is pretty important that we get that across. See what happens here, the word climate change, it started out years
back, you know, on the floor of this Chamber in many debates as global warming. Global warming was the preferred term, it is what we kind of referred to as a self-explanatory global warming, the globe is getting warmer, I don’t think anybody would deny that. We are in a warming period. If I was speaking to you about 100,000 years ago, we would be under a mile of ice right now, so yes, we are in global warming. But along around 1997 there was peak of the world’s global mean temp, surface mean temperature if you will and that’s a very definition right there and it leveled off. Since 1997 the actual mean global surface leveled off. A lot of scientists are starting to ask questions about it going flat after 1997 and there was even a decline in some years as the sun went into what we call a modern minimum. The sun went into the very minimum sunspots, the sun will go into a minimum and then energize every 11 years as it goes through a cycle. So we are in a minimum but this minimum was a modern minimum called Modern Minimum, it was the most
passive sun that we’ve seen in over 100 years so we even went into a bit of a cooling period and the scientists are starting to say, you know, the globe is not warming any more, maybe it’s reached its peak. So the word got changed to climate change. Global warming got changed to climate change. We started hearing it every day, just hammering away at this word climate change. So climate change became somewhat of a different term now and everybody starts using the word climate change instead of global warming. Climate change was just again, self-explanatory. It was a change in climate. The globe, the surface warms and the surface cools and that is climate change and I think that the worst thing that happened in that is that politics reared its ugly head, politics started getting involved. You saw the Kyoto Protocols, the U.N. started trying to stir up some sort of a crisis that we were heating up too much and so we all got together, started the Kyoto Protocols and that’s were there was a great deal of skepticism, the Rio Accords
after that and then when President Obama got elected he flew right over to Iceland, no, no over to Denmark and tried to get on, tried to sign an accord right then, a global treaty, he tried to sign right on to that, right away and the powers that be changed that conference out there. So then climate change after that became kind of, when politics reared it’s ugly head, it then became somewhat of a term for, it became a crisis. You heard of this Al Gore saying by the year 2000 all the ice will melt in the Arctic and different claims were being made and the *Inconvenient Truth* where New York is gonna get flooded by rising sea levels and so there was all these scare tactics by our different government entities and that is what politics does. They create a crisis so we act. And what we were trying to react to was cutting our CO2 levels. Our CO2 levels, carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas and that all of a sudden became the cause and the efforts to cut CO2 was basically going to hurt the United States economy. Cause what CO2 is, is an output of
energy, a manufacturer produces widgets and he burns a lot of electricity to make these widgets and that produces CO2 any burning of fossil fuel is an expenditure of CO2 into the atmosphere and, excuse me one minute, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Fighting a cold. But anyway, the energy is any expenditure of energy gives off CO2. So the United States is agreeing to cut it’s output of CO2 and the whole world was going to get together and we were all cut our CO2 and the emerging countries that are just starting to realize that energy is good, it’s a cheap source of energy and power is good for their economy now they can improve their quality of life, they are not burning fires and they are not doing that kind of thing. They have cleaner energy.

Excuse me, as I speak I am giving off a lot of CO2. [Laughter] So that’s the problem. The word climate change has become now human induced, what I just read greenhouse gas initiatives and so that’s where we are. I could go on like another half an hour, but I don’t think my body will let me. So I will
sit down, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Poletta of the 68th District you have the floor, sir.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and good evening. As I’ve listened to this debate for a while, I ponded whether or not I should offer my two cents and ask a few questions but I ultimately decided to do so. While this is definitely not my area of expertise, I can certainly sympathize with my friend, Representative Perillo when he asked the question regarding millennials and whether or not they are determining to start a family based on climate change. As a millennial myself and with a lot of friends that are now getting married and starting families, I can unequivocally 100 percent say not one of them has ever came to my house or a party of mine and said, “Joe I’m not gonna have a kid because of climate change.” I’ve never heard that once in my life I have to admit. So that was a new one for
today. As far as this Bill goes, right now I do have a couple of questions for the proponent of the Bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Number one, would this be considered a local mandate?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

And thank you to the good Chair for his answer and then ultimately who would be footing the Bill?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Currently there is no fiscal note for that portion. We’re talkin about the climate change, they are currently teaching that in the school systems so there are available resources for that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Then why are we discussing this Bill?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

