THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 2019

(The House of Representatives was called to order at 1:00 o'clock p.m., Representative Joe Aresimowicz of the 30th District in the Chair.)

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives will convene immediately, members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives will convene immediately, members to the Chamber.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

RABBI ALAN LEFKOWITZ:

Good afternoon. In the spirit of yesterday's Memorial Day, I wanted to offer a prayer. It's a very emotional day just being part of a parade, hearing the music and seeing veterans especially from WWII who are...
slowly leaving us, so a prayer for our God, God of our ancestors, we thank You for the numerous blessings You have bestowed upon our Nation. Out of the many nations of the world, our Country has been blessed with a singular opportunity - to demonstrate how people of many faiths and heritages can live side by side and enrich one another's lives through friendship and the sharing of our unique traditions.

We are united on the day of memory, yesterday, Memorial Day, as a solemn act of gratitude to those who have served in our Nation's defense, to those who have risked their personal safety to save the lives of others, and above all, to those who have died serving this Country. Their sacrifices are forever remembered by us and by our children for generations to come. We do not forget, and we will never forget, despite those who desire to put these events behind us.

Our hearts go out to those serving today in our armed forces and to their families. Those present, those who are here who are veterans of previous wars, know best of all what they must be feeling and thinking, what their spouses and children are feeling and thinking, and for what they are praying. In all
our many faiths, we are united in this - our prayers are with those who serve our country today and ask God that they may return speedily and in good health and safety to their loved ones. May God grant each of us the wisdom to uphold this Nation's virtues that it may continue to serve as a beacon of liberty and harmony between people, for all the world to see. As it says in Scripture, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land!"

We say Amen.

(ALL) Amen.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Would Representative Ferraro of the 117th district, please come to the dais and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

(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):

Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Zawistowski of the 61st district, madam, you have the floor.
REP. ZAWISTWOSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purposes of an announcement?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. ZAWISTWOSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Old New Gate Prison and Copper Mine which is a state-owned museum in East Granby --

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Gavel] I'd just ask the noise to stay down in the Chamber while a member is making an announcement, please. Go ahead, Representative, I apologize.

REP. ZAWISTWOSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'll start over. Old New Gate Prison and Copper Mine is a state-owned museum located in East Granby, Connecticut. This has just opened for the first time for a full season in ten years. To celebrate this, I've arranged for a special tour for legislators. It's going to be on June 27, uh, 11:30 in the morning. You're going to be receiving an email this afternoon with details. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you can join
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Yeah, really cool place, I've been there before. I'm going to plan on attending. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Smith of the 108th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good to see you, sir.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Thank you. Today, ladies and gentleman of the Chamber, I'm honored to have with me a student from New Fairfield High School who's going to shadow me for the following week and see what we do up here in Hartford especially here in the House. It's Hannah Rigoglioso. She is going to the University of Delaware and she's anxious to get there, but also anxious about politics and what we do here in the State so I'm hoping you can all give her a great welcome and applause. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two introductions to make here. On our right, and I would ask that they waive, from Achievement First Hartford High School, please waive. We have 12 sophomores through senior students and their AP Government and Politics teacher, Ms. Olson. Could we give them a round of applause please, Mr. Speaker. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Welcome to the Capital.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

And then we have another one. We have Bridgeport Achievement First. Where's Achievement First Bridgeport Academy Middle School. They're over there waiving as well, 8th graders with their academic dean, Ms. Fox. [Applause] And I've got one more, Mr. Speaker. They gave me a lot to do today.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Wow.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Braeburn Elementary School which is down here form West Hartford. [Applause] I was asked to do
Braeburn because my nephew, Jacob Schwartz, is a 2nd grader at the school and so he asked me to do that on his behalf so welcome everybody, enjoy your day at the Capital. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

    Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Good afternoon, sir.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

    I think it's a Hartford thing here today. I'm honored to go after our good majority leader here, but I'm delighted. This month we're celebrating lupus. It's National Lupus Awareness month and we're so privileged to have such a great advocate Delmarys Serrano-McDonald. Just waive your hand. She's here with her boys and her little girl [Applause] and she's definitely a survivor and we're so delighted that today, she took the time out to host a series of workshops to really educate us on lupus and forgive me, I have a few names that I just want to mention and
I may mess them up, but please love me, okay? Colleen Hahn, Ambassador for Lupus Foundation, New Canaan Lupus Warrior. We have Arnita Christie, Engagement Liaison for GSK, Ruth Ramos Lupus Warrior, Matthew Maler, physical therapist from Live Fit and if this Chamber would be so kind just to give a round of applause to Lupus Warriors, people living with lupus. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Baker of the 124th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. BAKER (124TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say good morning, more like good afternoon to my children and students from Achievement First in Bridgeport. It's a great pleasure to see you come up here and learn all the things that we do and I welcome each and every one of you to the Chamber in Hartford. Thank you. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Ritter, before we recognize the Clerk for some of the business we have to do, you know West Hartford is very unique with their elementary
schools. I've learned that they're all divided up so like you're a Duffy parent or you're a Raeburn parent, they all have little names over there. I don't know if you're aware of that, Mr. Majority Leader. I've been told this. I'm sure members of the West Hartford Delegation, I see Representative Gilchrest now having a seat can really explain that to us too.

Representative Gilchrest of the 18th.

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction. I myself am a Morley mom, that is what we call ourselves, but so happy to see that Braeburn Elementary School is here which is in my District. Welcome Braeburn. I hope you have a fantastic day exploring the Capital.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, Representative. [Applause] With announcements and introductions being done, is there any business on the Clerk's desk?

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, I move that we waive the reading of the list of the Reports and the Reports be referred to the Committees indicated.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

So ordered.

CLERK:

And last, but not least, the daily calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. Just a few more days the whole Calendar's is gonna be the go list I think. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Announcement or introductions? Seeing none, the Chamber will stand at ease.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Chamber come back to order? Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 369?

CLERK:

On page 26, House Calendar 369, Substitute House Bill No. 7083, AN ACT CONCERNING THE INCLUSION OF PUERTO RICAN AND LATINO STUDIES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL CURRICULUM. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing
Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm, you have the floor, madam.

REP. PALM (36TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Clerk to call the LCO 9557, please call this amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9557, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A?"

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A," LCO No. 9557, offered by Representative Palm and Representative Sanchez.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative Palm, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a strike all amendment which would require the teaching of climate change consistent with the Next Generation's Science Standards. It revisits an issue from last week. We have removed the underlying fiscal note and I move adoption. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Consistent with the Next Generation Science Standards. We have removed the fiscal note and there is no more issue about mandates, fiscal notes or the development of a curriculum which exists so I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Vail, you have the floor, sir.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just concerned I don’t see the germaneness of this. Two separate subjects. Maybe you could explain that to me. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm. Should I call point of order? Is this a point of order?

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Yeah, I want to call a point of order on germaneness.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, I would disagree. This is a bill that deals with the inclusion of certain studies in public school curriculum and this underlying bill, the amendment is no different. It's a different topic, but it's the same underlying concept, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The House will stand at ease. The Chamber will come back to order. [Gavel] The Point of Order is not well taken. To determine whether an amendment is germane, Mason's Section 402 provides that it be relevant, appropriate, and in a natural and logical sequence to the subject matter of the original proposal and any subsequent amendments. The underlying bill proposes a change to standards for which is being taught in our public schools under the Connecticut General Statutes 10-16b. The strike all amendment replaces this change with another change to these same standards which is taught in our public schools in the same section of statutes. Consequently, the amendment is germane to the underlying bill and your Point of Order is not well taken and the amendment is purposely before us. Representative Vail, you have the floor, sir.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Okay. So I can speak on the amendment?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Yes, sir. You have the floor.
REP. VAIL (52ND):

Again, I understand and I accept your explanation. Thank you for that, but we're going to be voting on this and it says an act concerning the inclusion of Puerto Rican and Latino studies in public school curriculum. You know in the underlying amendment, was taken off a previous bill that was similar to this that we just debated last week that passed through this house after that was taken off. But to me, the title of the bill does matter for me personally. You know, an act concerning the inclusion of Puerto Rico and Latino studies in public school, we could have that debate and I think we had the other day cause I think that was part of the African American, adding that to the public curriculum but climate change, I don’t see the connection. I couldn’t vote this you know cause it just doesn’t make sense. This isn’t how this body is supposed to work. You know, I have a question through, through you for the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The Representative looks prepared. You may proceed.
REP. VAIL (52ND):

Did the underlying amendment receive a public hearing?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

There was no public hearing on this particular amendment. There was a public hearing on the teaching of climate change in several iterations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

So if there was no public hearing, how is the public supposed to view, extend their concerns or questions to this particular amendment?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

There were several public hearings on different iterations and different bills which included climate change teaching for which there were public hearings.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

So if that were the case, why didn’t you use the language on the bills that did receive a public hearing?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Because this is a strike all amendment.

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Again, to me this represents everything that's wrong with politics right now. This is, I find it deceitful and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment
before us? Representative MacLachlan of the 35th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few comments and a few questions to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going through the amendment here. I do recall that much of this language was contemplated in a former bill that was debated on the floor so I'm re-familiarizing myself with the language here and I wanted to point to, start at section 6 here, I'm sorry, line 6, in the public schools, the program of instruction shall be offered, offered shall include at least the following subject matters. Through you, Mr. Speaker, should I, is it my understanding and is my understanding correct that, that this amendment is a mandate?

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, this would mandate the teaching of climate change to the state statutes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative MacLachlan.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. You know I think many of us, there are a range of opinions on the topic of climate change. I for one believe that it's one of the greatest, uh, greatest problems that, and challenges that our generation will face personally. As a person who has participated in the renewable energy field, it's something that I feel very strongly about, but I also represent three small towns and we all know that times are really hard for, uh, for small municipalities, uh, in our state's current financial climate with talks of you know making cuts to whether it be educational cost-sharing or saddling small towns with the additional costs of teacher pension obligations. These are all real financial challenges that towns are facing in the State of Connecticut right now and so my primary concern is not with whether or not towns should be
teaching and schools should be teaching climate change, but whether or not we should be mandating public schools at this time to not only teach climate on top of everything they are currently tasked with doing, but a number of other subject matters and so for me, my issue with this amendment is not with the content or of the importance of educating youth on climate change to make informed decisions to reduce our carbon footprint, but rather to saddle our towns with additional costs.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, would the proponent of the bill have a fiscal note or a projected cost upon small towns?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there is no fiscal note. It has been removed. This amendment would require the teaching of climate change consistent with the Next Generation Science Standards which were adopted by the State of Connecticut in 2015. The curriculum has already been developed by the
Department of Environmental and Energy Protection so there is no fiscal note and there is no need for curriculum development. It is posted on the DEEP websites.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative MacLachlan.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

And I appreciate the good Representative's answers, I really do. 2015 was my first session here in this body when we passed the Next Generation Science Standards. Would good Representative help me understand the major points, purposes of the Next Generation Science Standards, the, you know, what, I'm sorry what information they're looking to promote that be taught in our school systems? If the good Representative wouldn't mind just helping me better understand what those standards are, I'd be very thankful.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good Representative for those questions. NGSS was developed by states, by advocates, by teachers, by legislators for the use in all 50 states, 19 of which have adopted it and they are methodological approaches to the study of science. Starting in the 5th grade, they would require the teaching of an understanding of climate change. They are age appropriate, class appropriate, and they develop over time in their complexity and in the range.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative MacLachlan.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So am I to understand then, Mr. Speaker, through you, that the Next Generation Science Standards only, are only opining to curriculum and subject matter pertaining to climate change or are other subjects considered in these standards?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.
REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. They are a broad and deep guide or framework for the study of science in all its many forms, not just climate change science. That is one component.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative MacLachlan.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

I appreciate that and I certainly think it's important, particularly as this body focuses on STEM careers, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, but also on the vocational fields to make sure that our young people are being prepared to compete in a highly competitive work environment and so making sure that we are on the forefront and the cutting edge of our scientific education and curriculum I think is paramount to preparing our young people so I do appreciate the good Representative's explanation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative?

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):
Yes, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

If you could hold on? [Gavel] I'm having trouble hearing the gentleman from the 35th. If you could just take your conversations outside of the Chamber? Thank you. You may proceed.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So line 6, you know we start to see that this amendment would mandate a number of subject matters, not just climate change starting with the subject of the arts, going into career education, consumer education, health and safety, human growth and development, nutrition, first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation training, disease prevention and cancer awareness to also include self-screening, community and consumer health, physical, mental and emotional health. There's a lot of good stuff in here. There's a lot of topics that I think are going to you know taken in a vacuum are probably beneficial for the development of young people.

I don't think it's the subject matter that I have a concern with, but rather the volume in subject matter that is being mandated, that small towns who
are being asked to do more with less will be forced to now figure out how to incorporate into a day's worth of schooling.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, in line 7, the amendment contemplates the instruction of subject matter by legally qualified teachers. Uh, through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the legal qualification to teach career education?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the issue before us is the teaching of climate change through qualified science teachers and I do, by the way, appreciate the good Representative's support in theory of the importance of this issue. Currently, the mandate, which includes all those things, current statute includes those things he just elucidated, exist now. We would be adding the teaching of climate change into the science curriculum which already has qualified science teachers employed to do exactly that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do appreciate that and you know, you know, going through this bill and I appreciate, you know the opportunity, that's why we have the debates, to understand the content of you know one of hundreds of pieces of legislation that come before us in quick succession so I do appreciate the good Representative's explanations and for her advocacy on an issue that's very important to her and many individuals in the State of Connecticut.

The, I think we're missing an opportunity to talk about a component of education that is often forgotten and I think there have been efforts in this Chamber to include it into curriculum. I'm not sure if, if it's included here as I'm just you know running through the legislation as we go, but does this amendment contemplate social and emotional learning in any way?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I couldn’t be more in favor of social emotional learning but that is not
addressed in this current bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative MacLachlan.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was driving up to Hartford today before session. There was an interesting interview on NPR about the issue of depression and mental health amongst college students and talking about the number of pressures that young people feel to perform at a high level academically, to bring home impeccable grades in order to ensure themselves a great job when they get out of college with the looming threat of tens of thousands of dollars' worth of student loans, certainly impacting their ability to start a family of their own and to buy their own home. And one of the solutions that the guests in this interview, who are co-authors, were proposing was you know the education of social and emotional learning in middle school and high school if my memory serves me correct. And their argument was as follows and I'm paraphrasing. We do a fantastic job in our education system of focusing on and
prioritizing IQ information, the ability to process information, recall. Where we struggle a bit, particularly in a generation that is spending more and more time online is in you know preparing young people to deal with the emotional ramifications of adult life, of overcoming failure, self-regulation, you know monitoring their internal narrative in the form of self-talk. These are things that I think are taken for granted perhaps and I think we're fortunate to be able to be at a time and place in the world where we are focusing on those types of problems as opposed to the kind of problems my grandparents faced which was where are we gonna get our next meal with them growing up during the Depression. These are the problems that we have to face and they're still important and so I think that you know a lot of good work has been done to advocate for social and emotional learning. I know my schools, particularly the Westbrook School System has made that a priority, um focusing on school climate, basically creating dialogues between students and teachers, students who wouldn’t normally have dialogue with one another under the premise that people who have relationships with one another tend
not to want to hurt one another and that the relational bond creates a sense of safety and makes it easier for young people to process information and synthesize.

And so I understand that you know we can't conquer every single issue in every single amendment, but I did want to highlight the importance of social and emotional learning as we're talking about um adding issues and subject matter to the list of mandates that our public schools need to teach.

Going on down this list, Mr. Speaker, I do understand that the issue of this amendment is to, uh, to add to a number of subject matter mandates the teaching of climate change consistent with Next Generation Science Standards that were adopted by the State Board of Education. Without seeming trite, Mr. Speaker, I do want to highlight an issue that I do believe this body should contemplate adding to maybe not a mandated subject matter, but enabling language sometime in the future and that is the subject matter of financial literacy.

Mr. Speaker, I've done a little bit of research on this and it's come to my attention that the average
credit card holder in the United States has something around $16,000 dollars' worth of credit card debt. That's an issue that I think we need to think about. Young people are spending, God I think I spent, we were in school for almost 12, 13, 14 years and I don't remember taking a single, not even a single period or class where I learned how to balance a checkbook or how to create a personal budget. I don't remember ever being instructed on the nature of debt and how a mortgage works and how college debt works and the positive or negative impacts debt can have in my life as a perspective college student. I was too focused on this pressure to keep up with the Jones's by getting into a college no matter the cost and studying something no matter the subject or the future income that that subject matter and degree would provide for me and so I think as we look to add subject matter to the very long list of mandated subjects our public schools are instructed by the State to teach, I think we need to really think long and hard about the single greatest human construct that governs our lives and that being finances and the fact that a young person basically enters adulthood without knowing anything
about how money works aside from what their parents teach them and, uh, I think that's really dangerous. I think if we're going to be talking about creating fiscal sustainability in the State of Connecticut, then we need to start with our young people teaching them the value of the dollar and some of the dangers of debt when used improperly and how to save and how compounding interest works. These are things that will create a higher quality of life and create more empowered adults if we could start early and I think that's, that's something that we should consider if not to be included in the underlying bill, in future legislation. So I do appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to share a few thoughts on what we ask, really what we tell our public school systems to do and I would ask that we just be very careful before asking them to put more work on their teachers' plates, create additional mandates for administration because those drive up costs and ultimately, those costs are bore by the taxpayer and I think we know how the taxpayers feel about their costs going up consistent so, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to share some thoughts on the issues at
hand. I look forward to the rest of the debate and I think the proponent of the amendment for her answers, her thoughtful responses.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker,

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative McCarty of the 38th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Through you, I just have quick question to the proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you very much. To Representative Palm, would you be able to explain the difference in the language between House Bill 7113, the other evening that we discussed at length and the language in this bill, this amendment?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I'm sorry, could you have the good Representative repeat the question, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarty, would you please repeat the question?