We are discussing it because it goes from a “may” to a “shall” in the science curriculum.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

Then if it goes from a “may” to a “shall” then
are there school districts right now that are not teaching this curriculum?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

There could be that are not teaching it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

So then.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Are they in violation of the law?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I don’t know that answer.
Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

Since climate change in my opinion is a theory and not a fact who makes the determination if the teacher is an expert on climate change?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Like I stated before, it’s a curriculum that is already being taught so teachers already, whatever they’re teaching they have been trained to teach that so, I believe it is up to the district.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So the district decides which areas should be taught regarding climate change if I am
understanding the good Chair correctly?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The House will stand-at-ease. The House will come back to Order. Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, I move that we pass this item temporarily.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

If there is no objection, so ordered. [Gavel] The House will stand-at-ease.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Gavel] The House come back to order. Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 233.

CLERK:

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good Bill, I’m sorry. Representative Simmons of the 144th, madam you have the floor.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good evening, madam.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an Amendment LCO 9262. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be grated leave of the Chamber to summarize.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9262 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 9262 offered by Representative Simmons, Representative Cummings, Representative Aresimowicz.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Simmons you have the floor.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a friendly Amendment, I’ll reserve my comments on the overall Bill after we pass the Amendment. But this Amendment essentially makes some technical changes to the Connecticut Tourism Council appointments to make sure they are fair and evenly distributed between leadership. It also adds in the stipulation
that the Welcome Centers be open subject to available funding, that their bathrooms be open 24 hours, that the signage be consistent and I move adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on Adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark on the Amendment?

Representative Cummings of the 74th District.

Madam, you have the floor.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I rise in favor of the Amendment and will reserve my comments for the underlying Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Opposed? Nay. The ayes have it [Gavel. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark on the Bill as amended? Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an extremely Bill to our State’s economy. It seeks to promote and support our tourism industry which is a critical sector in Connecticut supporting over 82,000 jobs, $1.7 billion dollars in revenue and over $14 billion dollars in business sales in our State every year. This Bill comes from an excellent bipartisan commission that you commissioned, Mr. Speaker in 2018 made up of experts from across the State on tourism and made a number of recommendations which we are seeking to implement in this Bill. First and foremost, we are aiming to reopen our Visitor Welcome Centers which is an important part of our tourism industry. Right now you see the closed signs when you are driving through the State. This Bill seeks to reopen them so you don’t have to see those closed signs so they are open for business and
Connecticut is welcoming visitors back to our State.

Secondly this Bill creates a Connecticut Tourism Council appointed by leaders on both sides of aisle that will fall under DECD. And then thirdly this Bill requires DOT to look at ways we can loosen or ease the regulations on way finding signage in our State. Right now, believe it or not, there are 500 available slots in way finding signs across our State that cold be used by businesses to advertise local businesses, tourist attractions, food and gas locations. But what we heard from them is there’s such strict regulations that they are not able to get their businesses listed on these signs which is extremely frustrating and something we need to fix so we’re working with DOT to each those regulations so we can get more business to advertise on support local jobs and revenue to our State. So it is an excellent Bill, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Ranking Member of the Commerce Committee for all their support in passing this unanimously and I urge my colleagues to support this Bill.
Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. To the esteemed Vice or the esteemed Ranking Member of the Commerce Committee, Representative Cummings, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are you giving me a promotion?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Might be [Laughter].

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

A couple of questions to the good proponent of the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I believe she is prepared. Representative Cummings please proceed.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker is there a fiscal note associated with the implementations under this Bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Through the Amendment we have essentially taken out the fiscal by adding in, “subject to available funds” because we don’t want to place a mandate. However we are working as part of our broader budget negotiations to provide some funding in order that we can reopen these.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Cummings.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the good proponent of the Bill please identify the areas of tourism that are going to be represented on this council?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, it will be a 27-member council with representation from lodging industry, the restaurant associations, tourist attractions, Chambers of Commerce, the Heritage Industry, the airline industry, the arts industry, the gaming industry, and several other tourism related industries.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Cummings.

REP. CUMMINGS (74TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I am particularly encouraged by the provision that is going to look at lessening the burden on the way finding signs. I took a look at some of the regulations and they are regulations such as “A business on the sign is only allowed to be within
one turn of the end of the exit ramp” they “must have a phone available to the public” which is completely outdated in today’s age when everyone has a cellphone and if you, and it’s only “limited to six” and lodging “must have ten rooms” which would completely prohibit some of our small Beds and Breakfasts and it is not good for small business so I am very encouraged to see that we are going to be lessening the burden on our business and our communities. It is something that the State of Connecticut is well overdue for. I rise in support of this Bill and I encourage my colleagues to support as well. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Borer of the 115th. Madam, you now have the floor.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you to the good Chairwoman of the Commerce Committee. I’ll be very brief as I know it is getting late. But I just
wanted to lend by support to this legislation. I want to thank the Speaker for commissioning the Blue Ribbon Panel, in particular I’m grateful that the component where we’re going to be opening the Welcome Centers, what a bad message it has been over the years that we have closed the Welcome Centers and sent a message that we are closed for business. So this is going to turn this around. I think having those centers closed has not been a good message about the pride that we feel for our State and the willingness that we have to showcase all of the attractions that we have in Connecticut. So in Connecticut we have a very valuable arts, culture and tourism industry, we don’t invest a fraction of what the other states do in our arts, culture and tourism industry and this is just a small step in that direction. I recognize that there is a fiscal note but we also know that for every one dollar that we spend, we see a return on investment of three dollars so this is a good investment and it is a good investment because it is time to change our
message in Connecticut and tell people that we are open for business. They are welcome here and most importantly they are welcome to spend their money here. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Thank you very much, madam. Representative MacLachlan of the 35th District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. MAC LACHLAN (35TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few brief comments if I may?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Please proceed, sir.

REP. MAC LACHLAN (35TH):

    Thank you, sir. It has been a pleasure representing the Town of Westbrook for the past four and a half years having grown up there. I do want to thank the good Chairwoman of the Commerce Committee and the Ranking Member for their work to address the fact that our Welcome Center has been closed for a number of years. You know, Westbrook
is a shoreline town. It is a town that folks come to from out-of-state to enjoy some of the best aspects of Connecticut’s tourism industry and for several years now we’ve has a large closed sign on our Welcome Center as the good Representative from the 115th pointed out, that sends a terrible message to the point that we’re trying to communicate in this Chamber is that Connecticut is open for business. And so I do want to thank the leadership of the Committee for making an effort to appropriate funds where available. You know, as a pass-through town on 95, folks from Massachusetts, Rhode Island and New York come through and I do appreciate that we are fighting for small towns and I look forward to the budget negotiations that will continue to make sure we prioritize the tourism industry in the State of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Representative Carney of the 23rd you have the floor, sir.
REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If I may?
Through you.
A few questions of the proponent of the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Simmons looks prepared.
Representative Carney please proceed.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Okay, thank you very much. I was just wondering if the good Chairwoman of Commerce could tell me if she knows who was on the Blue Ribbon Panel?
Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Yes.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

There were about 15 members on the Blue Ribbon Commission and it was a bipartisan commission of experts across the tourism industry including
representatives from Middlesex Chamber, casinos, from the Wadsworth Museum, the Mark Twain House and a number of other tourism sites across our State.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Carney.

REP CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you very much for that response. Are there any other recommendations from the Blue Ribbon Panel?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, there were a series of recommendations. Another one was to divert 25 percent of the sales tax, oh sorry, the hotel tax back to the tourism districts. That was one of the main recommendations that we didn’t feel responsible to take this year given our budget deficit.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Carney.

REP CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you very much for that response. Just one last question, I was just wondering if the good Chairwoman knows whether we can sell or lease our Welcome Centers to a for-profit or an nonprofit business.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS (144TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you for that question, Representative.

There are strict federal regulations from the Federal Highway Administration on Commercializing our rest areas. Generally they give states the sole authority to control and maintain and operate those, but we can in certain circumstances contract them out.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Carney.