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Yes, certainly. I'm just asking the proponent if she could please clarify for the Assembly the difference in the language that appeared in House Bill 7113 the other evening that we discussed at quite some length, and the amendment that is before us this morning or this afternoon. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, the difference is that this is specifically about climate change. This is a specific strike all amendment and the other bill concerned some technical changes. The other change is there is no fiscal note. It has been removed.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Yes, I thank you for that explanation and if I just may make a few comments just to set the record straight. I believe that the language that we're looking at in this amendment is to be consistent with the Next Generation Science Standards that are currently mandated in our schools. This was done back a number of years ago when the State Board of Education adopted the standards so currently, the schools are to comply with the standards that are already in place concerning climate change and we test our students in grades 5, 8 and 11 on those standards which already include climate change so this discussion today, if this were not to go forward, I think we need to take a look at the standards because our children are tested on those standards that are currently in the Next Generation Science Standards so through you, Mr. Speaker, is that the understanding of the proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the good Representative for that question. The NGSS are not in fact in statute. That is the point of this amendment. It would put into statute; it would codify into law best practices that we already essentially do. The NGSS are curriculum guides and they are pedagogical tools that the SDE recommends. Anecdotally, we know that not all school districts may be in fact teaching this. The point of this is to make sure that all of the schools have the NGSS at their disposal and in fact, abide by them.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. We're actually going to stand at ease to fix a technical issue so the Chamber will stand at ease. The Chamber will come back to order. Representative McCarty, you have the floor, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we were discussing prior to being at ease, I was trying to point that
currently, our school districts are mandated to follow the Next Generation Science Standards. This is according to the State Department of Education so I just wanted to clear that with the proponent, that this was done back in 2015, that the State Board of Education approved the Next Generation Science Standards so currently, the schools should be following that. I've asked for a percentage. Do we have a number or percentage that may not be following the standards and I'm being told that almost all the schools are following the Next Generation Science Standards now and I just wondered if the proponent has an opinion on that, not an option, but is aware of that fact? Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, yes, and again, thanks to the good Representative for the question. I am aware that the vast majority of our schools are already teaching by the NGSS which are again, excellent standards. They are not, however, mandated. They are guides which most schools abide by.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. That would be somewhat in contradiction to what I am receiving from the State Department of Education and this is not an argument whether you're pro climate change or anti climate change but to just say what the practice is currently throughout our school districts, and it's my understanding that the State Board of Ed put this Next Generation Science Standards in place and climate change is one of those, and then just another point if I may, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

So there is no real time duration. This could be a topic in the science curriculum when science is taught in those grades, that it doesn’t mandate any particular amount of time that would have to be devoted to the topic; is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, yes, that's my understanding.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. So just in summary that to my knowledge and according to the State Department of Education, this was adopted in 2015 in the Next Generation Science Standards, it's applicable to 5, 8 and 11 when they are tested, and it's a mandate to follow the standards, but not necessarily a new mandate on the school districts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.
REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to understand how this amendment is different than the one we had last week. I understand the proponent mentioned that it's been changed to take out the fiscal note, but it remains a mandate with the answer of another question. So would the proponent please clarify for me, through you, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the amendment says that it would require, it would include climate change "consistent with the Next Generation Science Standards as adopted by the State Board of Education." There is no fiscal note. We already have science teachers teaching science. This would ensure that part of their curriculum includes climate change and again, since the DEEP has these curricula available, there is no fiscal note.

    Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Representative Piscopo.
REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the answer. My question would be on the fiscal note itself. Does the proponent have a fiscal note on this amendment? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I have a statement on the fiscal impact. There is no fiscal note.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so the words have changed from, in the last questioner, the words have changed from this amendment we're doing to the one we debated last week in that it is clear that now, teachers will be referencing the Next Generation Science Standards. Am I clear on that? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
Yes.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, I think what we, uh, I hate to go through this again this week because it seems like we just had this debate. You know we try not to be too repetitive in here and I don’t want to hash out the same debate we had last week but I guess we're forced to because here we go, you know, this amendment comes right back up a couple of days after we debated it. So just to make it clear what this body is voting on, the Next Generation Science Standards clearly state that human activity such as the release of greenhouse gases from burning fossil fuels are major factors, major factors in the current rise in earth's main surface temperature, global warming in parenthesis. So that's what teachers are going to be mandated to teach and that's wrong. It's just glaringly wrong. There is active scientific debate among scientists and others, politicians I guess today, that that's not, that's not
the case. There is a continuing scientific debate on this issue, many, many volumes. I have a petition from thousands of climate scientists in my office saying that that just simply is not the case and there's not exactly, it can't be determined how much global warming is caused by human burning of fossil fuels and what it's time and course will be on the effect of climate in the future. It's just on the face of it wrong. So if you see something wrong, why tie teachers' hands to debate one side of a debate. Like I said last week, it doesn't become teaching. It's indoctrination. You're indoctrinating the kids to learn one side of a legitimate scientific debate.

The climate does change so we have an ice age every 100,000 years or so. It takes 10,000 years to get out of an ice age, about 10,000 years, and we happen to be enjoying a period of global warming of a relatively warm climate on this globe. If I was talking to you about 10,000 years ago, we'd be under a half mile of ice right now so thank God for global warming.

A question, through you, to the proponent is you keep hearing this 98 percent of all scientists agree
with that. When was the survey done and how was the question asked?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As discussed previously, there are several sources on this fact including the New York Times, National Public Radio. I have a letter before me from the National Center for Science Education in Oakland, California that believes this is a solid bill for this reason of the unit, all but unanimous consensus on the effect of human activity on global climate chaos.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH):

Thank you. I thank the woman, the proponent for her answers. I have a document from some climate scientists saying that they were never polled, that climate scientists were never polled and the question wasn’t specifically asked on the effects of man-made
global warming. There was something cited about papers, about going over different papers on that but the question, that survey was never really done and it's just never been in publication. When, how the question was asked, who was asked the question so that figure gets thrown around a lot and I've just never seen any evidence of the exact poll.

You know this whole debate you know can be summed up in that we are tying teachers' hands. We want teachers to be free to be able to teach the way they want to teach, that there is a legitimate debate on climate. I would like all our students to learn about climate and how it changes and how it goes over the millennia of slow, slow change, 10,000 years from each ice age, we enter an ice age and then 10,000 more years of, uh, to achieve a global regular warming climate so if you ever could get down to the Smithsonian Institute, I think it's best portrayed that way. You'll see this huge column of all the eons and eras of the earth's history. It's about 30 feet tall and it shows the different ice ages that we've gone through and the Jurassic Period when there was a warming a while back and then you'll see the relative,
what we call the mini ice age in the 1600's. You'll see a warming period during the time of the Romans. You'll see another ice age coming after that and so you'll see that the earth does go in cycles and I think that for policy makers to steer students is just wrong. To develop a false crisis and to say we have to act now is wrong. The Paris Climate Change, uh, the Paris Climate Summit was designed to do that, to get the United States of America to all of a sudden start cutting its output of carbon dioxide and what would that do? That would diminish our output, our productivity while China, India and emergence nations didn't even get involved in that and they said we're not, we're not going to do that. We're gonna just keep growing and so it was, it was a, I think these global climate accords are just a way of trying to get the United States to curtail its productivity.

So you know this is a debatable problem. I'll just leave you with you know just something where skepticism is the underpinning of science. You have to ask questions about any part of the science, not the comfort of consensus so skepticism, a healthy skepticism is good in science and not the cold comfort
of consensus. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Mushinsky, you have the floor, madam.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good afternoon to you as well.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH):

We’ve known about global warming and climate change since at least the 1980’s when Dr. James Hanson testified before Congress. He was a scientist employed by the United States and had been studying climate for many decades on behalf of the United States and his projections turned out not only to be accurate, but also to be conservative. His models were not effective enough and actually, scientists including himself have amended his models to show that climate change is happening much faster than he had projected in 1988 and so the most recent summary of scientists around the world including our own at NOAA, our own federal agency, are that we have about twelve
years left from last October when the studies were issued to act, to reduce fossil fuel use before temperature increases are irreversible and they will take effect and harm our children and grandchildren. So we have about a dozen years left and that is why Representative Palm has put in this bill and I commend her for doing so.

We now that climate change is happening on a faster schedule and we have less time left to make corrections. For example, the most recent sea level rise projection which just came out from the scientists is six feet sea level rise within the lives of our children. That means New York City becomes submerged and just focusing on our own State of Connecticut for a minute, there's enormous cost to our state if we fail. These are Connecticut specific projections. Storm damage, loss of water supplies, the need to relocate roads, railroads, highways, sewage treatment plants, dislocated residents who will have to be moved to new neighborhoods, increased tropical disease vectors. We're seeing southern diseases now appearing in Connecticut. Agricultural loss as crops we won't be able to grow in Connecticut
any longer and additional world conflicts. For those of us who have kids in the military, they will be facing additional conflicts driven by loss of water or food which will affect their safety as they serve in the military.

Connecticut's students in the fifth grade now will be entering college or technical schools in six more years and we are gonna need their intelligence applied to help us solve these problems for the good of our community and our state. Kids are already interested in this issue. If you talk to them, they ask how they can help and they need to apply their science knowledge to their corner of Connecticut.

They're not all gonna be scientists just cause they take the science curriculum. They're not all gonna be scientists in the future but they may be tradesmen or entertainers or musicians or whatever, but whatever their career is, they can help fight and influence the fight against climate change. It is not a cheap problem. When Hurricane Sandy hit us in 2012, there was $80 billion dollars in damage and the legislature had to help to try to repair that. How do we know this is getting worse? Well one indicator is
the carbon dioxide levels are now past 405 parts per million which according to NOAA is higher than at any point in the last 800,000 years so human beings have not experienced this level of warming in our time on earth. We have not experienced this. This is going to be a brand new challenge for our children and our grandchildren.

Connecticut is more fortunate but nationwide, 80 percent of the energy we're using is from fossil fuels. We still have Millstone so we're in a better position so for our kids, the challenge will be they're going to have to help us move the US off of fossil fuels in only a dozen years and this is a big challenge. We will need all of their intelligence and all of their energy to help us prepare for the future. It's very important to enlist their help. If they are helping solve the problem, there is hope for the future and hope is a good way to solve the problem. So I'd like to thank Representative Palm for being persistent. I hope we will all give her the support she needs today so our kids can be enlisted in this biggest challenge of the future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Zupkus, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good afternoon to you as well.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

If I look in line 6 of the amendment, actually 6 through 27, 28, at the end of line 6, it says in public school programs of instruction offered shall include health and safety, human growth, development, nutrition, first aid, disease prevention and cancer awareness, developmentally appropriate instruction for performing self-examination for purposes of screening of breast and testicular cancer so as I'm reading this, that's mandated that they must teach this,
correct?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

   That's my understanding, yes, currently in statute.

   Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative Zupkus.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker, as I continue down the line, it also says that we shall include instruction related to opioid-related disorder, safety, safe use of social media which I'm really glad to hear that because I believe social media plays a huge negative impact in a lot of thing we discuss in this Chamber, but then I continue on and before I ask my next question, through you, Mr. Speaker, this bill is saying that climate change is a mandate and shall be taught, correct?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Currently, it says we must teach science which may include. This would change it to shall.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zupkus.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So on that note, on line 19, you will see it says use of social media as defined in section 9-601 and may include the danger of gang membership, accident prevention, language arts including reading, writing, grammar, speaking and spelling, mathematics. This say that we may include reading and writing and math in our schools?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I think for point of clarification, the semicolon after prevention separates that clause so that's a new clause.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zupkus.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker but I don’t see where it goes back to say that we shall teach language arts including reading, writing, grammar for clarification.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure what the good Representative's question is please.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zupkus, will you rephrase the question, please?

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess I'm concerned that I don’t see where it says, as I read this, it says we may include dangers of gang membership, reading, writing and those important subjects. I don’t see where it says that we shall include reading,
writing and math after that may include line.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, is the good Representative asking me to defend the entire current statute?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zupkus.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zupkus.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to be very clear because the way I read it, it does not say that we shall include reading and writing. The way I read it, it says we may include these and I want to be sure that climate change, first of all to me is not as
important as reading, writing and arithmetic and as I read it, this statute, and maybe it's just me, but as I read it, it does not make sense to me that it says that we shall include reading and writing. So through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent, I just want to be sure and get a confirmation from the proponent that it is mandated to teach reading and writing and grammar because it does not say that to me in this piece of amendment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Yes, those are currently mandated.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zupkus.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what grade does this start in, teaching climate change?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.
REP. PALM (36TH):

The NGSS recommends starting in fifth grade.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zupkus.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I looked actually, I Googled NGSS and I saw fifth grade but I really didn’t see anything that it talked about what it was going to, the curriculum was for fifth or sixth grade and going on forward. Could the proponent of the bill please give me some examples of what will be taught to fifth graders through high school?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, starting in fifth grade they introduce concepts about the intersection of engineering and science, the life cycle of water. There's a whole -- it's all spelled out in the NGSS by age-appropriate curriculum.
Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Zupkus.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will have to follow up to find where that is cause I looked and could not find it on their web site but I would just, I guess I'll end with I have a fifth grader in school and right now, she struggles in math and reading and has to get extra help quite honestly, and I struggle as a mom who thinks it's extremely important to read and write and do arithmetic, that we're going to be mandating that more and more is put on our kids. I think that some schools do it now, climate change; however, we just debated not too long ago how our children are stressed out and need more playtime. I can tell you my daughter just finished the i-Ready test. She goes through standardized testing. You know she as bullying, suicide, drugs, smoking, everything and so we just continue to pile more and more on our children when out of the other side of our mouth we're talking about how they need more playtime so I'm really concerned about how these things that keep being piled on our children and stressing our
kids out and how they're affecting them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Candelora of the 86th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just going to be brief but I also want to just stand in opposition to this piece of legislation. You know it's very frustrating serving on the Education Committee and thinking it's one thing and then we're all doing another. For us to be constantly dictating exactly what we think students should be learning in schools is a mistake. We should be leaving it up to the experts. That's our Board of Education, our superintendents, and our teachers and I think that this bill represents a level of arrogance out of this legislature that is not becoming of what we should be doing. I've had children go through every level of schooling through the public school system and the teachers do a great job of determining what they need
to learn and all of my children have been exposed to climate change. It's not something that we need to statutorily mandate. What if science changes as it always does and maybe there's a better emphasis that needs to be placed on a different piece of curriculum. We continue to nitpick and micromanage education just because we as a legislature want to put a stamp on what we think children should be learning, and I just think it's a huge mistake. It's not the way Connecticut should be going. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Case of the 63rd, you have the floor, sir.

Representative Michel, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise just to comment on the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I heard the Smithsonian being quoted earlier or talked about, but the
Smithsonian published in 2014 the age of humans living in the Anthropocene in which the Smithsonian declares that we have enough scientific evidence to demonstrate that the global climate is warming and changing as a result of human activities. The UN Climate Change Report stipulated that 60 million people were affected in 2017 and two million people were forced to relocate. I was covering myself at the Cob 21 in New York City at the UN and the goal there was to stop the increasing temperature of more than 1.5 degrees Celsius pre-industrial levels. Warming from anthropogenic emissions from the pre-industrial period to the present will persist for centuries to millennia and will continue to cause long-term changes to the climate system but also to the many diverse echo systems on the planet. The first people to suffer from climate change will be the most vulnerable financially and geographically. We are a coastal state and we will be impacted. Bridgeport, New Haven, Stamford, coastal cities, and also areas of lesser population will be impacted. It would be a grave mistake that we do not mandate climate change studies as those will be parts of the building tools to save
life, huge amounts of life and it is our duty, those
that let things degrade to the extent they did, to do
all we can to help future generations. It is a matter
of survival of the species including the human race.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark
further on the amendment before us? Representative
Currey of the 11th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when the
vote be taken, I ask that it be taken by roll call.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is on roll call
vote. All those in favor of a roll call vote, please
signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The requisite 20 percent has been met. When the
vote is taken, it will be taken by roll call. [Gavel]
Will you remark further on the amendment before us?
Representative Dauphinais, you have the floor, madam.
REP. DAUPHINAIS (44TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a few questions of the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, madam.

REP. DAUPHINAIS (44TH):

We're talking about the amendment. What kind of knowledge or expertise does a teacher need to teach climate change?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you for that question. A good science teacher who is prepared to teach the broad spectrum of science will undoubtedly have this. I have before me a statement from the National Science Teachers Association which is the body that encompasses all the teachers of science in all 50 states. They are very much in favor of the teaching of climate science and they say that is their official position because the science of climate
change is firmly rooted in decades of peer-reviewed scientific literature and is as sound and advanced as other established geosciences that have provided deep understandings in fields such as plate tectonics and planetary astronomy so this is a basic premise that science teachers are taught.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you. Representative Dauphinais.

REP. DAUPHINAIS (44TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, Mr. Speaker, as I understood the conversation that we had earlier before today, this was going to be a one-sided conversation as I understood it. Am I right?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I'm sorry, I need clarification on the question. One-sided in the sense that are not teaching climate denying? Is that what, is what you mean?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Dauphinais.

REP. DAUPHINAIS (44TH):

Yes, thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, I understood that there are scientists on both sides of this argument and I understood that we were only going to be teaching one side of that argument.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Again, since the preponderance of peer-reviewed scientists agree that climate change is caused by human activity, that is what is included in the NGSS and that is what science teachers teach.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dauphinais.

REP. DAUPHINAIS (44TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, just a few comments to the proponent of the bill. I just looked up just a little bit of information. There's just hundreds of documents put out by hundreds of scientists with the other side of that argument so I
might disagree with you and say that the science isn’t settled. Just on this document alone, it talks about ten scientists that refute that, several with different documented articles and arguments against global warming and I think we all understand that climate is changing constantly, but I would argue that there are many scientists perhaps as many that believe that it is caused by humans and on the other side of that argument believe that it is not, so I would say that the science is not settled. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Blumenthal of the 147th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to rise briefly in support of the amendment before us, specifically with regard to the portion dealing with climate change and frankly, I'm a little surprised to be in the Chamber today hearing that this matter is somewhat controversial because the idea that climate change is human made and actually occurring is not
controversial scientifically and you don’t have to take my word for it. You can take the word of the fossil fuel companies and their scientists because they said back more than a quarter century ago and I quote, "Greenhouse effect and the potential impact of human emissions, of greenhouse gases such as CO2 on climate is well established and cannot be denied. This was an internal memo created by scientists of the Global Climate Coalition, the industry group specifically created to obfuscate the science of climate change. And they were clear on this much earlier. In fact, going back to 1957 when Humble Oil scientists, Humble Oil is the predecessor of today's Exxon Mobile, published a paper indicating their understanding of the science of climate change and fossil fuels role in that phenomenon.

Nevertheless, over the course of these decades, groups like the Global Climate Coalition and the American Petroleum Institute funded science or scientists to attempt to obfuscate the existing scientific consensus that again, fossil fuels and other human-made measure do create global warming and climate change and even in the past decade we have
seen no less than a publication that our National Defense Strategy composed by our military has indicated that climate change is one of the primary threats to our national security for reasons that Representative Mushinsky and others have indicated.

So I don't think that including this in the curriculum should be controversial. In fact, I think it should be uncontroversial. I think that what this bill does is not take one side of an argument, but it teaches what we should be teaching of science to our children. The best science. The uncontroversial science. The science with the politics taken out of which is that climate change is occurring, that humans are playing a role, and that there are things we can do to stop it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Gilchrest of the 18th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this amendment. As the mother of two young children, I want my kids to be armed with accurate
information to be able to protect their future and climate change is one of the most important issues impacting them as they grow. When I go to different schools in my community of West Hartford and meet with either the Girl Scouts or the Family Resource Center, the number issue that children are raising with me is climate change and so I applaud my colleague, Representative Palm, for her tenacity and for spearheading this effort. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Kennedy of the 119th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. KENNEDY (119TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the proponent of the bill? I have one question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed.

REP. KENNEDY (119TH):

Looking at the amendment, it says the effective date is July 1, 2019. Am I correct in looking at that?

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

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

The NGSS were designed to be rolled out over a five-year period and individual school districts that find themselves unable to meet the next year deadline have the option of getting an extension.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Kennedy.

REP. KENNEDY (119TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, to the proponent of the bill, where is that spelled out cause I see what I'm reading is substitute and effective July 2019. I don’t see where the rollout is. Could the proponent of the bill please point that out to me? Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, sir. This is information I got from the State Board of Ed and also on the NGSS website there is a time frame spelled out.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Kennedy.

REP. KENNEDY (119TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you to the proponent of the bill. I would echo the comments of my colleague, Representative Candelora. I sit on the Education Committee. This is not what was brought before us. This is something completely different. I'm not against climate change. Climate change shouldn’t be controversial but this is not what we took up in Committee but I do thank you, sir, for the opportunity to speak.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Betts of the 78th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sorry for the delay. Question through you if I may to the proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Could the proponent please explain to me who has
the responsibility for developing and establishing a curriculum of courses that are taught in the public school system?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you for that question. As we know, local boards of Ed are fairly autonomous in their curricular development and again, I wanted to point out that the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection has curricula available for school districts.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you, but that responsibility of the local boards, is that not established in statute?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
It's my understanding, yes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you. And is it also not part of their responsibility to review and examine courses that are taught in the public school system?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

That is my assumption.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you. That is mine as well so I'd like to ask the proponent, why is it, if that's in statute and it's been going on for a long time, why is it that the legislature is now deeming itself as the authority and the expert in terms of what courses can and cannot be taught or how they should be taught? It's very
clearly spelled out in statute as well as in practice who is responsible for this. You also have PTA's who can speak to teachers and to superintendents, and you can also have many hearings and forums to talk about courses so could you explain to me what gives us the authority and the right to interfere with a process that's already in statute? Are we smarter than everybody else or is the current system broken?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Again, for the record, the NGSS is not in statute. It is a strong recommendation adopted by the State of Connecticut and the Board of Ed which is in favor of teaching climate change as part of science curricula so we would be codifying into statute best practices that most districts already do.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much. So do we routinely, when we
get together in the legislature, is this a common practice that we undertake? I've been nine years and I don't recall this being a common practice every time we get into session. Through you, does the good proponent either know or does she support the idea that every time we get together as a General Assembly look at the core curriculum and evaluate what the local Board of Ed's and the State Board of Ed's are doing and then insert our opinion and judgement as to what should be done?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, it is not routine for us to get involved in the minutia of what individual districts do. However, it has been brought up several times questioning why we are codifying into law something that we generally already do here in the state and yes, there is a precedence for that including this session.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

So thank you for that answer. So I'm to understand that you support and agree with the role of the legislature to interfere with the statutory responsibility of the Board of Ed's when it comes to what should be in a curriculum, what grades they should be taught, and how the subject should be taught? Is that your view? Not your view, is that what you're advocating for in this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I do not see this as an intervention or meddling in any way. I see it as codifying into law what our own State Board of Ed believes is best practices through the NGSS.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much. Thank you for that answer.
So is there something along that line in that thinking, is there something that specifically prohibits this from being done if this law were not put into place? Could this not be done, if you say it's being codified in practice, why do we need it if it's already being done?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

It is my understanding that codifying things into state statute gives them a kind of gravitas that a recommendation or common practice does not have. For example, we passed a bill to increase the penalties for the sale of fentanyl which codified the classification of fentanyl, a synthetic opioid analgesic as a narcotic substance. By regulation, the Department of Consumer Protection already classifies fentanyl as a narcotic substance so there are other examples of that ranging from relatively minor to some major codifications and it is a common practice and again, it sends a message that we here in Connecticut take very seriously the threat of climate change and
that we are empowering our teachers to teach the best practice that most already do.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you very much for that answer. I'm not talking here about climate change or any other subject that the legislature wishes to speak. I'm talking about responsibility for core curriculum and who should be teaching it and why it should be taught, who's reviewing it and giving teachers the ability to modify it accordingly. It's not one size fits all. It has absolutely nothing to do with climate change except for the fact that you've added that in the language.

What I'm talking about is jurisdictional responsibility and is it the role of the legislature to be continuing to do this. If we want to do this, then I question why we even have the local State boards of ed. So let me ask you this. Should we get rid of the local State board of ed if we're going to start doing their job for them?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Assuming that is a question to me, I'm not in favor of abolishing local boards of ed.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you and I'm not either. What I am saying though is we are inserting ourselves into a system in which we don’t have qualifications, we have opinions. We don’t have any expertise. It is currently being done right now, but that doesn’t seem to be good enough. Now, we have to pass a law. I mean you talk about having no confidence in people and making people look bad. My word, if I were on a Board of Ed and I saw the State Legislature was doing something like this, it would make me think if we're already doing it, what in the world are you doing passing a law saying that what we're already doing? As a matter of fact, why even bother having me on a State Board of Ed
if you're not going to let me do my job? Who would want to sit on a Board of Ed doing their statutory responsibilities? Who would want to be a teacher for that matter trying to teach a course and then being lectured or told by the General Assembly this is how you should do it as though we have any experience or background to it? I cannot believe that we're taking this up. This is not about climate change. This is about overstepping our responsibilities and jurisdiction. And if we're going to do it with this, why don't we do it with other things we have in statute? It is amazing to me in this day and age, when we have so many crucial things to take up, this is what we're focused on.

I am absolutely stunned that we would be so arrogant as to insert ourselves into doing something like this. Absolutely amazed and I can't wait to see what else we're going to introduce and interfere with next time. If you think it's hard to recruit people or get people to serve on volunteer boards, now you know why. This is astonishing to me and I am strongly opposed to it, not only because it's not needed, it's not our role. We can't even do the job we've been
elected to do and now we're interfering in other things for PR purposes or for whatever. It could be climate change today; it could be something else next year. Is that really what we're supposed to be doing up here? I'll tell you I don't have the expertise or the desire to do it and I think it's a real shame, it's a slap in the face to the local Board of Ed's, the teachers and frankly even to the kids. I'm a parent and I know darn well if I was unhappy with something that was not being taught, I'd be speaking to the teachers, I'd be speaking to the local Board of Ed's. There is nothing that prevents them from doing that now and yet I've not heard from one single person, not one in my entire district about this issue or the idea that we should be interfering or they don't have the ability to do things themselves. This is terrible legislation. We are sending an awful, awful message. I am sorely disappointed in our interfering with something that has been statutorily assigned to other people and I strongly oppose this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the
amendment before us? Representative O'Dea from the 125th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is actually the first time I've spoken on the climate change issue in this Chamber of the many times this has been before us and a few questions to the proponent if I may. Based on the responses that have been given, it's my understanding that in lines 24 and 25 or I'm sorry 23 to 25, the climate change consistent with Next Generation Science Standards as adopted by the State Board of Education pursuant to section 10-4 is that the climate is getting warmer due to human activities; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

In the arc of time since we have started groveling with this problem, we've gone from calling it global warming to climate chaos to climate change because the cycles are such that as one part of the earth precipitously heats up, others cool down and so
the preferred is climate change because of that. And in speaking to retired Emeritus Professor at UConn, David Anderson, he points out to me that it is the rate at which these upheavals are happening that constitutes the crisis.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you for that response. And would the good proponent agree, from the 40's to 50's, temperatures actually dropped globally steadily during that 20-year time period?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I think one of the fundamental issues that gets debated is the difference between weather and climate. Weather is the short-term precipitation and heating and cooling and the seasons. Climate is over time with greater geographic areas.

Through you.
Representative O'Dea.

I would agree. In a short period of time, just to understand the good proponent's response, would short period of time be the 20 years that we're talking about I guess in her response?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Palm.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I am not a climate scientist. I am a person who respects climate scientists so I can defend the need to teach this, to educate people including me on the severity of this problem. Parsing the individual pieces of the science of it is not my expertise. I believe that our responsibility as lawmakers, as was previously said about deferring to the experts, I would defer to the experts on this which by the way includes our own State Board of Education which is in favor of mandating the teaching of climate change per the NGSS.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and would the good proponent, does the good proponent believe that the UN's IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change are experts in this area?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. There are any body of professional organizations including NOAA, our own federal agency and the United Nations and international climate change experts that agree on the severity of this issue?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, but my question is very specific to the UN's IPCC. I understand that our State Board of Education believes in this science. My
question is does the good proponent, is it the proponent's belief that the UN's IPCC is an expert or are experts in this area and the basis upon which, one of the basis upon which we are creating this curriculum?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I would have to study specifically what that report is.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize, I didn’t mean the report. I was talking about the body. The UN established in 1988 a 195-member, a 195-member country called the IPCC or the International Panel on Climate Change and my question is, does the good proponent, as I understand it when discussing experts in the field, is it her understanding that our State Board of Education and many of the people that rely on
the fact that the climate is warming because of human activity, does she, is it her understanding that the IPCC is an expert in climate change?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Again, through you, Mr. Speaker. Basing this premise on the NGSS which were developed by climate scientists, by educators, by state legislatures, that is what I am going by. Whether or not the good Representative's specific source was cited in the NGSS development, I am unaware.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good proponent. I'll get right to it. The IPCC, the international or Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which the UN formed in 1988 predicted in 2000 that temperatures would rise by 1 degree calculus, Celsius, excuse me, calculus, there'll be no math on
these questions, um, Celsius by 2010 and the point I'm making is this group, the IPCC which is supposed to investigate, research global climate conditions through history and made this prediction when in fact, at the same time, a Professor Easterbrook, a professor at Western Washington University, publicly predicted the exact opposite would happen, that temperatures would decrease during that period of time and in fact, guess who was right? I'll give you a hint. It wasn't the IPCC. Temperatures actually went down, not up from 2000 to 2010 so the IPCC was wrong in their estimates and I know the good proponent had stated that she's not an expert on climate, nor am I quite clearly. One of the things I found out in my research though, it was pretty interesting, I wonder if I may, through you, Mr. Speaker, has the good proponent ever heard of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation or PDO term before today?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, no.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much and what’s interesting about the PDO or Pacific Decadal Oscillation finding is that every 25-30 years, oceans undergo a natural cycle where the cold water below churns and replaces the warmer water above which affects the global temperatures throughout the planet by fractions of degrees and the reason why Professor Easterbrook disagreed with the IPCC's estimates were because of this exact thing, that the Pacific Decadal Oscillation or PDO. The IPCC didn’t take into account this PDO which happens over time cyclically every 25-30 years and so because of this, by his calculations and his reporting, this PDO started to happen in 1999. So he’s actually predicting that the cooling that went on from 2000 to 2010 by a degree Celsius is going to continue for another decade or so potentially and so the IPCC didn’t take this into account so the IPCC's calculations, and they’ve been relied on by many, are off dramatically just in that ten-year period by a degree or two Celsius, not calculus, Celsius.
So my point in bringing this out is I am not one of those who doesn’t believe that human activity doesn’t impact the environment. I absolutely believe that. I drove a hybrid car. Actually I used to and I couldn’t afford to any more cause it costs a lot of money and all the miles we put on our cars here, the trade-in value got killed but I drove a hybrid car for seven years. I tried to get solar panels on my house. I absolutely believe we need to do everything to reduce fossil fuel use in the world. But, and the good proponent can actually sit down or take a break for a couple of minutes if she would like. I’m not going to have any questions for a couple of minutes at least if any more. I just want to point out, as I do to my wife, I admit I’m wrong every day. Okay? Just ask her. She knows I’m wrong every day and I may be wrong on my opinions on climate change about the amount of human use of fossil fuels and other activities may impact. I do believe it does impact the weather, but there are scientists that do not believe that human activity is changing or making any significant impact on the environment. I disagree with those scientists, but I also disagree with the
premise that we're going to mandate to our teachers and our educators that they have to teach one side. I respectfully believe that's foolish because the science is not settled on the impact of humanity on global temperatures. This science is not settled that we're going to continue increasing temperatures to the point where the IPCC says we're going to have sea rises of up to 3 meters in 100 years.

I do not believe that science is settled on that and I would ask the good proponent if she's heard of the period known as the Dalton Minimum from 1790 to 1830? Presumably, the answer is no and it's just a quick answer but I was just wondering if through her research in looking at these global climate issues she's heard of the Dalton Minimum Time Period?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, the Representative is correct, I have not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Dea.
Thank you. During that period from 1790 to 1830, the world saw temperatures decline by 2 degrees and what many scientists believe, is the reason for that is a reduced very low sunspot activity. Now what do I know about sunspot activity and our planet temperatures? Zero or very little. I admit that. However, I do know that according to scientists, it's undisputed that the summer of 1816 was the year without a summer because global temperatures had decreased and that had nothing to do with fossil fuels.

I would ask the good proponent if she's heard of the Maunder Minimum Time Period from 1645 to 1715?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Palm.

Through you, no.

Representative O'Dea.

So I hadn’t either up until recently. During
that time period, scientists calculated only 50
sunspots during a 30-year time period in time when
normally now, we see 40 to 50,000 sunspots and so
scientists, many scientists, and I think it's
undisputed, that the lack of sunspot activity in the
sun contributed to the decrease in temperatures on the
planet. So I would ask the good proponent if she's
ever heard of or knows when the time period of the
Little Ice Age was?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

   Through you, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

   Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and through you,
I'm not asking these questions to be difficult. I'm
simply trying to make a point. The Little Ice Age was
from 1300 to 1870 thereabouts and scientists are
trying to figure out what was the cause in the
decrease in temperatures across the planet during that
time period. It clearly wasn’t fossil fuels. I think we’d all agree that didn’t happen from 1300 to 1870 and the Black Death was 1347 so scientists look at possible causes. Obviously it wasn’t humans, but scientists have pointed out that there was a cyclical low solar radiation from the sun and scientists today all universally agree the amount of solar radiation obviously impacts the temperature here on planet Earth. There was also a low number of sunspots during that time period, again related to the solar radiation activity.

Geologists have also found an increase in volcanic activity during that exact time period that cause, and I think everybody would agree that when you’ve got a bloom of volcanic activity going across the planet, you're going to have a decrease in sunlight and a decrease in temperature. Nobody disputes that and science proves that there was a high instance of volcanic activity during that time period.

The changes in the ocean circulation, again, as I discussed the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, PDO, every 25-30 years you're going to have the ocean temperature decrease because the cold water comes up to the
surface and that affects global temperatures. So you also have the variations in the earth's orbit. Again, I'm not the brightest bulb in the chandelier in this building by far as you can all probably attest, but I think we all would agree our seasons are dictated by the orbit around the sun and the rotation of the earth and how we're facing the sun. That obviously affects global temperatures, the axial tilt.

So we've got all these things that we all agree affect global temperature and I guess, through you, Mr. Speaker, will that be taught in this, in lines 22 to 25, we're mandating the education on climate change, will all those things I just went through, the cyclical amount of solar radiation, the low number of sunspots, volcanic activity, changes in ocean circulation, variations in earth orbit and the axial tilt, will all that be taught in this mandated classroom educational program?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I'm assuming not since that data came from the
Heartland Institute which is a lobbying group for the fossil fuel industry, I also get that newsletter so what I believe will happen is that based on the State Board of Education's recommendation that science teachers will teach science consistent with the NGSS, which state that it is largely due to human activity.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I mean it's not only the Heartland group. I thought I also got this from a number of other research sources including Professor Easterbrook but okay. If I many then, is it the good proponent's understanding then that solar radiation doesn't impact the temperature on the planet?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I'm sorry. Could the good Representative repeat the question? I apologize.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Dea.
REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Sure. So I understand the good proponent's comments that the Heartland Institute isn't credible in the position of the groups that as a state we've decided to side with in this apparently undisputed debate, but I guess my question is, clearly the earth's orbit and the axial tilt of the earth affect our climate or the temperature of the earth's surface and that will obviously be taught or is taught through the curriculum today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Again, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that the science that is taught in the NGSS has been approved by the State Board of Ed and I believe we could probably go all day long citing sources. Those of us who believe that climate change is an urgent matter are relying on groups such as NOAA, Sierra Club, the Audubon, the Connecticut League of Conservation Voters, the National Science Teachers Association, the National Center for the Teaching of
Science, NASA, and so I choose to trust those sources and so that is what is based, that is what the NGSS is based on.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I obviously, or I just want to state for the record that human activity and fossil fuels are impacting our climate. I'm not disrupting that fact. What I'm trying to point out is I do believe there are other explanations and other things affecting the planet's temperatures and I would just finish up by pointing out that the global temperatures from 2500 B.C. and estimated into the year around 2040, so another approximately 21 years, have varied dramatically. We went through the warmest period of time that we ever went through on the planet was from roughly 1400 B.C. or I'm sorry, nope, 1200 B.C. to 800 B.C. That was the warmest, at least according to the climatologist Cliff Harris and meteorologist Randy Mann in an article dated March 10, 2018. So the warmest period of time on the planet by
a lot was 1100 B.C., at least according to this report.

The coolest time on the planet occurred roughly, at least according to this, in 1607 and during the "Little Ice Age." Obviously there were colder periods of time during the Ice Age long, long ago but I'm talking from the time period of 2500 B.C. to 2040 A.D. So, and one of the reasons why scientists say we went through this Little Ice Age was because of eruptions, the lack of solar activity and the Earth's orbit and axis so I guess my point is, I'm not disagreeing with the science that human activity impacts our planet, and I am all about, I think all of you who know me know that I am all about the good Chair of the Energy Committee knows that I am active as a solar proponent. You know, I tried to get them as I said on my home. I just believe that we need to be more open-minded and teach our children that there are a lot of things causing the temperature fluctuations on the planet in addition to the human activity beyond what I believe sections 23 through 26 or 25 are going to be teaching our children and I would just hope that as part of this curriculum, the teachers go into what I've been
going into. There is no dispute on the science that I've been talking about in my humble opinion and I would, I would ask my, I am not satisfied that this bill is going to provide the information to our students as necessary. I would also point out that I don't believe we should leave the education of our children to our local Boards of Ed. We obviously have some minimum standards to meet that the state mandates but this bill, I believe, misses the mark and provides a mandate that there's too much dispute over and I would ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment. But I thank the good proponent for her responses and I apologize if I was monotonous. I did not intend to be. I was simply trying to point out some other science potential impacts. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Wilson of the 66th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a very interesting discussion. Please forgive me, I'm
getting over a cold. So I do have a couple of questions, through you, to the proponent if I may, sir?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

Thank you, madam. I believe earlier in the conversation it was mentioned that a lot of schools in Connecticut are already teaching climate change. Through you, Mr. Speaker, how many schools are not teaching climate change in Connecticut?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

According to the State Board of Ed, we don’t have a specific on that because it would require literally calling every one of the 169 towns. The vast majority do and again, since this is common best practice, this would codify into law what most are already in fact doing so the controversy eludes me because it is something that we are mostly already doing.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

And I thank the proponent for that answer. Could the proponent make some kind of an estimate, in other words, is it 10 percent of our schools? It is 15 percent of our schools that aren’t teaching? Are there any estimates on how many aren’t teaching climate change?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

No, I do not have estimates, sir.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let's go at this from just a little different angle if we might. Is there an estimate as to the size of the school or school systems that are not teaching climate change?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, no, there is not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

And so then since we don’t have the estimate of how many and we don’t have the estimate of the size, could we begin to make an estimate of the cost to these towns that are not teaching climate change.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Again, there is no fiscal note. We already have science being taught. This would simply add to the science or blend into the science curriculum.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So my thought process really is going to when I look at line 22 where we
struck the words "which may include" and in line 23 we inserted the word "including" so thereby making it a mandate and making it therefore an unfunded mandate on however many of these schools, no matter what the size of these schools, no matter what the dollar cost to these schools might be. We're making that decision for them. We're taking that decision away from their local Boards of Education and even perhaps, as I read it here, the State Board of Education. I just don't see that it's our place to be inserting these kind of mandates from this legislative body to these communities and so therefore, because I have so many small communities in my district, I can't support this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Carpino of the 32nd, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CARPINO (32ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard a lot of questions and I'm not necessarily sure I heard all of the answers I was looking for so through you, a couple of questions to the proponent of the bill.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, madam.