REP CARNEY (23RD):

I do appreciate the good Chairwoman from Commerce’s responses. I have to say I am somewhat disappointed in this legislation. I am going to support it but I think we could do more, some of the recommendations that the Blue Ribbon Commission had sought was certainly to reopen the Welcome Centers, this Bill doesn’t do that, reinvest more in tourism dollar, create a strategic tourism plan and review marketing strategy branding and slogan. I’ve talked to so many folks from across my district which is so tourism heavy, they talk about all of these things to me and I really think we need to be mindful of that, not just in this legislation but through many pieces of legislation we’ve seen here so far this year and could see later in the year that could have a negative impact on the tourism industry. Like I said though, I am going to support this today. I
think we need to keep the conversation going but I would like to see more substance hopefully next year. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? If not, Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Will the Members take your seats, the machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7306 as Amended by House “A”

Total Number Voting 141
Necessary for Passage 71
Those voting Yea 141
Those voting Nay 0
Absent not voting 10

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill passes as Amended. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 336.

CLERK:


SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Steinberg of the 136th. You
have the floor, sir.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative Steinberg, please proceed.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have had many momentous Bills this session and we will have many more. Mr. Speaker this Bill is not one of them. [Laughter] The Clerk has an Amendment LCO 9344. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be grated leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9344 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”.

CLERK:
House Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 9344
offered by Representative Steinberg, Senator Daughtery-Abrams and Representative Petit.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Steinberg you have the floor.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This addresses an opportunity to expand the education of lifeguards in particular in CPR, use of defibrillators and first aid in general by identifying additional potential educators in this regard. The Amendment explicitly deals with the only issue we had which is not putting the Department of Public Health in charge of stipulating who would be allowed to do this additional education and instead provides the most expert organization that opportunity. This is a very straightforward Bill. It will make sure that
we have more lifeguards trained in CPR, AEDs, and first aid and I move adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on Adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark on the Amendment? Will you remark on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed. Nay. The ayes have it [Gavel] the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Representative Petit of the 22nd District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very uncontroversial Bill will help with the training of lifeguards and other first responders across the State and I urge all my colleagues to vote for it. Thank you very much, sir.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Klarides-Ditria of 105th. Madam, you have the floor.

REP. KLARIDES-DITRIA (105TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good Bill, ought to pass.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, madam. Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Members take your seats, the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 6146 as Amended by House “A”

Total Number Voting 141
Necessary for Passage 71
Those voting Yea 141
Those voting Nay 0
Absent not voting 10

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill as amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 300.

CLERK:

On Page 23, House Calendar 300 House Bill 6916 AN ACT EXPANDING REMEDIES AND POTENTIAL LIABILITY FOR UNREASONABLY CONTESTED OR DELAYED WORKERS' COMPENSATION CLAIMS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Public Employees.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Johnson of the 49th District. Madam, you have the floor.
REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Will you remark? Representative Johnson you have the floor.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Clerk has an Amendment LCO 9426 and 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. 9426 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 9426 offered by Representative Porter, Senator Kushner, et al.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Johnson, please proceed.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker this is a Bill that came out of the Labor Committee unanimously and after further discussion because of the complexities of the Workers’ Compensation System, because of the complexities of the Court System also because of all the different types of medical conditions that require good analysis, we’ve agreed to create a work study group, a task force to study the processes of the Workers’ Compensation Commission and also how the interaction between the Court System, the Workers’ Compensation and all types of medical advisors will work together to make sure that injuries that are sustained by employee are going to be addressed more rapidly than they have been in some circumstances in the Workers’
Compensation Commission. So we have worked with business community, we’ve worked with members here in the Chamber and I think that we have a good agreement to try to make sure that everybody will have a voice during this study. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Polletta of the 68th on the Amendment. Let me try your minds on the Amendment. All those in favor signify by saying, aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, nay. The Amendment [Gavel] is adopted. Representative Poletta would you now like to speak on the Bill as Amended?

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

And Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening. Very briefly I would just like to thank the
proponent of the Amendment for making some necessary changes and including a few more members here on our side of the aisle so I will support this and I urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? If not Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Members take your seats, the machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill No. 6916 as Amended by House “A”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill as Amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 589.

CLERK:


SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The esteemed Chair of the Finance Committee, Representative Rojas you have the floor, sir.
REP. ROJAS (9TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Will you remark? Representative Rojas.

REP. ROJAS (9TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is similar to Bills that we passed in 29 other states which allow various public service utility companies to come into the state more quickly with reduced administrative regulations and burdens when responding to disasters in the State. The Clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO 9384. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be grated leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9384 which
will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 9384 offered by Representative Rojas, Representative Davis, et al.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize Amendment. Is there any objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Rojas you have the floor.

REP. ROJAS (9TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment makes some clarifying changes to the Bill that clarifies exactly what activities can be disregarded when an out-of-state business is coming into the State to do disaster relief and also clarifies that to the extent that the Secretary of State requests any information for out-of-state business it doesn’t preclude that business from doing a disaster relief activities. I move adoption.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Davis will you remark on the Amendment, sir? Please proceed.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the Chairman of the Committee did an excellent job in explaining the Amendment and I stand in support of it.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on Adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark? Will you remark? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying, aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes [Gavel] have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark on the Bill as Amended? Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of
this Bill. As the kind Chairman mentioned that this should and hopefully will lead to greater response times during disasters by undoing some of the unnecessary burdens that are placed on out-of-state companies that come in to try to repair our infrastructure after major accidents or disasters, so I stand in support of this Bill and I am hopeful that my colleagues do as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? If not Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Will the Members take your seats, the machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll, Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll, Members to the Chamber.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7376 as Amended by House “A”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill passes as Amended. [Gavel]

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

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker many are asking about tomorrow’s start time. We are going to start at eleven o’clock
tomorrow.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

   Eleven a.m. tomorrow. Thank you very much, sir. Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 293.

CLERK:

   On Page 23, House Calendar 293, Substitute House Bill No. 5883 AN ACT CONCERNING WORKERS' COMPENSATION INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR DETOXIFICATION FOR CERTAIN INJURED EMPLOYEES, LOCAL AND REGIONAL BOARD OF EDUCATION EMPLOYEE NOTICES AND REIMBURSEMENT OF LOST WAGES FOR APPEARANCE AT A DEPOSITION. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Public Employees.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

   Representative Winkler of the 56th District, you have the floor.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

   Mr. Speaker, I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Mr. Speaker this Bill passed unanimously in the Labor Committee however the Ranking Member suggested better wording and we have incorporated his suggestions. The Clerk has an Amendment LCO 9396. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be granted leave to summarize.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9396 which will be designated as House Amendment Schedule “A”.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 9396 offered by Representative Porter, Representative Winkler, etal.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to
summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Winker, you have the floor.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

The Amendment simply makes it clearer as to the fact that opioid treatment will be considered as part of a workers’ comp claim and their treatment for the opioid addiction would be provided. I move passage.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Question before the Chamber is on adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark on the Amendment? Representative Polletta of the 68th, sir you have the floor.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and good evening. This Amendment was brought to our attention earlier today and I thank the good Representative for adopting the language making it a friendly Amendment.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

With that, those in favor of the Amendment please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark on the Bill as Amended? If not, Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Representative Fishbein of the 90th District, you have the floor.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, sir and good evening.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good evening.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

If I may I have a few questions for the proponent?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I believe Representative Winkler is prepared.
Representative Fishbein please proceed.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, sir. So it is my understanding that under this Bill, that if an employee is injured in the course of their employment therefore going on a workman’s comp and they get addicted to opioids that detoxification would be part of workman’s comp. Is that true?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Yes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And in conjunction with that, would there be an increase in workers’ comp premiums for private businesses under the system we presently have?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. This treatment is already required. We’re simply making it explicit because we found that certain people were not seeking treatment because it wasn’t explicit on how it would be paid for. I can go into more detail about why there were uncomfortable about applying for withdrawal treatment if the good Representative would like.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was my understanding that this treatment was already required for municipal and state workers and therefore there was no fiscal note tied to that but I am unaware of it being mandated for private
employees otherwise we wouldn’t need this statute is my understanding. So if I can understand why we would need this statute if this already exists.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It wasn’t explicit in the Workers’ Comp Statute it is explicit in the Insurance Statute and we had trouble with people not applying for opioid withdrawal partially because their medical bills were getting hung-up between insurance companies and they were unclear as to whether or not this would be paid for and because their medical bills in some cases were already hung-up they didn’t want to see treatment that would lead to further Bills being hung-up. So we just wanted to make it explicit in the Statute.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I would think that the current premiums for worker’s comp is based upon the current statute so the representation was that this would not lead to an increase in premiums so I must ask the good Representative.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

The basis of that representation cause I see nothing before us.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER (56TH):

It is my understanding that insurance policies written in the State of Connecticut must include opioid withdrawal treatment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
I’ll take the good Representative at his word at this point. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Representative Dubitsky of the 47th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker you will be happy to hear that I have nothing to say on this Bill [Laughter].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Well played, Representative. Well played. [Applause]. Staff and guest to the Well of the House. Members take your seats, the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll, Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll, Members to the Chamber.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

And the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 5883 as Amended by House “A”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill as Amended is passed. [Gavel]. Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 242.