REP. CARPINO (32ND):

Thank you. My daughter just took the Next Generation Science Standards test over the last two weeks so I went to the source for some of the questions that were asked here. So I called both the school, like some of our members who are on the floor, and I reached out to my Board of Ed and they had some interesting comments that I thought I would share with the Chamber. Well if it's on the test, of course we're going to teach for it so I don't know why we're debating a bill when don't know how many tests teach address. We can't answer any questions on here. It doesn’t make any sense to me. So the Next Generation Science Standards go over quite a bit. They're a very comprehensive set of guidelines. Through you, to the proponent, are we going to be itemizing every guideline in every standardized test that we give to our students?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.
REP. PALM (36TH):

If I understand the question correct, through you, Mr. Speaker, we are not getting involved in what school districts, how they test. Again, at the risk of sounding repetitive, we are upholding the NGSS as currently endorsed by the State Board of Ed and as adopted in 2015 by the State of Connecticut.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Carpino.

REP. CARPINO (32ND):

Thank you. I thank the good woman for her answer, but that wasn’t my question. My question was, the Next Generation Science Standards are quite comprehensive and they list a number of items to be covered in the curriculum so perhaps better stated, are we going to as a legislative body list in our general statutes every single item in this set out curriculum?

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would assume not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Carpino.

REP. CARPINO (32ND):

Then why are we picking this one?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Because we are trying to codify into law best practices that are most often being taught, but not necessarily uniformly.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Carpino.

REP. CARPINO (32ND):

Thank you. In looking at these standards, they're all important. Otherwise, the State Board of Ed wouldn't have selected them. They're rigorous. They cover our entire academic curriculum for our students and yet we're here just speaking about one. For those of you who haven't been paying attention, our students take an awful lot of standardized tests
and they cover a wide range of curriculum, and yet we're only here picking on one. For me, this debate isn’t about whether I believe in climate change. I very much do, but it is why we think we know better than an unknown number of schools. Why would we dictate one item of one bit of curriculum on one test without having the information in front of us? I think it's irresponsible.

The good proponent indicated it would be so difficult to get the answers, that they would need to make multiple phone calls to every school in 169 towns and cities. I don't know, in today's day and age, I would send out an email and ask the SDE to forward it. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to listen to this debate, but why we're picking one item out of such a long laundry list makes me very suspect. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Gibson of the 15th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Good afternoon.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions for the proponent of the bill. May I ask, through you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, is there a financial note attached to this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Gibson.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Mr. Speaker, is this matter of climate change a part of the Next Generation Science Standards?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
Through you, yes, it is.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Gibson.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):
Mr. Speaker, is this already being taught in schools as we currently stand here today? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
Yes, in most cases, it is. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Gibson.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):
Okay. So Mr. Speaker, that's the end of my questioning. I just have a couple of comments if I may, Mr. Speaker?

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

REP. GIBSON (15TH):
Okay. So, Mr. Speaker, I spent 23 years as a science teacher. I'm not a scientist, but I think I
know pretty much what I'm talking about when it comes to science and education and teaching science. Mr. Speaker, when I was a child, there was this big thing about the ozone layer, about there being a whole in the ozone layer and we have to do something to save our planet and so we took it very serious as a, as a world and we protected and we made steps to protect our ozone, right? So, Mr. Speaker, this matter of climate change and things that is going on in our world today, I think we owe it the same due diligence to do something about it and to educate our children. Mr. Speaker, how would it be for us to look at our children 10, 20 years down the line, our grandchildren, and look at them and say that we didn’t do anything? We didn’t give them the opportunity to look at this issue and to give it it's due diligence to make sure that we're protecting our planet? Cause, Mr. Speaker, there comes a point of no return with this whereas you cannot do anything else because what has happened cannot be corrected and since, Mr. Speaker, since this issue of climate change is already being taught and is being taught in grades 5, 8 and 11, there's assessments with this issue of climate
change, it's in the Next Generation Science Standards right now, I think what it would do, Mr. Speaker, is just like when I was a kid and talked about the ozone layer, it would bring an awareness and it will let our kids know this is something that's important, that they need to know about how this can affect our world. There's no fiscal note, it's already being taught. It will make sure that our science teachers are giving it it's due diligence because there's a number of things that we have to teach as science, as science teachers. But, Mr. Speaker, I will say, these are one of those things that's not like teaching the skeletal system, about how bones are connected and about tendons and about ligaments. This is something that's affecting our planet, that if we don't bring attention to, again, we can't go back so Mr. Speaker, again, I was sitting here for an hour or so listening to the debate back and forth, this is a good bill, Mr. Speaker. It's a great bill. It's something that we need to bring attention to and our kids need to be on point as far as climate change is concerned. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Fishbein of the 90th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good afternoon to you.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, I didn’t speak the other night about this either. I was a spectator but you know I find myself in a position that I have to say something cause I have no idea whether or not climate change exists. I really don’t, but with that in mind, since we’re talking about education, I just had some questions for this, for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you. Understanding that, and I’ve heard a lot about there not being a fiscal note, am I to understand that it’s been determined that every school district in this state has an educator ready, willing
and able to teach this curriculum?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, according to the State Board of Ed, the DEEP has curricula available. There are any number of resources available. The NGSS has a series of guides for teachers and so science teachers can readily pick this up and run with it.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the good Representative for that answer cause I did find some of those guides and unfortunately, I couldn’t access any of them because one would have to pay for them so am I to understand that good Representative would have the educators buy these course materials for themselves since there is no fiscal note?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. The teachers would not be expected to pay for this. These curricula are readily available for free from the DEEP and there are, again, resources at the Audubon, Reforest the Tropics, several educational groups ready to help with curriculum development or enhancement.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I went on the Department of Education's website and looked at the link and there's a guidebook for the implementation of this program and for the E-series, the electronic series, there's a $30-dollar cost so I don't know where those materials would be available for free. You know, perhaps there's a copyright violation going on here but clearly the implementation guidebook requires a fee so I must challenge the fiscal note, but moving on from there, am I to understand that the position here is that human activity causes climate
change and that's the only thing that's going to be taught as opposed to that in conjunction with natural processes?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

No. I think that throughout all of our educations we learned about the Great Ice Age. We learned about reasons dinosaurs went extinct. That had nothing to do with human activity clearly. The point again of this bill is that the NGSS are guides for helping science teachers teach climate change as one piece of the curriculum.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and you know I appreciate the answer. I'm just trying to figure out because we've heard a lot about one-sided position here. Am I to understand that we're only going to be talking about human activity or are we going to be teaching
our children that perhaps a change in our climate emanates from natural processes as well?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I'm sorry, could you ask the good Representative to repeat the question, please? I apologize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've heard a lot this morning or this afternoon about one side being taught and I think the claim is that I've heard here today that children are going to be taught that human activity causes climate change. Am I to understand that there will be no portion of this curriculum that will deal with natural processes also affecting climate change?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
As natural causes such as volcanos, for example, do impact the environment, that would of course be taught. What I understand would not be taught is that legitimate science allows for the denial of climate change as a primarily man-made consequence.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just trying to get to the cause and effect, climate change being the effect of someone's activity and perhaps embedded in the answer was the answer to my question but I didn't get it out. Am I to understand that children, it's anticipated under this process, they will be taught that perhaps it's human activity, perhaps it's natural activity, perhaps it's a combination of the both?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Again, through you, Mr. Speaker, NGS Standards state that climate change is currently primarily
because of carbon emissions caused by human activity. That does not disallow for natural ebbs and flows or ancient ice ages or volcanic activity or plate tectonics or other things that might naturally disrupt the atmosphere. It does put the focus on the reality of climate change as primarily accelerating because of human activity.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know I'm looking at the public license for this curriculum and the NGSS expressly put into their license that first of all, this standard was developed by educators and school leaders and that states, districts, schools, teachers and non-profit education entities may copy, reproduce, alter, adapt, edit, delete and rearrange any and all parts of the NGSS so am I to understand, given the public license issued by the entity, that the school districts will be free to essentially educate as they see fit using this as a bedrock or a foundation?

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

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to hear that because I'm all about local control. You know, Mr. Speaker, as I've heard this debate, very lengthy debate over a few days now, thankfully not in consecutive hours, but you know I harken back to a movie in the 1920's I think it was, Inherit the Wind where the, it's a black and white movie, I think it was in Tennessee. I think it was against the law for them to teach, it was either Darwinism or Creationism and you know the whole movie was about what was right and you know from my perspective, debate is good. One of the things I learned a lot in school was when the teacher assigned me a paper on something I didn’t believe in, and I learned about it and I think all of our school districts should, wherever possible show students both sides, allow them to debate it, allow
them to learn from the other sides argument as we sometimes do in this room. So I'm happy to hear that our school districts will be allowed to alter, edit, delete as they see fit from this curriculum as we move forward educating our students into the future.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Ferraro of the 117th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a few questions to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The proponent of the bill and I had a conversation a couple of days ago regarding the same subject and I just want to ask a few questions regarding some of the data points and how they get to them. Through you, Mr. Speaker, how many years has the collectors of temperature data been collecting data?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that in the 80's, the early 80's when climate change became fairly well established, that is when there were modern tracking's of changes and vagaries within both climate and weather.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So it's fair to say then we've been collecting data for roughly about 40 years?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. The experts I've spoken to cite that as the classification of when the acceleration of climate change started. Obviously, we have data going back much farther than that, but as a
phenomenon, the acceleration of the pace at which the planet is changing, that's traceable to the 80's.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I guess to drill down into my question, the specific data collection of temperature changes and you know from day to day, from year to year, when did that process actually begin? Can we look back into the 1800's and actually see the temperature changes each day in each region throughout the globe?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I don't know the answer to that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Okay. Well obviously, I wouldn’t have asked the
question if I didn’t know the answer and the answer is no. So the proponent of the bill has mentioned earlier that opponents of climate change often confuse the terms climate and weather. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and would the proponent of the bill be so kind as to explain to me what the difference is between climate and weather again? Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that weather is the fluctuations over short durations of time and that climate is fluctuations over long
periods of time and greater geographic areas.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I really appreciate that answer because I'd like to make a few points about that. To begin with, if opponents of climate change often confuse these two terms, I would submit proponents of climate change often do the same thing as well. For example, recently one of our national representatives has said that the recent uptick in tornadoes in Oklahoma was a result of climate change. She was immediately excoriated in the social media and for good reason because that would be a confusion of weather and climate.

The point we just made that statistics are actually being accumulated for 40 years is an indication that we're still in the weather period and not the climate period because 40 years is hardly long enough to be able to talk about any trends especially when data has been manipulated. For example, the proponent of the bill has mentioned has mentioned an
organization called NOAA. Through you, Mr. Speaker, is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I appreciate the proponent's answer. NOAA has been the subject of quite a bit of controversy in its own right. For example, they have repeatedly adjusted their own data which they state is for the presumed reason that they want to make the data sets more accurate and common knowledge is that if an error is made in data over years, because of the average of the realistic data, the error data is oftentimes averaged in and has very little effect, isn't a major player in the final results. However, there's only one problem with the fact that NOAA has been adjusting its data for quite some time and that is that all their adjustments have been to lower previously-measured temperatures to show
cooler weather in the past and to raise more recent temperatures to show warming in the recent present. In fact, one would say that weather adjustments pre 2000 temperatures were progressively cooled and post 2000 temperatures were warmed. Now this has the effect of continued adjustment to the data which would not have it averaged and have a minimizing effect. In fact, it would impact the data with regards to whether or not the global warming that has been recorded has been accurate. This creates an illusion of temperatures increasing and global warming advocates say, as we just heard from the good Representative across the aisle, that there is a causal effect, that the more CO2 that is put into the environment, the more warming we have, but the problem with that is that actual temperature measurement records show that there's something different.

There have been hot years and there have been hot decades, but the overall measured temperature shows no clear trend in the last decades. That is until, of course, NOAA statisticians, the data, using complex statistical models, the changed the data to reflect not the reality, but their underlying theories of
global warming. The year 2000 was a particularly spectacular episode of data tampering by NOAA as they introduced 2.5 degrees of fake warming since 1895. Climate analyst, Paul Homeward, notes for instance that New York State temperatures this year 2.7 degrees than in 1943. But that's not the case with NOAA. NOAA's data shows that the temperature this year was only 0.9 percent cooler than the actual data in 1943 and the problem that I have with NOAA adjusting their temperature data on a consistent basis is they have never yet, not once, offered a convincing explanation as to why they did it.

So I rise because there's been a lot of discussion about science being settled. Obviously if the science was settled, we wouldn't have had this conversation the way we have over the last two days. We wouldn't have numerous scientists on both sides stating their case. We wouldn't have the need for peer review to be able to determine whose peer review articles are acceptable. Science would accept all viewpoints and then they would analyze and decide which ones were accurate, but it's a very simple model when you are doing scientific research that expects to
return a result of global warming and you're being funded to do so, then in order to keep the funding going, to keep the spigot open, you have to produce the results that are necessary. And this is why we've had numerous scams and numerous fake emails and problems we've had over the past eight to ten years which have given a black eye to the global warming community. This is why we have climate change today. This is why they'll be new language coming in the future which make the argument a little bit easier to swallow, and this is why it's never gonna go away because it's all about who is supplying the money and keeping the research going.

So I submit at this point, to require and mandate that our schools are going to teach a science is not settled and only one side of the argument, and to continually cite as the proponent of the bill does, an organization who has decided which is acceptable science and which isn't while ignoring data and scientific information that has been brought forward by not just myself but some of my colleagues, and then indicating that this is the real science and everything is fake science, I think is doing a
disservice to our students. It's not creating critical thinking. It's not giving them the opportunity to look at all the data and to make up their minds for themselves. It amounts to what might be called indoctrination and indoctrination is when you only allow one side of the argument. And we have generations of children who will come through the system and unfortunately, will not be privy to the fact that the very organization that is cited as infallible has actually been adjusting their science and their data for years, and you don’t have to continually adjust your data if your science is accurate. And if it is inaccurate, then maybe that should be taught to the children. Maybe the students of climate change should begin to learn about such things as sunspot activity. Maybe they should learn about such things that greenhouse gases are actually more than just CO2 and that the number one greenhouse gas is actually water vapor and water vapor probably has an effect on global warming or on climate change just as much as CO2, and that CO2 increases have not necessarily turned out to have a corresponding increase in global temperature as the temperatures
have been recorded over the last two decades.

Additionally, when we look at temperatures, we have to realize that most of the temperatures are taken in large cities and in large cities, the temperatures in those cities are actually warmer and when we take temperatures in more remote parts of the planet, we find out that the temperature is actually less. So it's pretty easy to skew the data by only taking data readings from areas where the temperatures are much higher so I think there's much more work that needs to be done on this and I think if we're going to create questioning scientists from our young people coming through our school systems, we need to provide them with all the information which brings me to my last comment.

It has been brought out by numerous people on both sides of the aisle today that this climate change is currently being taught in our schools. I know for a fact in my school systems, when I talk to the kids, for the most part that's all they talk about in school is climate change and some of them are pretty sharp. I mean I've spoken to them in my karate school and we talk about such things and they obviously are being
taught in their school about climate change. We ask the question of how many schools do not teach climate change. We don’t have that data. We asked if the schools that don’t teach climate change were mandated to teach it, would there be a fiscal note. We were told no but the bottom line is we can’t be sure that every school has a qualified person to teach the climate change and in some cases, as one of my colleagues has pointed out, in order to get the information to add to the curriculum, we have to pay x amount of dollars to get it. So to say there is no fiscal note to a municipality who might have to now begin climate change where they don’t, I don’t think it’s exactly accurate.

And lastly, the Next Generation Science, from what I understand, and this through you, to the proponent of the bill, Mr. Speaker, this accounts for about 41 different topics?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

The NGSS have a series of standards and
recommendations based on the aptitude and the level at which the students are being taught.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the gentle lady for her comment. Again, approximately how many topics are included in those standards?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I don't know the exact number, sir.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and those that have researched it have told me there are 41 and so I imagine it would be a pretty difficult task for a teacher to get through all 41 topics should they all be mandated. So the question was asked, why of all those topics in the standards, is this particular one
being singled out to be mandated since it's already being taught?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Because current statute makes it optional in the sense that it says you must teach science which may include, so this is changing it to including standards consistent with NGSS.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, and I thank the gentle lady for that answer. So am I to assume the other 40 topics are also currently a may?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Uh, through you, I'm sorry, I couldn't hear the
question please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So based on the fact that we're changing this one topic in the standards from a may to a shall, am I to assume that the other 40 topics are also mays at this time?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. This applies specifically to the teaching of climate change.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I was able to figure that one out on my own so my question is what about the other 40? Are they mandated by a "shall" or are they still under the "may" statute?

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

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

What is in the NGSS including climate change is what would be required in statute.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

So then because I'm kind of hearing one side and then I'm hearing the other side coming from the same person, so what is in the, excuse me, I'm not familiar with the letters, the alphabet there, but what's included in the standards is what is required to be taught in the curriculums of the schools?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Again, Mr. Speaker, the NGSS are standards that the SDE recommends for all school districts. What we are saying is that when you teach according to the NGSS, it must include climate change which is now by
statute a "may." We are turning it into a "shall."

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So if climate change is one element of the standards mentioned by the proponent of the bill, and that is now being changed from a "may" to a "shall" and now must be taught in all the schools in Connecticut, then am I to assume the other 40 elements in the standards are now "shall" instead of "may?"

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is a standard that is adopted by the local boards of ed

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Okay. So if my local board of ed adopted the standard that included climate change and that meant
that they were teaching climate change in their curriculum, then why are doing this legislation to require something that is already being required?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, as has been said before, codifying into statute gives gravitas to what is currently standard best practices which may or may not be uniformly applied.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I guess what is really beginning to become very frustrating to myself and many people in this Chamber is we are codifying a single element of a standard that has 41 different parts. Why this particular element and not the other 40? Why not do a comprehensive bill and let’s codify the whole standard?

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

   Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

   Currently, it is the only thing in statute separated out from science teaching in general. The statute says you must teach science, which may include climate change. It does not say which may include astronomy or plate tectonics, etc so we are codifying that one piece which is currently listed as optional.

   Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I appreciate the Representative's comment. So this is more of a fear that because the statute says we are mandated to teach science by those standards, which may include climate change, for some reason, some people might think that climate change is not science?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
I'm sorry, what is the question?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

The question, through you, Mr. Speaker, is does the proponent of the bill in this proposing this amendment have concerns that the statute as written that the local statutes as written that the local municipality would adopt these standards of Next Generation Science which may include climate change, because it's stated that way, there is a concern that climate change may be viewed not as science?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Well I certainly can't speak for those who wrote out the NGSS, but my discussions with the people at the State Department of Ed, that is not the case. There is not a fear that climate change is not a legitimate part of science. Currently, in our statute, it is the only thing singled out as optional
and we are turning that into not optional.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Okay. Through you, Mr. Speaker, then based on what I am hearing, the Next Generation Science Standards would consider everything else as science and in order to say remove any possible ignorance by the public that climate change might not be a science, this legislation codifies it in such a way that it lumps climate change with the rest of the sciences?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

This is not, through you, Mr. Speaker, this is not a fear that climate change is not real science. It's exactly the opposite. It remarks upon the urgency of making sure that that is included in the curriculum.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I would agree with the lady across the aisle. Of course climate change is a science and I would also like to stipulate that like all science, science on some occasions is right and on other occasions, the science gets it wrong. We talked about this last week where the general belief that the earth was flat was disproven. We have proven over recent years that antimatter exists when we didn’t think it did. There’s been particle discussion and wave discussions, super string discussions that have brought science from error to reality and to truth and so of course, climate change is a science and of course, it is part of the New Gen system so from what I’m hearing from the gentle lady across the aisle, currently once a local municipality agrees to teach Next Generation Science Standards, they are agreeing to 40 mandates of required science and have an option for only one, which is climate change?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.
REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, again the NGSS are standards and they are recommendations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, that did not answer my question at all. I'll rephrase it again. From the gentle lady has said, once these standards are adopted by a municipality, because the others are a must teach, the other elements of those standards, and climate change is a "may" teach, then once climate change has gone from "may" to "shall," we now are back to where we are mandating these municipalities to teach 41 elements of the standards of New Gen Science.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The standards, the 41 elements that I assume he's referring to, again, these are over time, they are over several classes, several years of student engagement and what the NGSS does is
it trusts teachers and it trusts, the State Board of Ed trusts teachers to teach science in a way that is appropriate to the students, again, climate change being the only branch of science that is singled out currently in our state statute. So by changing it from a "may" to a "shall," yes, we are saying that climate science must be part of the science curriculum.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can only say that if this legislation passes and climate change is mandated to be taught by every municipality in our state, I can only hope that the approach to teaching that science will be done in a way that our students will be able to get a fair and balanced approach to all sides of the argument and the causes of global temperature increases.

I would also hope that the data that they are being fed will be accurate data, not data that's been manipulated by those that have an agenda and those
that are trying to preserve federal and state funds to continue research, and I would hope that the purpose of all these mandates is to produce children who are critical thinkers and not children who are indoctrinated into a form or belief. With that being said, Mr. Speaker, I have no further comments. Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Dubitsky of the 47th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, through you, I'm looking at the board and I see an act concerning the inclusion of Puerto Rican and Latino studies in the public school curriculum. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what does global warming have to do with that?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. This was addressed earlier by Representative Ritter.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I either did not fully grasp the discussion at that time or did not hear parts of it, or was not satisfied with the answer that I heard, but my question again, through you, is what does global warming have to do with an act concerning inclusion of Puerto Rican and Latino studies in the public school curriculum?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative, it was raised during a point of order and the Chair ruled that it was germane.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not questioning the germaneness of the question. I'm simply asking what does global warming have to do with the inclusion of Puerto Rican and Latino studies in the public school
curriculum?

   Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative Palm. Do you care to answer, Representative Palm?

REP. PALM (36TH):

   Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

   Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

   Mr. Speaker, I think that does a grave disservice to the people of this Chamber and the people of this State. It's a very simple question. We have a bill up on the board, an act concerning the inclusion of Puerto Rican and Latino studies in the public school curriculum. That is the bill that we are discussing right now. That is the bill that if somebody turns on CTN to watch the proceedings in this chamber as to what's going on, what we're discussing, that is what they expect us to be discussing and Mr. Speaker, through you, I ask again, does this discussion, global warming, have anything at all to do with the bill that is on the board?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative, we are speaking on the amendment before us.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn’t hear you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

We are speaking on the amendment before us, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Yes, on this amendment, correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

And the amendment deals with global warming, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand the amendment concerns global warming. I am asking, through you, the proponent of the bill what the subject of global warming has to do with the substance of the underlying bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The Chamber will stand at ease. The Chamber will come back to order. Representative Palm, would you care to respond?
REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a strike all amendment having to do with curriculum reform. That is the tie-in. Thank you.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I interpret that answer to mean nothing. Global warming has nothing to do with Puerto Rican and Latino studies in the public school curriculum. It is a strike all amendment that strikes the entire substance of the underlying bill which is the inclusion of Puerto Rican and Latino studies in the public school curriculum and it completely replaces it with something that is completely different, is studying something that has nothing to do whatsoever with that. That is one of the problems we have in this chamber and in the legislature as a whole is we throw this stuff up and there are people at home watching, there are people that follow this stuff. There are people who have interests in seeing various bills go through and
various bills not go through and for the legislature to do a strike all on a bill called an act concerning the inclusion Puerto Rican and Latino studies in the public school curriculum and putting in global warming instead does a grave disservice to the people of my district, to the people of the proponent's district, to the people, Mr. Speaker, of your district and every other district. Sure there are people who would love to see a global warming bill go through, but they would like to see it be named an act concerning the inclusion of global warming studies in the curriculum. That way they can follow along, they can know when something is going to be presented, they know when the debate is going to come up. There is no way anybody who is not part of this legislature would have known that this bill was going, this amendment was going to be attached to this bill with a completely name, and they would have no way to know that it was being debated today.

Frankly, most of the people in this Chamber, including myself had no idea that we were going to be debating global warming today. We debated the other day. We didn’t know it was coming up then either so
throwing this stuff on bills that have absolutely nothing to do with the substance of the amendment is one of the reasons why people in this state don’t trust us. They know that we're sliding all this stuff in secretly behind closed doors. Nobody had any idea this was coming up today, yet here we are. We're debating a mandate on our school system. We're demanding an ideology that some people agree with, some people don’t. We're demanding that that be taught in the schools. Did the school teachers of our state know that we were going to be debating this today? Absolutely not. The people in this Chamber didn’t even know it was going to be debated today.

I would ask rhetorically wouldn’t you think that some of the school teachers in our schools might want to contact their legislators and say whether they approve or disapprove of this amendment? It makes no sense to just throw this stuff on using what's colloquially called a dummy bill. I don't know if this was a dummy bill. I think this is a real bill. The act concerning the inclusion of Puerto Rican and Latino studies in the public schools. That's something that is an issue that should and has been
discussed in this Chamber. In fact, we had a combined bill that included this very subject that passed this Chamber. I voted for it. But now we have a bill that has the same subject matter of one that's already passed, we gut it out completely and we throw in something completely different without letting anybody know and we wonder why people don’t trust politicians.

Mr. Speaker, last week we discussed global warming. We discussed this very same issue and I stood up and I made some comments and because we can't cut and paste those comments into today's debate, I'm going to have to do them all over again so the people who saw that we were debating global warming last week, who have no idea that we're gonna debate this week, and perhaps they might be interested to see what I have to say about it, well unfortunately, now I'm going to have to say it all over again because we're running the same amendment all over again.

I also ask rhetorically, is that a great use of the time of this legislature? Is that a great use of the time of our staff, our police, our electricity, of everything that keeps this building running? Of course not. But we are now what, on the fourth hour
of debating this. We debated it already last week. We shouldn’t have to debate it again. I shouldn’t have to go through all my comments from last week again. It's a waste of the taxpayers' money but yet, here we go. We decided that it's so important, it's so critical to saving the world that we must be the first and only state in the entire nation to mandate this. We're gonna have to do the whole thing over again. I can't even imagine what the burn rate is on the staff, the lawyers, the police, the air-conditioning, the light bill. You know all these people sitting down here, they're not here for free. This is costing money to do this over and over again and it does the people of this state a grave disservice.

So the substance of this amendment. Is global warming real? I don't know. I don’t. I'm not a scientist. I'm a lawyer. I look at arguments on both sides and I can argue either side just like most of the lawyers in this room. Most of the people in this room are not climate scientists. They're not astrophysicists or some other type of climatologist. They listen to the arguments, they read what they can.
They read some of the studies. They listen to people. They decide who they're going to believe and who they're not going to believe so what do I do? Who do I believe? I don't know. I don’t. The jury’s still out in my view.

There are plenty of people who say that we have twelve years to abandon all use of fossil fuels in this world or the world is gonna come to an end. There are other people who say it’s a complete hoax, that this is ideologically drive, this is political, this is simply an effort to take money from the rich countries and divert it to poorer countries.

There are scientists on both sides of this debate. Now we've heard of course well it's 98 percent of all the scientists in the world believe that man is causing global warming and that global warming is a big problem and that if we don’t stop it immediately, we are going to be extinct as a species and the world is going to fry up like a little piece of charcoal. Well 98 percent. I've been looking through the research in the few minutes I've had since finding out we are gonna debate this, and I see the number is actually 97 percent; 97 percent is the
number that's actually thrown around. I'm not sure where the proponent came up with 98 but my research shows that it's 97 percent of people, that's the claim. The claim is 97 percent of all scientists believe that man is the primary or the only cause of global warming and therefore, man must stop it. Man must stop burning fossil fuels. Well I did a little research on that 97 percent number and it turns out, well you would ask, 97 percent, where does it come from? It's a consensus, right? A consensus of 97 percent of people. Well here's a guy who's a statistician and he went and he, his name is Alex Epstein and he went through and he checked all the various studies that use this 97 percent claim and he tracked them back. Where did this 97 percent number come from? Well it appears that it came from a summary, I mean a paper titled Cook Et Al and it found that 97 percent of scientists believe that man is contributing in some way to global warming. Contributing in some way. So does that mean it's more than 50 percent? Does that mean 90 percent? In what way is man contributing to global warming?

He went through some of the studies that were
cited by Cook and he found that only a very small percentage of the studies that Cook cited even said that man's contributing to global warming was about 50 percent. Most of them indicated yeah, I think man is probably contributing somewhat to global warming. So that could be 1 percent. That could be 2 percent. That could be less than that. This 97 percent number is fake. It is not a real number. It is not based on science. If that's what we're trying to do, we're trying to base everything on science. Well this 97 percent number which the proponent has indicated is 98 percent, my research says 97, that number does not indicate a consensus in the scientific community that man is causing global warming.

So as I said last week, I don't know one way or another but let's say it is 98 percent and let's say it's 98 percent of all climate scientists agree that man is the only cause of warming and that it is catastrophic. So what does that leave? Two percent. That leaves 2 percent of peer-reviewed, legitimate climate scientists say it's not true. All right. So they're used to be a consensus about live waves. Light was determined to be waves. Well Newton decided
it was particle, not a wave. It's a particle. But all the light scientists at the time said it was a wave. The consensus, scientific consensus among all the light scientists in the world at the time said no, light is a wave. And for over 100 years the consensus was light is a wave. And then we get this guy called Albert Einstein. Albert Einstein comes in and he says you know what? I believe that flat earther, Isaac Newton, from hundreds of years ago who said it was a particle and he went about proving that it was a particle. Even though the entire scientific consensus was it was not. It was a wave. So what do we learn from that one instance? We learn that a consensus doesn’t necessarily mean that it's true and that good scientists don’t follow consensuses, consensi [sic], whatever the word is. They follow science. They follow the scientific method.

Now what's a scientific method? A scientific method is somebody comes up with an idea, observes something. Well I see the ground is flat. Seems flat to me so I'm going to come up with a hypothesis. That means that because I see the ground is flat that means the world is flat. And then you test that hypothesis
against the observable facts. You go and you take measurements elsewhere. You walk all around the world and take measurements there. You start in one place, you take a boat straight across, see if you wind up on the other side. You do research, you do studies, you take tests and you challenge your hypothesis and you ask other scientists to do the same. You say here's my data, here's my hypothesis, here's what I believe this hypothesis means. Here's what I believe is the real science. Prove me wrong. That's what the scientific method is. You ask other scientists with your data, you publish your data. You say this is what I've developed. Prove me wrong or prove me right and you don't look at anybody who doesn't believe you and doesn't believe your hypothesis as a heretic. You don't demean them. You don't call them some type of denier because that very hypothesis, that the world was flat, was consensus. Everybody believed it. All the scientists said well the ground is flat, it's flat from here to there, the whole earth must be flat. So somebody challenged that. Several people challenged it. They were considered heretics. Many of them were burned at the stake because they did not agree with
the consensus. They turned out to be right didn’t they? They turned out to be right that the world isn’t flat. Now there are still people who believe it is. Well they’re not heretics. I challenge them and we should all challenge them. Okay, you believe the earth is flat. Prove it. Prove it. We don’t demean you. We don’t challenge your integrity. We don’t say that you are hired by some corporate conglomerate that has an interest in a flat earth. We say all right, you have science, prove it. Here’s my science that the earth is round. I got a photograph from space; it shows a round world. Go ahead, prove me wrong. We challenge them. We ask them. That's the scientific method.

Again, I don't know if global warming is caused by man. I don't know if warming of the planet is going to be a major problem. I'm a lawyer, not a scientist, but I can tell you that from my research, there are very, very credible people that say it's not true. Not true. And I will challenge anybody in this Chamber to identify these people as being paid cronies of the oil and gas industry.

Now, when Representative Mushinsky spoke, she
said that CO2 is the highest it's been in 800,000 years. I wrote that down. CO2 is the highest it's been in 800,000 years. But it's not the warmest it's been in 800,000 years and there are scientists who say there is no correlation because it was a lot warmer only a few thousand years ago. A lot warmer than it is now. So how come the CO2 is the highest now in 800,000 years but it was warmer only 3000 years ago? Well, I could show studies up and down that say it's because there's no correlation and even though there are scientists that say there is no correlation, we still have people who insist that we must completely change our society, completely change the way we generate power and locomotion on this planet in the next twelve years based on a questionable statement of science, a questionable hypothesis when there are plenty of scientists who say it's just not, there is no correlation.

The proponent of the bill indicated based on a question, I apologize, I don't remember who the question was from, that this curriculum will prevent anybody from teaching "climate denying." Climate denying. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the
proponent of the amendment, what is climate denying?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding it's the practice that does exactly what we are arguing about now which is to invalidate the 98 percent of peer-reviewed scientists and by the way, I did want to make one note on that. The good Representative is correct about the 97, but it's actually 97.8 percent so laws of math, we round 0.5, anything over 0.5. That's where I got the 98. So that is the sense that climate deniers are people who do not hold with the preponderance of science experts and again, the intent of this amendment is not to argue about whether client science or climate change rather is real or not. It is to defer to the expertise of the DEEP, the State Board of Ed which want to this into state statute because it is best practices and so when the National Science Teachers Association believes this is the right practice, I think those are legitimate sources that should be respected and that is what I'm trying
to do with this bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, do I, do I interpret it correctly that the term climate denying is intended as a pejorative?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

There are those who would say it is, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I suspected, that even assuming that this 97 or 98 percent number is correct, which I from my research have concluded it is not, the proponent of this amendment is using a pejorative of the other two percent; those people who do not subscribe to this majority belief. She's
insulting them. Even though these people admittedly, I believe, are peer-reviewed climatologists, astrophysicists, climate scientists, if they do not believe in this what is becoming a religion, they need to be insulted. They are referred to in a pejorative. Well would we then be referring to Albert Einstein with the same type of pejorative when he claimed that he believed that light was a particle and not a wave?

This is not the way science is handled in any other field. Any other field, chemistry, biology, physics, any field where science is taught and science is debated. If somebody's got a new idea or somebody's got an idea that goes against conventional wisdom, against the consensus, that person is not demeaned. That person is not called pejorative names. They are simply asked to prove it. Put your cards on the table. Where's your research? But when it comes to global warming suddenly it becomes improper. You become an outcast if you have some other idea as to what is making the world warm other than SUV's. Somehow, you are a heretic. You're a paid goon from the fossil fuel industry.

This is not how we should be pushing in this
legislature. This is not how the teachers of our schools should be teaching science. That you can debate any other field. You have an idea? Come on up. Let's use a scientific method. Let's do peer-reviewed studies. Fine, but in this one field we must have unanimity. We must all stand in line. Everybody's gotta be speaking the same language. Everybody's gotta be singing the same song. Otherwise, you're a heretic. Otherwise, we call you names. That's not what we should be doing here. We should be encouraging open debate. We should be encouraging people who don't agree with this so-called consensus.

Mr. Speaker, during remarks I believe I heard the proponent of the bill state that the Heartland Institute was a lobbying group for the fossil fuel industry. Did I get that right?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

They are an objective interest group and not an objective journalistic enterprise.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question was, did I get the good Representative's statement correct? I wrote it down, that the quote said, "The Heartland Group is a lobbying group for the fossil fuel industry." Did I get that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. When I actually spoke with them to request that they not send me their propaganda, they confirmed that they have among their supports, yes, fossil fuel.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, I didn't hear fully the good proponent's answer. I believe she said
they have supporters in the fossil fuel industry. Is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, when I called their main number to request they take me off their subscription list, I asked who their supporters were and if there were fossil fuel industries among their supporters and I was told yes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would ask does this good proponent of this amendment have any facts to indicate that the Heartland Institute is a lobbying group for the fossil fuel industry?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So again, I reiterate, earlier this particular institute which essentially a think tank was, in my view, improperly degraded and improperly called a lobbying group for the fossil fuel industry with no basis for that statement. None whatsoever. Again, it's trying to demonize people who do not believe, who do not toe the line. So the fossil fuel industry happens to support this particular think tank. Well this particular think tank happens to be made up of people who don’t toe the line and don’t believe in this consensus. So doesn’t it make sense, I ask again rhetorically, that the fossil fuel industry or at least some players in the fossil fuel industry happen to support this particular think tank? Of course it makes sense. That doesn’t make them a lobbying group of the fossil fuel industry and they should not be attacked as one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I again didn’t know that we were going to be debating this and in the short time
that I had to pull some of the research during the earlier debate, I pulled some stuff up so I apologize in advance to my colleagues if the things I talk about are not in any particular order because had I known this amendment was going to come up, an amendment on global warming when we're talking about an act concerning the inclusion of Puerto Rican and Latino studies in the school curriculum, had I had any idea that this was going to come up again, I would have spent a little time and organized my thoughts a little bit. But because this was a surprise to me in the same way it's a surprise to everybody else in the Chamber and everybody watching on CT-N who were completely unaware that this is what we're debating in the legislature, because I was surprised, I apologize. Some of these are going to be a little bit out of order but I'll do the best I can.

So talking about this 98 percent versus the 2 percent, peer-reviewed studies. Well I just, without being able to access my research, just kind of pulled up a few. So this is a study that came up published in the International Journal of Climatology, International Journal of Climatology. It's a well-
established, respected, peer-reviewed journal that is known around the world and in this particular study, paper published, it examines solar radiation at the earth's surface in Greece from 1993 to 2011 and it found a significant increase after the 1990's and the upward trend in solar radiation over the past 18 years dwarfs any alleged effect of CO2 on the earth's surface during the same period. So what do we have? We have a peer-reviewed article in a well-established climate journal that says we're getting a lot of sun hitting the earth and it dwarfs any alleged effect CO2 has on any warming by a factor of more than 108 times. So what this is saying, maybe this is one of these 2 percent people, I don't know, but a peer-reviewed study finds that the sun is heating up the earth quite a bit, more than 100 times more than anything that SUV's and home heating fuel would ever have.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the proponent is any part of this curriculum, this climate change curriculum going to address the theory that solar radiation is a major factor in warming the planet?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, I think one of the pieces of the NGSS that is being lost in this debate is that it is primarily about having students come to reasoned conclusions. It is about the scientific method and so while a teacher can say there are those who debate without actually saying those debates or those conclusions are legitimate, any good teacher and certainly under the NGSS, a good science teacher would in fact encourage debate and inquiry. It's as I said earlier, their methodological guides for how students can come to reasoned conclusions and I would like to state, just for the record, it was not I who brought up climate change deniers. I have avoided using that term as a matter of the fact even though several of the people I have referenced do use it. I have said consistently those who object or who question man's role so just for the record, it was not I who used that. The question to me was it is a pejorative term and generally, it is and that's why I have avoided using it.

Through you.
REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there's a gentleman named Roy Warren Spencer who's a climatologist, principle research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, the U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer on NASA's Aqua Satellite, and he's also served as Senior Science and Climate Studies at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center. No kook with him. You know right there, that's a pretty impressive set of credentials and he's written a number of papers including in the Geophysical Research Letters, the Journal of Climate, and others and his papers indicate that most climate change is natural in origin resulting from long-term changes in the earth's albedo which is sunlight reflection, how much of the sun's radiation is reaching the ground. They call that the earth's albedo.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the belief that the changes in the earth's albedo are goin to be included in the curriculum that is the subject
of this amendment?

Through you.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it is --

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Yes, through you, thank you. In a science class I took on the earth's climate, we did in fact study albedo which was the way the science teacher pronounced it and that is a reflected light from many things including snow and the ocean and so yes, I believe again that as the NGSS seeks to give students the tools to discern fact from fiction and in part of that curriculum, according to the State Department of Ed, it does teach about the natural world. Yes, it does teach about albedo, sunspots, volcanoes. That is absolutely included in the NGSS.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, does the
curriculum simply reference the albedo or does it indicate that legitimate climate scientists who have published in peer-reviewed articles believe that the change in the earth's albedo is the primary origin of climate change and not anthropomorphic greenhouse gas emissions?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I'm sorry, I couldn't hear the question. Good the good Representative repeat it please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Could I ask the Chamber to quiet down, please? We're having trouble with the discussion between the two folks on the floor. So that the proponent of the bill can hear the question from the questioner, I would ask you all to take your conversations outside and to keep it to a minimum roar. Representative Dubitsky, could you please repeat the question, a little more loudly this time so it can be heard?

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would
ask, through you, if the curriculum that we are discussing in the amendment simply mentions the earth's albedo and describes what it is or does the curriculum identify changes to the earth's albedo as possible causes of climate change?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not an expert in all of the nuances of the NGSS. I trust them as a modality, as a recommendation that was voted on unanimously by the State Board of Ed so therefore, I would defer to NGSS experts to answer that question.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you could give me one second, Mr. Speaker, I apologize. Had I known that we were going to be debating this, I'd be much more prepared. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the proponent is familiar with a gentleman named Bert
Burt Rutan?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Burt Rutan is an engineer who is an expert in analyzing studies. For those who may think they remember his name, he was the gentleman who designed the airplane, the first airplane that flew unfueled around the world. He and his brother, Dick Rutan, have worked on a number of scientific engineering feats including that one and Burt Rutan underwent, although he is not a climate scientist, his expertise is in analyzing studies. And what he did was he went through dozens and dozens of studies to figure out if they were based on the facts and the data that they claimed to be based on and if not, why not? So he went through all these studies and analyzed the data that was presented by the authors of the studies. So for those of you who are
not familiar with scientific studies, essentially what happens is an author will do some research, draft up a study, have their data, and they'll submit to a journal, one of these peer-reviewed journals and the editors and the scientists that run that journal will review the science, will review the study, will review the data and will try to poke holes in it and will ask the author to go back and change things that they find either inconsistent or not well articulated or not well covered, any gaps in the analysis, any gaps in the data and they'll often bounce it back and forth until the authors are satisfied that it's adequate and then they will publish. And other scientists in that same field will often look at it, this is what we call peer-review. They will look at the study and they will review it and they perhaps will try to poke holes in it, will try to repeat it, will look at the data and determine whether or not the data is sufficient to reach the conclusion and what Burt Rutan did is he took these studies and he reviewed the data and he reviewed the hypotheses and conclusions of these studies and he realized that a huge percentage of the supposed peer-reviewed studies that were published in
these journals, their data actually didn’t match their conclusions and their hypothesis. And he wrote a study, a 100-page report on his work and all his work was from the standpoint of an engineer because an engineer needs to look at the data and challenge the data, challenge the theories, challenge the conclusions and make sure that the data meets the theory and the conclusion and his report is devastating, devastating to those so-called 97 or 98 percent who have submitted articles for peer review and although if I were better prepared, I would probably end my remarks with this, I would like to just read you one thing that he wrote and this is about, this references to some extent this climate denying we’ve heard about. The difference between an environmentalist and a denier. You can easily tell if someone is a true environmentalist, i.e. an advocate for a healthy planet. He is one who is happy to hear the news that the arctic ice has returned. He is one who celebrates when the recent climate data show the alarmist’s predictions of catastrophic warming might be wrong. The denier, if he is an eco-political activist always denies new data that show the planet
may be healthy after all. The media usually defines deniers as those who deny the scientist’s computer model predictions. However, denying the measured climate data meets a better definition of the word science.

Now, what that brings up is the difference between the models and the observed data. We’ve all heard this story about the hockey stick. The hockey stick is that the climate was just going right along just flat and all of a sudden it jumps up. It looks like a hockey stick on a chart. We've all heard about that. That was a prediction. That was not observable climate measurement. That was not thermometers out there in the field. That was a prediction. There are a number of predictions based on models. People say well based on what we observe, we anticipate that in twelve years, the world is going to turn into a piece of charcoal if we don’t eliminate all SUV's. That's a prediction. It's not based on any observable climate measurements. So what Burt Rutan did was he looked at what the actual measurements were and what the predictions of what those measurements would be over the years and the two diverged enormously. There was
a huge diversion. Actual measurements stayed pretty much constant in most instances. Maybe a little up and down. That's what was actually measured. People with thermometers out there in the field but what was predicted was these enormous increases, sea levels are rising, hurricanes, locusts, burning up. None of that has happened. We've heard others talk about the different changes over the millennia, different changes in the temperature. Sometimes it got hot, sometimes it got cold. Most scientists pretty much agree the earth hasn’t warmed at all in about 20 years. Now, there's a lot of different reasons for it and a lot of different people come up with a lot of different theories on why has the earth not warmed at all in the last 20 years when we had these horrific predications of massive changes to the environment and massive increases in temperature. Why has it not changed? Well some people say it hasn’t changed because the models are wrong and what are those models based on? Well different models are based on different things. There are studies about the models and why don’t the models all match? If everybody's so convinced that we are all heading in the same
direction, if we have 98 percent of all climate scientists agreeing, well why are the models so different? Some say that we have twelve years. Some say that in the last 20 years, the temperature should have increased 2 percent. The fact is, most agree, it hasn’t changed at all.

We also have hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of climatologists, astrophysicists, other types of scientists who are involved in the climate change field who have made it very public that they don’t agree with this so-called consensus and they don’t believe there is a consensus. In fact, 125 of them signed a letter to the former head of the United Nations, Ban Ki-Moon, indicating that they don’t believe there is any such consensus and they dispute heavily the UN's assertion that climate change is primarily caused by man-made burning of fossil fuels. They indicate that there is no sound reason for the costly, restrictive policies that the UN is proposing because a rigorous analysis of unbiased observational data does not support projections of future global warming predicted by the UN; 125 of them. And they are mathematicians, astrophysicists, professors of
physics, a founding director of the National Arctic Research Center at the University of Alaska, University of Copenhagen, professors at the Wharton School whose specialty is analyzing projections, environmental consultants, professor of chemistry at Harvard University, emeritus professor of physical chemistry at Southern Connecticut State University.

Hundreds of them. There's 125 in this instance. I'm not sure if those are the 2 percent that we've been talking about or if this 98 percent really isn't true. I'm thinking the latter. The founder of Green Peace calls global warming the most difficult issue facing the scientific community today in terms of being able to actually predict accuracy. He believes that much of the science is not science. The founder of Green Peace. The founder of the Weather Channel said the same thing. The founder of the Weather Channel believes that there is hype going on. There is hype for political reasons and this 98 percent consensus is not true. Again, I'm a lawyer, not a scientist. I don't know if there's global warming. I don't know if it's made by man and I don't know if it is made by man, is it due to driving SUV's and I also have no
idea if it is, can we prevent it.

I've got just in the short time that I was able to look at this because again, we had no idea that this was coming up today, I've got dozens of peer-reviewed research papers that were put in legitimate scientific journals that say it just isn't true. And I don't believe to pull them up from the other side because obviously the proponent believes that 98 percent believe it's true. I don't know. I don't. But I can tell you that there's hundreds and hundreds of high-credentialed people, scientists in this field who believe it's not true which raises the question, a couple of questions. If there are hundreds of peer-reviewed scientists in this field, why are we denying that? Isn't that science denial when you're claiming that these peer-reviewed scientists from high caliber universities and institution, from the federal government, if they say that this isn't happening, why are we denying that they're saying it? We're not just denying their science; we're denying their very existence. That's not science. To say that these people don't exist and that their research doesn't exist or that they are just some lunatic fringe that's
hired off by the fossil fuel industry, that's science denial. That's worse than science denial. That's denying the very existence of opposition, of descent. That doesn’t even get to the substance of the reports that they’ve issued and the papers that they’ve written and the research that they’ve done. It's just ignoring it. They're saying it doesn’t exist. Is that what we want to be teaching our children? That we're just going to teach them that if you don’t agree with a specific ideology, if you don’t agree with a certain line of inquiry with regard to science, a certain set of data, if you don’t believe it, just ignore it. Just make believe it doesn’t exist. Is that what this amendment is about? To teach our children to ignore this science? I think we should not be doing that.

There are many, many peer-reviewed articles, peer-reviewed reports, deep scientific studies that indicate that the fear of global warming and the drive to change our very way of life based on that fear is completely unfounded. Here's one from the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine by Arthur Robinson, Noah Robinson and Willie Soon talking about the
environmental effects of increased atmospheric carbon dioxide and you know I won't read it but it essentially says the same thing. That the increased levels of CO2 in the 20th and 21st centuries have produced no deleterious effects upon the earth's weather or climate. Not my words. I didn't come up with this. They have all the charts and grafts and I've gone through. I read all the abstracts and the analyses and the conclusions and I've seen the charts and I've seen the charts from the other side too. I don't just read anti-global warming stuff. As I said last week, which unfortunately I'm forced to repeat today, I'm a bit of a global warming geek because I don't know the answer and I don't like not knowing the answer and so when I was challenged by somebody one day that I wasn't a full blown adherent to the ideology which coming from him appeared more like a religion because I hadn't yet drunk the Kool-Aid, that I was somehow a heretic. So I went after that encounter, I went and I started reading studies on both sides and you know what? They're both right in my view. I don't know. I don't know which one is right but I do know that are plenty of scientists on
both sides of this issue and for us to say that a child in our schools can't learn that there are two legitimate sides of this scientific debate is doing a grave disservice to the children of our state and to the people of this state whose children are in school because again, I could bring up dozens of them only in the few minutes that I was checking.

There's another list. There was a conference on climate change by hundreds of climate change scientists and specialists from around the world and at the end of that conference, this was in New York City, at the end of that conference, 206 climate science specialists and other types of scientists like statisticians, physicists, people who are involved in science but are not necessarily climatologist, 206 of them signed a letter. They've signed a declaration and the declaration essentially says the same thing; that there's no convincing evidence that CO2 emissions from moderate industrial activity has in the past, is now or will in the future cause catastrophic climate change. Are they right? I have no idea, but I know they're a lot more in tuned to the science than I am and that's what they say. No convincing evidence that
CO2 emissions from moderate industrial activity has in
the past, is now or will in the future cause
catastrophic climate change. Yet that does not appear
to be anything that this curriculum will teach the
children of this state. Even though there are 206
people who are in the field who will say it. Now,
since that declaration was signed, and it was signed
only by people who attended the conference, since that
time, that declaration has been posted on the internet
and now they have over 700 climate scientists or
scientists in those fields, statisticians, physicists,
astrophysicists that have signed onto that
declaration. That human-caused climate change is not
a global crisis. I don't think that's what we're
teaching in this curriculum. Even though there are
now 700 scientists in this field who put their name to
that declaration. Now, I don't know how many climate
scientists there even are in this world but if 700
account for only 2 percent, there must be a heck of a
lot of them. My feeling is that 98 percent is not
accurate. That an enormous number of existing climate
scientists do not believe in anthropomorphic global
warming. Many of them believe that there is warming
and it's natural. Some believe that man contributes in some ways. I read a study that man's biggest influence on the climate has nothing to do with CO2, but it has to do with cutting trees, putting pavement, sidewalks and buildings and absorbing more solar energy. There's a lot of different possibilities that legitimate climate scientists have researched and have data on and have put forth hypotheses and theories. Many of them or most of them that I have found have put their data out for anybody and everybody to review. That's part of the scientific method. Here's my data, check it out. Replicate my research, prove me wrong, show me where I messed up or prove that I'm right. From my research it appears that some, I'm not going to say many, but some that I have found of the scientists that are pushing a strict human-caused global warming theory, they refuse to put their data up for review. They refuse to show other scientists how they came to their conclusions. Well, it's apparently acceptable in the scientific community to write a research paper without showing your raw data but why? Why would you do a research paper and not show your work? The only reason I can think and I've
read many articles on it, the only reason why somebody would not show their data is because they either know their data doesn’t match their conclusion or their data is faulty to begin with.

Now let’s talk for a second about faulty data. You know it was referred to a little bit, a few minutes ago, well an hour or so ago about the data of observation, observational measurements of climate data. I have a study where a guy actually went to each of the temperature monitoring stations in a specific area of the country. He traveled and he went oh, there it is and he compared the location of that station to its historical temperature readings and what he found in some instances, he found in one particular instance the temperature at a specific location had over the years been rising pretty steadily and he went there and he found that temperature monitoring station right in the middle of a black asphalt parking lot. And he went back in time and he looked at the history of it and that station was originally in a field without any buildings around it and over time, buildings got added around it and then eventually they paved around the whole thing, but
the left the station right in the middle of the parking lot. Well, there is a very well-recognized thing in science called the heat island where manmade things tend to absorb heat and they tend to release them after the sun goes down. Like if you're standing in a parking lot as opposed to standing in a field, the temperature's going to be a lot higher because the asphalt is absorbing the heat and it makes it hotter around you and as the sun goes down, that heat is released from the asphalt so of course, a heat monitoring station that is now in the middle of a parking lot is going to show higher heat measurements than that same station when it was in the middle of a field with no asphalt around it and no buildings around it. So he went around to all these stations, I think it was in the northeast and he checked them, and he checked their history and he checked their observed readings and once he accounted for the changes in the geography around the monitoring stations and corrected for that on the heat measurements, he realized that there is absolutely no increase in temperature at those stations even though the measurements showed an increase. Yet, the increased measurements were used
by NASA, by NOAA and by other official temperature monitoring entities in an attempt to show that the temperature was going up even though it was a simply a matter of changes in the geography and changes in the manmade structures around the temperature monitoring stations. My guess is that the curriculum that is going to be taught to our children, that will be mandated under this amendment will not say anything about that problem.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the proponent of the bill if she's aware of the change in the earth's magnetic field over the last 20 or 30 years.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As I have said before, I am not here as a climate change expert to argue the pros and cons of whether or not climate change is real. I believe it is. I believe it is primarily manmade. What I am here to do is to advocate on behalf of our respecting and trusting our own DEEP and
our own State Board of Ed, both of which believe that this is a good change to codify into law best practices that we are mostly currently doing and I would like to say that I respectfully reject the notion that this is indoctrination or inculcation. The essence of the NGSS is to arm students with the tools for debate, for inquiry, for scientific method and that is what they do and I trust teachers. I trust school districts and teachers to do the right thing by our students. I was a teacher for ten years and any good teacher will allow debate in his or her classroom and I believe there is plenty of room for debate within the NGSS structure so I think that needs to be said for the record along with the inclusion of other causes, as mentioned earlier, albedo, sunspots, volcanoes, other causes of fluctuations in the climate, the argument being that the rapid increase of the change is primarily due to human activity and that the cessation of that activity holds the key into helping reverse this trend. That is the point of including this.

Through you. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Thank you, madam. Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll take that as a no to my question. So perhaps some of you may have heard that recently, the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration issued a notice to airmen that they need to recalibrate all of their compasses because compasses don’t point to the north pole, they don’t point to the geographic north of the earth. They point to magnetic north which is different, it's in a different spot than the north pole and the magnetic north, so if you hold out a compass or if you're in an airplane and have a compass, that compass is pointing to magnetic north, not true north. So there is a deviation factor between those two points, between magnetic north and actual north and when you navigate an airplane, you have to calculate in that deviation so you know where true north is.

Well recently, the FAA has put out a notice that because the magnetic north is moving so fast, compasses need to be recalibrated more often now than ever before. In fact, the scientists say that the magnetic field of the earth is moving faster than it
ever has in recorded history and even in past history, it's moving fastest, it's actually moving away from the north pole and towards Scandinavia so fast that they may need to recalibrate these things over and over and over. And at the same time, the earth's magnetic field is weakening and the scientists believe that it is weakening faster than it has ever weakened before in the history of the planet, at least that they can, they can find. And nobody knows why. Nobody has any clue why the magnetic field is weakening and the magnetic pole, which is the point of the magnetic field is moving so fast. Well the magnetic field is the thing that protects us from solar radiation and when the magnetic field weakens, we get more solar radiation hitting the earth, more solar radiation hitting the earth. What does that mean? Well more solar radiation hitting the earth means that we get more sunlight. We get more sunlight hitting our ground, hitting our buildings, hitting our asphalt. Well I've read reports that that is the primary reason why the earth is heating up and has nothing to do with CO2. Is it right? I have no idea. I don’t. And since nobody here is a climate
scientist, I don't think anybody knows but I can tell you, 98 percent of the people that I've read, peer-reviewed global warming climatologist, climate scientists, 98 percent of them are not saying that it's caused by manmade CO2.