CLERK:

On Page 18, House Calendar 242, House Bill No.
5181 AN ACT REQUIRING THE PUBLIC UTILITIES
REGULATORY AUTHORITY TO STUDY THE CREATION OF A NEW
RATE CLASS FOR GAS COMPANIES. Favorable Report of
the Joint Standing Committee on Energy and
Technology.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Mr. Speaker the Clerk has an Amendment LCO No.
8229. I would ask the Clerk to please call the
Amendment and grant me leave of the Chamber to
summarize.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 8229 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 8229 offered by Representative Arconti, Representative Ferraro, et al.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Arconti you have the floor.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker this Amendment directs PURA to conduct a study of a new rate class and PURA will report the findings of the study by February 1, 2020 to the Committee of cognizance which is Energy and Technology. I move adoption.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is Adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark on the Amendment? Will you remark on the Amendment? Representative Ferraro of the 117th sir, you have the floor.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For all the reasons that the good Chairman has just spoken on the Amendment, I rise in strong support for the Amendment and ask that my colleagues do the same. Thank you, sir.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The
Amendment is adopted.  [Gavel]  Will you remark on the Bill as Amended?  Will you remark on the Bill as Amended?  Representative O’Neill of the 69th District.  Sir, you have the floor.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Yes, very briefly, Mr. Speaker.  I wish to thank the Co-Chair and the Ranking Member of the Energy Committee for their hard work on this matter.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir.  Staff and guests to the Well of the House.  Members take your seats, the machine will be open.  [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 5181 as Amended by House “A”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill as Amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 275.

CLERK:


SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Abercrombie of the 83rd District, madam you have the floor.
REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Will you remark? Representative Abercrombie, you have the floor.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Mr. Speaker the Clerk has an Amendment LCO 8769. I ask that they call the Amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 8769 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”.

CLERK:

House “A” LCO No. 8769 offered by Representative Abercrombie, Senator Moore and Representative Case.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker where permissible under Federal Laws breast mild donor would be now covered. I move adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on Adoption of the Amendment. I will try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying, aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Representative Case of the 63rd you have the floor.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a great topic,
great Bill. I’ve learned a lot about this topic over the last year and learning about what we can do further. Good Bill, ought to pass and I thank the good Chairwoman for her hard work in getting this Amendment going through. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Mastrofrancesco of the 80th District. Ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Abercrombie, please prepare yourself. Representative please proceed.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. I am happy to hear, I listened to this Bill in Human Services and I had some concerns about it. I think it’s great that infants when they are born premature obviously breastmilk is the best thing we can do for them. But I did have some
concerns about this Bill in Human Services and I’m glad to hear that this Amendment, that Medicaid will cover the breastmilk under this Amendment. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DSS has to do a SPA which is a State Plan Amendment to get it covered through Medicaid.

Through you, Madam, ah, Mr. Speaker, sorry.

[Laughter]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

It’s getting late. Representative it’s totally okay. Representative Mastrofrancesco. You have the floor, ma’am.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And through you. Is that because I know Medicaid right now will not cover breastmilk because
it is considered a food. Is it because it would have to be medically necessary and they will then cover that under that? Do we have confirmation that it will be covered through Medicaid if it was done through prescription?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

There is no confirmation on this. You never get confirmation from CMS unless you do a State Plan Amendment.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

The other concern, there’s two more concerns I have on this Bill. The cost. We don’t really know
what the cost is, right. I remember hearing in the Public Hearing it is very expensive, right. There was a fortifier that came with it, it was a very expensive and so we don’t know the exact fiscal note on it, number one. The other question I have and the concern is, is this covered through, if people are not on Medicaid, and they have regular insurance, would you know if they are covered through regular insurance?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is not addressed in this Bill, we are only pertaining to Medicaid.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you.