I read another report, just pulled it up a little while ago that we are now experiencing one of the, one of the, a period where we have the least amount of cloud cover that we've ever had. The least amount of cloud cover that we've had in recorded history and clouds block the sun. When you have lots of clouds, you have less sunlight that hits the ground so there are peer-reviewed scientists that believe that it is cloud cover that we need to focus on and not SUV's and they don't why we have less cloud cover. Apparently, the cloud cover is one of the things that almost all of these climate change models completely ignore. They create these models showing that climate change is going to increase drastically, but they don’t factor in the magnetic field and they don’t factor in cloud cover. Well I've read peer-reviewed articles by people who are on board. They think man is creating global warming. They think it's anthropomorphic
global warming is really the problem and even they say but these models are terrible. They're completely inaccurate because they don't take into account the change in the magnetic field and they don't take into account the change in cloud cover.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again, I wish I had some time to prepare for this and if I had, I would actually have something to say on the topic but given that I did not have time to prepare and I just pulled things up, peer-reviewed research, I'll bring my comments to a conclusion and I'll conclude with saying that again, I have no idea if man is causing global warming but I can tell you that neither does anybody else and claiming that 98 percent of climate scientists all agree in my view is nonsense. And even if it were true, which from research it clearly is not, it would make no difference because history is replete with instances where everybody got on board with a certain theory, whether it was mandated by the church or it was just that's what everybody seemed to think at the time based on the best available observations. History is replete with instances where the consensus was completely and absolutely wrong and we are in a
slightly more enlightened society than was Isaac
Newton or Magellan or others who believed what was
opposite of what the consensus was. We live in a time
of the scientific method where science is not hidden,
data should not be hidden, and people who disagree
with the majority should not and must be called
pejorative names and be belittled and have their
papers barred from being published and have their
research money pulled because they don’t subscribe to
a philosophy even though they believe that their
science, their data shows it's wrong. Why global
warming? Of all the sciences, all the different
aspects of science, chemistry, biology, physics,
mathematics, why do we only say there is a consensus
on this one issue and therefore, everybody else who
doesn’t believe it has to shut up. Why? We don’t do
that in mathematics. In mathematics if you have a
theory, people challenge you to go prove it. People
put the problem up and they say can anybody prove or
disprove this theory? But now with global warming.
With global warming it's toe the line or you're a
heretic. We should not be teaching our children that.
We should be teaching them the full scientific method
that it's okay not to agree. It's good. We encourage you to challenge the philosophy and the consensus. We want you to go out there and prove that the earth is not burning up into a little piece of charcoal. We want you to go prove that man is not doing the damage that some say man is doing. Go prove it. We encourage that. That's what we should be teaching our children. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Mushinsky for the second time, you have the floor, madam.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to wrap this up. I'm a science teacher myself like my colleague from Bloomfield and a good science teacher will teach all the different aspects of this subject matter and they will hopefully show the students visuals from NASA and from the Defense Department that actually show ice retreating, glaciers melting, Artic Ocean ice-free to the point where countries are starting to fight over who gets to exploit it. And hopefully they
will also emphasize that this climate period is different, this climate change period is different from previous ones in earth's history. This one is different because it is driven by CO2 which has been measured in Hawaii since 1958 so we know when it is going up. It started at 315 parts per million in 1958. More recently it's 405 and it's on tract to going to 900 parts per million by the end of this century which is 100 times faster than climate change has happened in the naturally caused cycles. It's 100 times faster. I think that tells me a great sense of urgency is needed and I, and I want to enlist the children of Connecticut to help us in this project, to use their best intelligence, their best innovation to help us prepare for this very serious threat to our state, our way of life and our descendants so I think they're eager to work on this and we just have to get them inspired. I hope we will stand behind these kids, give them the tools they need to help us protect our way of life in Connecticut and to have a sustainable future and with that, I hope we will coalesce and support this amendment, support our kids and thank you, Representative Palm for all your effort
on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Cheeseman of the 37th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I think as many questions have been asked of the proponent of the bill so I have no questions. I do have a few comments. I happen to know a fair amount about the NGS Standards. The museum, of which I'm executive director, has programming for educators and all of our programs are based on the NGS Standards. In fact, if you look at them, it will be linked to them and one of the things those standards promote is the use of data and having done, like Representative Dubitsky, some research looking at the NGSS website itself, it says that school districts need to collect, analyze and use that data to see how well they're implementing the standards. With this emphasis on data, I do find it disturbing that the proponent of the bill has no data with regard to how many districts are implementing the standards and where they are in this implementation
within districts. What's happening at each grade level? As the standards dictate, the sound use of the argument, but moving on from that regrettable lack of detail behind the bill, again, referring to what the NGSS recommends and the implementation of these standards, and they have a list of foundational strategies. One is student outcomes and that's what we want. That students are equipped to look at a problem, look at the facts behind it, analyze the data, come up with solutions and then test those solutions to see if in fact they can address a problem. That's a great thing. I think we all want in our schools, in our cities, in our state to create those sound critical thinkers who can address the problems that Representative Mushinsky cited, be they with regard to climate change, be they with regard other crises we face, the opioid crisis, you know everything from can we come up with a better way to design a crosswalk to can we get people to Mars. We need those good critical thinking skills.

Another major part of those implementation foundational strategies is teacher development and
here I want to focus on the burdens, but burdens is the wrong word, the demands we are placing on our teachers everyday as we mandate the teaching of this and that. Are we providing the funds? Are our school districts providing the professional development to allow them, the equip them to teach these new important skills, facts, theories? NGSS recommends 100 hour of professional development just in the implementation of the teaching of NGS Standards, not with regard to the subject matter, but this is how you need to go about teaching that and I worry, particularly because we've removed the fiscal note, that we are not providing the districts with the resources they are going to need to equip the teachers to teach, be it climate change or any of the other parts of the NGS Standards and the final piece and the one I really want to focus on is equity in access. That all students from K to 12 have what they need and are exposed to those sound science facts. Are teachers equipped to instruct every student in their classroom regardless of background, regardless of their skill set, regardless of their special needs or their gifted or talented status or their ethnicity or
gender. Are they equipped to teach all those different students? Again, what are we doing to help our teachers do that? We are in a state that still has the highest achievement gap in the country and it worries me that as we hear mandate, another albeit worthy things, we aren’t giving our teachers, we aren’t giving our school districts what they need on a daily basis to instruct our children across the state. Even in my district we have children that are not meeting those mastery standards. When we look at children with emotional disturbances, they are four times more likely to be excluded from school and yet, here we’re asking to teachers to do yet another thing. We want the best for our children. We want the best for our school districts. We want our teachers to be equipped to create good, healthy, functioning citizens for the future but as we continue to mandate, albeit worthy topics, I worry that we are fiddling while Rome burns. Let’s ensure that our students have the basics that every child, regardless of their background, regardless of where they live, regardless of whatever, is getting what they need to succeed. Before we spend five hours talking about what they should be teaching
them, we know what they need to succeed, we should be delivering that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Wood of the 141st, you have the floor, madam.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been listening, I think this is going on about six hours today and certainly many good points have been made. I would like to echo the thoughts of Representative Mushinsky on global warming, my thoughts certainly in line with her on this issue and I've been long involved in environmental preservation and conservation in our state and I do believe climate change is an issue that we need to address. However, echoing Representative Cheeseman's comments just now, she makes very good points. We are not addressing basic education as well as we need to be particularly in our urban districts. These kids are getting out of school. They're not reading, they're not writing, they're not capable in math. Dyslexia is still going undiagnosed, it's not
remediated appropriately and we're mandating one more thing for teachers to do. There are districts already doing this. I'm really wrestling with this vote quite frankly because I think we need to do a better job with basic education before we mandate one more thing for our school districts to do so thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Have all members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to 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 Amendment Schedule "A."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Voting</th>
<th>146</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Have all members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to
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 7083 as amended by House "A".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Voting</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Is there business on the Clerk's desk?

CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, business from the Senate.

Favorable Report Senate Bill No. 42, AN ACT CONCERNING COINSURANCE, COPAYMENTS AND DEDUCTIBLES AND CONTRACTING BY HEALTH CARRIERS to be tabled for the Calendar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Tabled for the calendar. Without objection, so ordered. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 238?
CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of amendment LCO 9844. I would ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9844 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:
House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 9844, offered by Representative Arconti, Representative Ferraro, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this amendment extends traditional net metering program in the LREC, ZREC programs, requires PURA to study the value of distributed resources. It increases the virtual net metering base cap and it begins a collaboration of installation of class 1 resources on certain state lands, allows the electric distribution companies to own energy storage systems, expands anaerobic digesters within Connecticut state farms and creates a green jobs career ladder. Mr. Speaker, I believe this amendment will lead to the increase of more deployment of solar energy within the State of Connecticut and have a positive economic and jobs
impact for our state. This has been a great bipartisan effort over the last few months to put this bill together which I am proud of and I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark further on the amendment? Representative Ferraro of the 117th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker, through you, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Normally I'm pretty reluctant to support big omnibus amendments which become bills eventually, but I have to say the work that has gone into this one has been truly a bipartisan effort. I would like to thank the Chairs of Energy and Technology Committee, namely Representative Dave Arconti and Senator Norm Needleman. They went the extra mile to include everyone's concerns who had a state in this legislation. Their efforts began with changing the name of this bill because many on this side of the aisle were pushing back. They were extremely careful to make sure that the concepts and policies in this
legislation were something that both sides would be able to support. No one is going to like everything in the bill and I'm sure that most could find something that they wish were in the legislation but at the end of the day, we have a comprehensive amendment which will become the bill that sets us up well on our way to achieving our future energy goals.

I would also like to thank my fellow ranking member, Senator Paul Formica for all his hard work and contributions which were instrumental in helping us to get the finished document that we have now before us, and also Vice-Chair, Representative Allie-Brennan and our wonderful staff at Energy and Technology including specifically Lynn Kirschbaum for her numerous writings and re-writings on the legislation contained in this bill. Also, my analyst, Ray Collins, who put in over 100 hours in helping to craft this legislation. With that being said and for the purpose of clarification of the bill or amendment that is before us, I have some questions for the proponent of the amendment, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.
REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent, will this bill with its eleven major categories, actually ten major categories help us lay a strong foundation going forward for our energy policy with regard to the current and emerging technologies?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe it does.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and beginning with sections one through five of the bill, which addresses extensions of our current problems, in section one pertaining to net metering, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent, is it true that net metering has traditionally allowed customers who own certain renewable energy resources to earn billing credits when they generate more power than they use?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good Representative. And these credits for their monthly excess generation, they would be at the retail electric rates; is that correct?

Mr. Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Yes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, Mr.
Speaker, this bill would end opportunities to begin this type of net metering for all customers on December 31, 2021?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The answer to that one is maybe, not necessarily. So what we did in this bill is address section seven from last year Senate Bill 9 which became, everybody quiet, Public Act 1850 and in that bill, we directed DEEP to begin a successor program to monthly net metering. We gave two options through legislation, a tariff and instantaneous metering. Throughout the summer as the proceedings got going, it became evident that things were moving too fast and one of the EDC's didn't have the ability to fully implement instantaneous metering so in this bill, we give PURA within the docket the ability to look at instantaneous metering all the way up to monthly net metering which is what we currently operate under so PURA can decide to continue the current net metering practices for all customers post
December 31, 2021 if that is what the docket and PURA decide should be the successor program.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good Representative for his answer cause I know how hard he worked and how many late hours he kept in meeting with all the stakeholders and making sure that we had this right. Through you, Mr. Speaker, this bill would essentially extend by two years the sunset for customers who begin traditional net metering before December 31, 2021 from December 31, 2029 to December 31, 2041. Through you, Mr. Speaker, is this correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and moving on, these dates
for beginning a new net metering contract and for the extension of the sunset date, they would apply to both residential customers as well as for those customers approved by PURA under the LREC and ZREC Programs?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is true and we extend the LREC/ZREC program for another two years to match the extension on the residential side. That was an important part for the commercial side of the solar industry.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And section two deals with the LREC and ZREC programs in 2021 and through you, Mr. Speaker, a question to the proponent of the bill? Could the good Representative from Danbury please elaborate, for the purpose of clarification of this legislation and for those here in attendance and
those watching, what an LREC and ZREC program is?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a low emissions and zero emissions purchasing incentive program for distributed generation that meets their end requirements.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and moving on, as stated earlier in this legislation, it would require electric distribution companies to extend their existing requirement to enter into 15-year contracts to procure $8 million dollars in LREC and ZREC projects per year by two years, expiring in 2021. Is this correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and we're going to move on to section number three. The bill addresses changes in residential solar investment program administered by Connecticut's Green Bank and through you, Mr. Speaker, under the current law, this program just expire on December 31, 2022 or when the program deploys 300 megawatts of residential solar photovoltaic installations. Is it true that this bill merely increases from 300 megawatts to 350 megawatts the megawatt threshold that triggers the program's expiration?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and yes, we did increase the megawatts for the residential solar incentive program by 50 which will lead to more solar deployment
within the State of Connecticut, but it no longer triggers the program expiration. That became, that became problematic last summer during the docket proceedings as mentioned earlier, so we decoupled the program expiration from the ending of the RSIT program to the date certain of December 31, 2021. That gives more certainty for the industry and it allows a cleaner time table to move forward into the successor program.

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sections three through six addresses new renewal energy programs as well as a required study. Through you, Mr. Speaker, would the proponent of the bill elaborate on the changes and extensions with regard to PURA's implementation of the new tariff program for new renewable energy programs?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker, I
remember last year and it even carried over to this year, this big debate on a cost shift, on whether or not people and ratepayers who don’t have the ability to use solar are subsidizing those who do. The industry makes the argument that once you get to 10 percent deployment of solar within the state, then the cost shift becomes realistic. We have our professional staff at DEEP who sometimes argue differently so we included in this amendment for PURA and DEEP to study the value of distributed energy resources to truly determine the extra benefits and what else and how deploying solar values all ratepayers of the State of Connecticut. Now this study is due to the Committee of Cognizance which is Energy and Technology by July 2020 and PURA then has to incorporate the findings of that study within the docket for the new successor program.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the Representative for his answer. For clarification
purposes, electric distribution companies are now required to offer new tariffs to residential customers beginning January 1, 2022 rather than when then Green Banks Residential Solar Investment Program expires. Is this true, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They are required -- so the docket will determine a new successor program, but they are not required to offer tariffs necessarily. There are, as I mentioned earlier in the dialogue, there are a number of different successor programs that PURA is currently looking at within the docket.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good Representative for his answer. In section seven of the bill, it addresses the issues of virtual net metering and through you, Mr. Speaker, to bring some clarity to this section of the bill, I have a question
for the proponent. This legislation would increase the virtual net metering cap from $10 dollars to $20 million dollars. Would the good Representative explain why this is important?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this increasing of the cap has been important to members on both sides of the aisle and many people around the building and advocates for a number of years and it's important because it allows the ability for municipalities to save a significant amount of money on their electricity costs and adds more deployment of clean energy and it's a jobs factor. More deployment of, increasing the cap from virtual net metering will lead to more solar projects, i.e. more clean energy jobs.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Section eight addresses
land inventory held by the Department of
Transportation and will require the DOT by December 1, 2020 to identify any land suitable to cite class 1 renewable energy sources and evaluate its sustainability and submit the inventory to DEEP. Through you, Mr. Speaker, would the proponent explain the criteria that DEEP's analysis will consider during its evaluation?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and yes, DOT and DEEP worked very hard on this concept and they will consider a number of things, the environmental factors, setback requirements once the inventory is put on the DEEP's website.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And sections nine and ten address our thermal energy portfolio standards and simply requires DEEP in the next integrated resource
plan to include recommendations for rather, excuse me, include recommendations for rather than consider creation of a portfolio standard for thermal energy. Section eleven addresses state building construction standards. Through you, to the proponent of the bill, Mr. Speaker, this legislation requires DEEP's regulations to establish building construction standards based on a nationally-recognized model by January 1, 2020. Could the good Representative give some examples for standards that pertain to high-performance green buildings?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Sure thing, Mr. Speaker. Some of the standards include reduced emissions, enhanced building, occupant health and comfort, a design to conserve water resources, a design to promote sustainable and generative materials, cycles and to enhance the resilience to natural and technological hazards.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
And a tongue twister. Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good gentleman for his answer. In section 12, it expands the situations where DEEP can retain consultants. The bill allows DEEP to retain consultants to assist DEEP staff during PURA proceedings as well as for federal communication commission proceedings. Existing law requires that expenses for the consultant be borne by companies that may be recovered through rates by the companies and moving on to section 14, it addresses the ownership of storage facilities by an electric distribution company. Under current law, EDC's or electric distribution companies are prohibited from owning or operating generation assets. This bill will allow the EDC's to own energy storage systems. Through you, to the proponent of the bill, Mr. Speaker, how would the ownership of the storage systems by the electric distribution company be ultimately beneficial to the ratepayers?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Try that again. Representative Arconti.
REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The benefits of, the energy storage systems can provide, will provide benefits to all ratepayers including charging and discharging optimal times. It's a way for us to meet peak demand going forward.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and it's extremely important as the Representative just said because we are always in search of ways in which we can lower rates for our ratepayers. In section 15, we address the financing of residential furnaces, boilers and propane tanks. This bill would simply extend for five additional years, the duration of the program, that provides financing for furnaces, boiler replacements and for purchases of new or leased residential propane fuel tanks to 2024. To the proponent, through you, Mr. Speaker, is this true and accurate accounting of this section?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And sections 16 through 19 address anaerobic digestion at animal feeding operations. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I have some questions for the proponent of the bill with regard to these sections. This bill exempts certain anaerobic digestive facilities from the requirement to obtain a permit from DEEP to construct and operate a solid waste facility. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, what are the circumstances that would qualify an anaerobic digestive facility to be exempt from the requirement to obtain a permit from DEEP to construct and operate a solid waste facility?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Only a solid waste permit is applicable here. In order to be exempt, such facilities must be co-located with an animal feeding operation which is a facility on a farm other than aquatic animal production where animals have been or currently will be stabled or confined and fed for maintained a total of 45 days within a twelve-month calendar year.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the Representative for his answer and for the purposes of legislative intent, through you, Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

I see that we are adding anaerobic digestion to the LREC and ZREC program. Since the language is permissive, if a utility has already done the year eight solicitations, would they need to do another
solicitation for year eight to include anaerobic digestion?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

No, Mr. Speaker. Since it is permissive, there is no need to repeat the year eight solicitation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, if DEEP determines a facility is found to not be in compliance either as a result of not being co-located with an animal feeding operation or it is found to be processing more than five percent of volume food scraps, food processing residuals, and soiled or unrecyclable paper, what remedies will DEEP seek against such a facility?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.
REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if DEEP determines a facility has violated some of the rules here, DEEP will direct the facility to apply for the solid waste permit within five days and if they do not, then DEEP can take further action such as issuing a cease and consist order.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, and I thank the good gentleman for his answer. So to clarify, once DEEP has been notified that a facility is not in compliance, then that facility will be made to apply for a permit and should they not do that within five days, then they will be closed and that will be the procedure for those facilities that are not in compliance. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the maximum aggregate nameplate capacity that the bill allows the DEEP commissioner to select proposals for resources in this regard?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This AD's on farms will be you know 1 megawatt at most but the commissioner has the ability to issue a 10 megawatt solicitation for anaerobic digesters.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the last section of the anaerobic digestion portion of this bill addresses biogas produced from anaerobic digestion. The bill requires PURA to initiate a docket by 10/01/2019 to define and adopt a gas quality interconnection standard for biogas derived from the decomposition of farm-generated organic waste or from the decomposition of farm, excuse me, or from source-generated organic material that has been processed through gas condition systems to remove the impurities.