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

That was a concern of mine. I mean I think
this is great and it should really be covered for everyone and that’s where I am having concerns with it. And what happens to a baby when their mother or the family is just over the line and they are not on Medicaid and they cannot afford it, what happens to their baby. I would love to see this for everyone. And those were my concerns. I will listen if there is any more questions and make a decision but I appreciate it and I think it is a wonderful thing that we can do for our infants. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? If not, Staff and guests the Well of the House. Members take your seats, the machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Have all members voted? I know many members are off in various areas negotiating Bills but I’d ask you to stay close to the Chamber. If all the members have voted please check the board to make sure your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7165 as Amended by House “A”

Total Number Voting 141
Necessary for Passage 71
Those voting Yea 141
Those voting Nay 0
Absent not voting 10

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Bill as Amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 69.

CLERK:

On Page 4, House Calendar 69, Substitute House Bill No. 5124, AN ACT INCREASING THE PROPERTY TAX
ABATEMENT FOR CERTAIN FIRST RESPONDERS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Planning and Development.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey of the 133rd have the floor, madam.

REP. MC CARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Will you remark? Representative McCarthy Vahey you have the floor.

REP. MC CARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker this Bill increases reducing property tax abatements from $1,000 dollars to $1,500 dollars through June 30, 2021 and to $2,000 dollars afterwards for the 22,000 volunteer fire fighters around our State. This is
permissive and the Legislative body would pass it by ordinance and the abatement can decrease the amount of taxes. It was passed unanimously out of Committee.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam. Will you remark further on the Bill before us? Representative Zawistowski of the 61st madam, you have the floor.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Volunteer fire fighters and other first responders are incredibly important to our communities. This is a very modest increase in incentive that we hope will help with the recruiting effort. It went through unanimously in Committee. It is permissive, it is not a mandate by any means and I recommend approval. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Representative
Yaccarino of the 87th. You have the floor, sir.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to thank the good Chair of P&D and the good Ranking Member. This is so important to our men and women that volunteer every day. They sacrifice, they don’t get paid and this is very important so I urge support and thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much. Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Members take your seats, the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 5121.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 422.

CLERK:


SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarty Vahey of the 133rd you
have the floor.

REP. MC CARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MC CARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker this Bill amends the Charter of the Grove Beach Point Association. It clarifies the voting rights within the Association and allowable locations for meetings and notice requirements. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO No. 9397 and 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. 9397 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”.
Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative McCarthy Vahey you have the floor.

REP. MC CARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Amendment simply strikes the Charter and By-Laws in line 111 and charter in line 115 in order to assure that the State retains the ability to manage those and the Beach Association the Rules and I move adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Representative Zawistowski of the 61st, you have the floor.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):
I support this Amendment and will have a couple of comments on the Bill. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, madam. Let me try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying, aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark on the Bill as Amended? Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Mr. Speaker this solves the problem for an organization setup by a Special Act which does require State action. It was unanimous in Committee. I recommend support.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Staff and guests to the Well of the House. House Members 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.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 6747

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill as Amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 215.

CLERK:

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey of the 133rd, you have the floor.

REP. MC CARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Will you remark?

REP. MC CARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker this allows any town that has a police commission established by Special Act to adopt an ordinance with the Provisions of the Special Act.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This solves the problem between a conflict between a Special Act and a later Statute. I recommend approval. Good Bill, ought to pass.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Members take your seats, the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Don’t run, ya got time. Have all members voted? If all the members have voted please check the board to make sure your vote has been properly
cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 6122

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] Representative Kupchick of the 132nd.

REP. KUPCHICK (132ND):

Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please House Calendar 349.

CLERK:

On Page 27, House Calendar 349 House Bill 7113

AN ACT CONCERNING EDUCATION ISSUES. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Education.
Representative Sanchez of the 25th you have the floor, sir.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Mr. Speaker the Clerk has Amendment LCO 9470. 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. 9470 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “B”.

CLERK:
House Amendment Schedule “B” LCO No. 9470 offered by Representative Sanchez, Representative McCarty.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Mr. Speaker this is a strike of Section 2 in its entirety and renumber sections in the internal references accordingly.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will you move Adoption?

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

I move Adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much. Representative McCarty of the 38th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. MC CARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of
the Amendment and thank my colleagues on the Education Committee for his cooperation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, nay. They aye’s have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? If not, Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Will the Members please take your seats, the machine will be 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? All members have voted. Please check the board to ensure your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7113 as Amended by House “A” and “B”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill as Amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 71.

CLERK:

On Page 4, House Calendar 71, Substitute House Bill 5417 AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY
THE USE OF BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY TO MANAGE ELECTOR INFORMATION. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Fox of the 148th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good evening, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Will you remark Representative Fox?

REP. FOX (148TH):

Mr. Speaker the Bill establishes a task force
to study the use of blockchain technology to manage
elector information. The task force is going to
look a feasibility, cost, benefits, security
concerns with a report due no later than January 1,

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much. Representative Buckbee of
the 67th you have the floor, sir.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate this.
This concept was kind of brought up last year from
the good Chair of Commerce. We started talking
about some of these concepts and why blockchain
needs to be implemented. I’m sorry I thought this
we were gonna get this in the nine o’clock hour,
really close but it is super important with a Bill
like this that we take that time again to get out in
front of this, really hit ‘em with the hind and get
this thing passed on. Great Bill, ought to pass.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative Yaccarino of the 87th.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was part of the working group with Representative Caroline Simmons and a few other people last year, for six months. So we did have a study, we did have the results but unfortunately we didn’t do anything this year but I hope if this passes we can do something finally, very important technology, it leads to high paying jobs and is very important, so thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Members take your seats, the machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Have all members voted? Have all members voted? If all the members have voted, please check the board to make sure your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 5417

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Voting</th>
<th>142</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not voting</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 318.

CLERK:

Speaker Aresimowicz (30th):

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

Rep. Conley (40th):

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

Speaker Aresimowicz (30th):

Question before the Chamber is Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill. Will you remark?

Rep. Conley (40th):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment LCO No. 9477. 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. 9477 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”.

Clerk:

House Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 9477
offered by Representative Conley, Representative de la Cruz.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? If not, Representative Conley.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Groton has been presented a very unique opportunity within the last few days to have the sale for the U.S.S. Groton to be right next to the library in the Senior Center. Our great employer Electric Boat has offered within a short period of time to put the sale together as a no-cost basis for the town so that members of the town and the submariners can enjoy the U.S.S. Groton, built in Groton, made in Groton and sailed around the world.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? Representative
Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I wanted to thank the Representative Conley for working together to get the final Amendment out, ready to go, still a number of questions to be answered. We will be looking forward to the Public Hearing on Tuesday, once we schedule that. Recommend passage.

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Aye.

Those opposed, nay. The aye’s have it. The Amendment is adopted. Representative Conley of the 40th. Representative Ritter of the 1st District.

Mr. Speaker, I move that we refer this item to
GAE Committee. Thank you. For the referral to GAE without objection, so ordered. [Gavel]

Are there any announcements or introductions? Oh, hang on we have some late read-ins. Mr. Clerk is there any business on your desk?

CLERK:

There is business from the Senate, Favorable Senate Bills and Senate Joint Resolutions to be tabled for the Calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move we waive the reading of the Senate Favorable Reports and the Resolutions to be tabled for the Calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing none, so ordered. [Gavel] Now is there any announcement or introductions. Representative Rojas of the 75th, sir you have the floor.

REP. ROJAS (9TH):
Mr. Speaker for purpose of Journal Notation we have Representative Young, Garibay, Rose - sick. Outside Chamber business: Walker.
In District business. Butler, Sims, Barry, Orange, Wood, Candelora, Lopes, Rosario and Baker. And personal, Representative Miller, Representative McGee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Betts of the 78th.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Purpose of Journal Notation.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you. Representative Camillo was out due to surgery. Representative Bolinsky was out due to funeral. Representative Smith is out of state and Representative O’Dea was in District. Thank you very much.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Curry.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just again another reminder we are in tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. and there being no further business on the Clerk’s desk, I move that we adjourn subject to the Call of the Chair.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on Acceptance to Adjournment subject to the Call of the Chair. Without objection, we are adjourned. [Gavel]

(On motion of Representative Currey of the 11th District, the House adjourned at 10:06 o’clock p.m., to meet again at the Call of the Chair.)
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