And lastly, sections 20 and 21 address a green jobs career ladder. This bill requires the Office of Workforce Competitiveness and Consultation with the Office of Higher Education, the Department of
Education, the Department of Labor, DEEP, regional workforce development boards, and employers to establish a career ladder for jobs and green technology industry by 01/01/2020.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, one last question for the proponent. Would the good Representative explain what items would be on the green career ladder list?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Such items would include careers at each level of the green technology industry, green job core certificate and degree programs offered by technical education and career schools within the technical education career system and state higher education systems and jobs available in this said industry.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Ferraro.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, the good Chair and I have for clarification purposes tried to
give a thorough review of the sections in this energy and technology bill and I'm confident that this bill will move our energy standards and policies forward and I stand in strong support of this legislation before us and would urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Ferraro. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? From the 37th district, Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I just have a brief question for the good Chair of Energy?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you. Through you, the section I think 20 and 21 refer to green jobs and when I made inquiries, I learned that a lot of our state definitions are derived from the Bureau of Labor Statistics definition and jobs and businesses that produce goods or provide services that help reduce energy, conserve natural
resources or help preserve the environment. Through you, Mr. Speaker, is that your understanding as well of these green jobs?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding as well.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, would that also include jobs in our nuclear industry whereby all means we are conserving the environment, preserving jobs? We know very well that our two nuclear plants provide close to 95 percent of our carbon-free power.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding. There's nothing in this language that would preclude
these types of jobs being listed so I would agree with the proponent.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good Chair for his clarification. I know that certainly the jobs at Dominion, they offer two dozen fully-funded scholarships every year at Three Years Community College along with employer-paid internships and those jobs that do not require four-year degrees result in a salary package that averages $156,000 dollars and I think we would agree these are great jobs for our state so I want to thank the Chair, the ranking member, and everyone else involved in energy and technology for their work on this bill and I thank the good Chairman for his answers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you Representative Cheeseman. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? From the 136 district,
Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you. I first want to thank the good Chair for addressing the fundamental flaw in what was SB9 last year by creating an appropriate pause in the progress of moving directly to tariffs. I think this is a critical short-term, not a solution, but a step in the right direction so I wanted to start on line 356 of the amended bill. It makes mention of the plan to ask both DEEP and PURA to engage in a value or solar study and sets a date of July 1, 2020. To the proponent of the bill, what happens if either agency or the regulatory authority fail to meet the date of July 1, 2020?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I appreciate my
colleague's question. So through you, since the docket won't be completed until, in the new successor program, won't be chosen until later that year in 2021, that gives us the long session of 2021 if we are lucky enough to return to this Chamber to address the lack of information that DEEP and PURA gave or if they don’t follow through on their end of the bargain to conduct this study and implement it in the docket, we can then come back and through the legislative process really amend the docket ourselves and include it and make recommendations ourselves for the successor program.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, so if I understand the good Representative correctly, if they fail to meet deadlines, not that DEEP has ever failed to meet a deadline in the past, that the legislature has recourse to reconsider some of the aspects of this bill such that the intent of this bill to make sure that we have a value or solar study completed and that
PURA has ample opportunity to assess its impact on its rate making structure, that we will be revisiting this in the 2020 session, or 2021 session assuming any of us are here?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do have full confidence that the commissioner of PURA will do the duty that we are assigning them within this language, but if they do not, the Representative is correct.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will now turn the good Representative's attention to lines 430 through 436 which refer to benefits that need to be considered in the event of establishing a tariff. This is a particularly important section to me because it requires them to consider when setting rates, energy storage systems that provide electric distribution
benefits, location of a facility in the distribution system, and time of use rates for other dynamic pricing. These are all things we've talked about a lot which oftentimes seem to not be mentioned as frequently as we talk about ratepayer rates. Could the good Representative explain to me how they're going to use this to establish tariffs in the future?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not a member of PURA so this will be decided through the docket.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):
Fair enough, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will now move on to another section of the bill, section six and I'm going to start I believe with line 508. I understand another Representative did ask him about the doubling of the virtual on the metering cap. Let me just the good Representative, what happens if that
$20 million dollars becomes fully subscribed within a year's time?  
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and there is a successor program in the making to virtual on that metering so the idea was to increase that cap to build a bridge to the competitive RAP process which will be the successor program to virtual net metering.  
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

I thank the good Representative for his answer. I personally believe there is a tremendous pent up demand for virtual net metering projects. I imagine that once word gets out that we're gonna be doubling it to $20 million dollars, there'll be lots of municipalities in particular that will be eager to get on the list and I imagine we'll have a new queue for projects as we did in the past when we topped out on
the $10-million-dollar cap.

Moving along to section 14, I want to start on line 854. Again, the good Representative answered questions with regard to allowing utilities or EDC's to be engaged in creation of large-scale storage. Does the good Representative see this as consistent with the state's deregulation dating back a good 25 years?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

I do, Mr. Speaker and generation is tough, battery storage is tough to define. Many say it's generation, others do not. I think deregulation has been successful and failed in many ways, but I think this moves us in the right direction especially going into next year with the integrated resources plan due to us. I think we're gonna do a lot of big things. I know my colleague from the 136th has a great interest in all of this and is someone who I rely on in help, in crafting these policies.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the good proponent's comments. I do agree that storage is a critical missed opportunity here in the State of Connecticut and if I were to make any exception from deregulation to allow the utilities to become involved, it would begin with storage though I view this as only the first step and that we need to create all sorts of scale of storage and to create other opportunities, maybe even collating a storage facility near our offshore wind in New London. There are lots of opportunities out there.

Just a couple more questions. When we were originally considering this green economy bill, there was made mention of some sort of successor or compliment to the Governor's climate change council. Is there something in here about creating a new task force or working group that would carry on the good work and help us identify good new green economy and jobs bill in the future?

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

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

There is nothing in this current language, Mr. Speaker, but I know this is of great interest and the GC3 is of great interest to the Governor and the Commissioner so I would expect some movement on that in the future.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm disappointed by that. It was part of I think our original consideration frame. I think that's a critical aspect of creating an inclusive working group that involves all stakeholders because that's where a lot of the good ideas some from, from a variety of different walks of life, people with different perspectives and interests and I would hope that, even though it didn’t end up in the bill which I thought was really perfectly suited for such a working group, that we find a way to get this and I count on the Governor and
the Commissioner of DEEP and the good Representative and his co-Chair to come up with an answer on this sooner than later so we don’t miss future opportunities. And lastly, with section 20 on jobs, could the good Representative just quickly explain this concept of a jobs ladder?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, this bill was originally offered by Representative Mushinsky and it went through the Higher Education Committee, but we thought it was important to include in this bill because we’re really looking to expand opportunities for young people and I believe young people will be attracted to states that are passing policies such as these.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to totally agree
with the good Representative on that point. I think we have just scratched the surface on opportunity for good paying green jobs in this bill. I think it's perhaps unfortunate that we spend a lot more time on the worth of aerobic digesters than we do on creating green jobs which I thought was the original intent of this bill to a large degree, so I'm still hopeful that in the future, we will put a greater focus on this and again, consistent with the Governor's pronouncements in the past, I would expect that there would be a huge emphasis on the economic benefit of green jobs and that if it's not in this bill, that we have something we can talk about next year. So overall, just to conclude, I'm supportive of this bill mainly because it puts a fix on the mistakes of the flawed bill from last year and I think it takes some real steps forward. I like the focus on green building codes and improving those standards and getting the state involved. I like doubling the virtual net metering cap and there are many other aspects that make this bill worthy of support. I just hoped we could have done more. Initially when we started off, I thought we were going to do a lot more but I do support this
bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you Representative Steinberg. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Gresko from the 121st district.

REP. GRESKO (121st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A couple of questions to the Chairman of the Committee, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. GRESKO (121st):

To the Chairman of the Committee for the integrated resources plan, thank you for including the potential TREC, but I do not see a date for completion of that IRP by DEEP. I see June 14 of last year as the projected date. What happens maybe at the end of 2019 if we have not successfully seen this IRP?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

The IRP is due to the General Assembly, Committee
of Cognizance which is Energy and Technology January 1, 2020 with these recommendations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Gresko.

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and not to reiterate a point made by the previous questioner, but if DEEP does not come across with the IRP in that said time, what are our options?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I do have full confidence in our agency that they will deliver the IRP for us for the 2020 session, but if not, I plan to draft some pretty significant legislation within the committee with colleagues from both sides of the aisle to begin the good work on this subject matter.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative Gresko.

REP. GRESKO (121st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say thank you for the efforts put forth for this legislation. I look forward to seeing the alternative portfolio standards for the TREC and thank you again for adjusting the net metering and the pause for the LREC and ZREC, a major win at least for a pause at this point. That's all I have, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Gresko. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? From the 8th district, Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and there's been some great dialogue on this amendment and so I don't have a lot to add to it other than I'm in full support of this amendment and the areas that I'm impressed with, you know first you know the jobs component of it. You know looking to make sure that we expand job opportunities in the green area whether it's energy efficiency, solar implementation to a digester building maybe. Also an area that I'd like to make
sure, I mean one of the things that -- and I like the fix, you know part of it, making sure that our solar companies can sell jobs out there and our roofs can still be put solar panels on and largely projects also. The energy efficiency component in our state buildings you know we've had kind of a lead by example and we haven't really led well. I think this sets the standard for our state buildings do be more energy efficient saving us tax dollars. So in full support of this. I want to thank the committee for its efforts on it and I know a lot of work and a lot of headaches and a lot of head scratching went along the way and I think they came to a good piece that will help Connecticut in the future so thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the amendment? Representative McCarty of the 38th district.

REP. MCCARTY (38th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just, I have a very quick questions for the proponent of the bill if I may?
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Of course. Please proceed, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you. If you could just tell me in section 20, there's reference again to the Office of Higher Education and the Labor Department putting these jobs on their website which I think is a great thing, but the next sentence talks about the inventory for the Tech Ed and Career schools on green technology equipment that might be the data on the equipment. Could you just give me an example of what that equipment might be?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

I apologize to the good Representative. I'm not well versed in this type of equipment so I don't have an example to give.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Of course. Please proceed, madam.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Well that's fine but in general I'm very
supportive of this amendment and all the work that has gone into with the Energy and Technology Committee and I'm very pleased that my great colleague, Representative Cheeseman pointed out that this will also include jobs that are nuclear industry so I thank the proponent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? From the 92nd district, Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON (92ND):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good evening to you.

REP. DILLON (92ND):

I'm speaking in support of the proposal and I really want to thank the house Chair of the Committee for the hard work that he did to pull people together. I'm particularly, as the Chair knows, interested in the virtual net metering which attracted a lot of concern in my own part of the state and it involved jobs. I also am very pleased to see that the green jobs ladder legislation was folded into this, but most
of all I really want to thank you for your work ethic and for your unfailing courtesy at the relentless questions that you got, certainly from me on this and I really want to thank you for a job well done.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative O'Dea from the 125th.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. No questions, just a comment. It didn’t take long for my no-vote on the climate bill for me to get plastered all over social media as being anti-environment. Just for the record, I want to thank the good Chair of the Energy Committee on incorporating a number of bipartisan bills including one of my net metering proposals in keeping the solar industry going at least for the next few years and I am pro-environment and I am very much in favor of this bill and I would ask my colleagues to support it. I want to thank again the ranking member and the Chair of the Committee. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? From the 58th district, Representative Arnone.

REP. ARNONE (58TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of 5002, specifically the anaerobic digestion for farms. Digesters provide farms two things, a nice renewable energy source as well as an environmentally responsible way to dispose of cow manure. Runoff from cow manure can cause or waterways to be polluted with pathogens like salmonella and E-coli so anaerobic digestion will help kill those pathogens and this is a great new technology for our farms and I urge its passage. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Thank you, Representative Arnone. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Have all members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to 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 5002 as amended by House A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Voting</th>
<th>146</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those absent and not voting 5

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Is there any business on the Clerk's desk?

CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Favorable Report of the House Committee on Appropriations, 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 (CSEA-SEIU LOCAL 2001) to be tabled for the Calendar and printing.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Tabled for the Calendar and printing. If not objection, so ordered. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 443?

CLERK:

On page 30, Calendar 443, House Bill No. 7401, AN ACT CONCERNING A STUDY OF VICTIM SERVICES. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO No. 9545. I ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9545, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

LCO No. 9545, designated House Amendment Schedule A, and offered by Representatives Stafstrom and Aresimowicz.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a strike all amendment of the underlying bill. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? I apologize, Representative Rebimbas. No, Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us comes from a situation that occurred recently in the state and what it does is clarify in our state statute that a state or municipal employee, while they are in the course of performing their job function, is not permitted to transmit, disseminate or otherwise make available to a third person the photographic or digital image of someone's deceased body. Mr. Speaker, the penalty outlined under the bill for violation of the statute, again, only where that municipal or state employee is acting within the
scope of their employment is a Class A misdemeanor. There is an exception where the image shared is part of a suspected crime or other misconduct. I urge support.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment for us. Just for clarification purposes, a few questions through you to the good Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, to the good chairman, you did indicate in your summary a few things I just wanted to point out. Again, this only specifically applies to state or municipal employees in the course of their duty so if they happen to be a state or municipal employee and not in the capacity that they're employed outside of their work hours, etc, would this apply to them?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, Mr. Speaker, this provision also only applies if the actual body they're taking a photograph of is of someone who's actually deceased so if it's someone who, at least for purposes that they have reason to believe that they're still alive and it's injuries, they would not fall under this proposal. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The ranking member is absolutely correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Rep. Rebimbas (70th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, Mr. Speaker, there's also the ability for the individual, whether it's a state or a municipal employee taking the photo to get permission from a family member, an immediate family member. If the good Chairman could just flush out exactly what would be included as an immediate family member?

Through you.

Deputy Speaker Morin (28th):

Representative Stafstrom.

Rep. Stafstrom (129th):

Deputy Speaker Morin (28th):

Representative Rebimbas.

Rep. Rebimbas (70th):

Deputy Speaker Morin (28th):

Representative Stafstrom.

Rep. Stafstrom (129th):

Yeah, through you, Mr. Speaker. Say there was an incident where an unfortunate passing of a young man and his body was discovered in the woods by a Department of Public Works employee. If the Public
Works employee got consent from the young man's family, parents, maybe wife or brother or sister or children if they have children, that would be considered immediate family and the image could be shared either with that family directly or if they so authorized, to another third party.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, Mr. Speaker, if that individual obtained permission from any of the family members you just enumerated, and not present was a family member that would objected, would the individual relying on the permission provided to the family member that they actually made contact, would they be okay and not fall under the penalty provision of this proposal?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, through you, Mr. Speaker, that's correct. We're not intending to have our state or municipal
employees referee family disputes as long as they receive consent from a next of kin, from an immediate family member, then that would be sufficient to avoid criminal liability under the provisions of this statute.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you, Mr. Speaker to the good Chairman, one last clarifying question. Just for legislative intent, if there are two family members that may be considered immediate and both of them having conflicting opinions as to whether or not it should be shared, what should that state or municipal employee do as an action?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, what they should do and what's required under the bill may be two different things. What they should do is maybe refrain from
sharing the image publicly but as long as the received authorization from one immediate family member, that would be enough to avoid any sort of potential liability for that employee under the bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I want to thank the good Chairman for his responses. Again, I do rise in support of the amendment. These are very sensitive situations and certainly, I think any time that an individual can take the precaution of trying to get permission or certainly for the caveat or the carve out regarding that this is conducting a report, that's one thing, but certainly the sharing of photographs of a deceased body can certainly cause a lot more damage that intended so I do think this is a good proposal. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Rebimbas. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Dubitsky.
REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a couple of questions for the proponent if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask, the substance of this bill, was this not a standalone bill in Committee?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, does the proponent, does the questioner mean the amendment or the underlying bill? I'm not sure I understand the import of his question.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky, please clarify.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. I mean the amendment, the substance of the amendment of
prohibiting a state employee from taking photographs of a dead body. I recall that being a standalone bill at some point. Am I correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I don't recall this exact language being the substance of a standalone bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask does prohibiting state employees from photographing dead bodies have anything to do with the concern, anything to do with a study of victim services?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, first, I don’t read
this bill as prohibiting the taking of the photo. It merely prevents the transmission or dissemination of the photo just so that we're clear for the legislative intent on this. As to the questioner's question about victim services, yes, in fact we did have a bill that came through the Committee on a study of victim services. That bill in fact received some opposition cause there were folks who thought a study was not necessary. We received testimony to that effect. There was subsequently a meeting put together by the Speaker of the House with stakeholders to discuss that issue and one of the issues that was brought to the Speaker's attention either as part of that meeting or subsequently was that based on a situation that occurred down in, I believe, Greenwich, there's no prohibition against a state or municipal employee sharing a digital image of a decedent's body publicly and certainly, if you were the victim of a crime who ended up deceased as a result, I'm not sure that you or your next of kin would necessarily want that digital image floating around on social media so we thought rather the bill altogether, given that was one of the suggestions that came out of the discussions
the Speaker had this year, that certainly it was appropriate to make sure that issue got addressed through the legislation this year.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Dubitsky, please clarify.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the proponent for his answers. I just need to articulate my frustration where having these strikes all's where a completely different concept and a completely different bill is inserted at the last minute under the title of a bill that was advertised as being one thing, and now we're making it something completely different. If the idea of limiting the use of photographs of dead bodies taken by state employees was one that was worthy of legislation, then we should have a bill up there that says an act concerning the use of photographs of dead bodies by state employees. We shouldn’t have one up there that says an act concerning a study of victim services which this is certainly not and I don’t really have much comment on the substance of the amendment. My frustration and my
objection is with the procedure and the way that this issue has become before this body. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Have all members voted? Have all the members
voted? Will the members please check the board to 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Voting</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] The Chamber will stand at ease. The Chamber will come back to order. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 621?

CLERK:

On page 54, Calendar 521, Substitute House Bill No. 7373, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE SERVICES' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION AND MINOR REVISIONS TO THE TAX AND RELATED STATUTES. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on
Finance Revenue and Bonding.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Meskers, oh, you move acceptance, right?

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Yes, I move acceptance.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 9423. I move for acceptance of the amendment. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9423, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 9423, offered by Representative Rojas.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The bill 7373 with the associated amendment is a bill that changes and synchronizes Connecticut State Tax Code to reflect the Internal Revenue Code where guaranteed payments will now be included in the past due entities to allow for proper treatment for taxes for the SALT taxes and for the exceptions thereof. Additionally, we are moving, the treatment of those itemized deductions referenced in the subsequent pages, additionally, the amendment to the tax bill also cover to account for limited
liability corporations and the capture of the assets of limited liability corporation for the decedents who are residents out of the state so we can properly assess the estate taxes on those, uh, those issues. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? The fine ranking member of the Finance Committee, Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of the amendment here today. I did have a question or two for the proponent if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Of course, sir, you may proceed.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you. In lines 33 through 40, we're waiving the interests and penalties for anyone who made an underpayment for the pass-through entity tax after we passed the pass-through entity tax about halfway through the year. some issues came up with individuals who were filing estimates and finals as
personal income taxes and individuals that were filing as pass-through entity taxes and what this is doing here is waiving that payment if they made that late payment in an attempt to sure up with their pass-through entity tax. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the next sections of the bill dealing with refers for online sales, it's my understanding that after the Wayfair decision, some of the language of the statutes that we had passed just a few months before the Wayfair decision have proven to be a little bit complicated for referrers and other marketplace sellers on the internet and through you, Mr. Speaker, with this section, are we making any
actual changes or are we just simply changing the effective date to give us more time to figure out the implications of the Wayfair decision on online sales?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Excellent question. Through you, no this is a delay in the implementation to allow for the proper implementation of those sales taxes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And in line 7 through 28 that the kind gentleman referenced in bringing out the amendment, this only impacts those out of state owners of LLC's, partnerships, S corporations and their liability for a state tax here within the State of Connecticut; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Meskers.
REP. MESKERS (150TH):

That is my understanding.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I stand in support of the amendment as I stated before. I think it does a couple of pro-business things in that it helps those small businesses that may have been late in paying their pass-through entity tax liability last year because of the late implementation of that tax change. This gives them the ability to waive those penalties and interests and I think that's a positive thing so I will be supporting the amendment and I encourage my colleagues to do so as well. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of questions on the bill as amended if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Of course you may. Please proceed.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the kind gentleman from Greenwich alluded to in his description of the bill previously, there is a change here that would deal with the pass-through entity tax and what can be applied from itemized deductions at the federal tax level and if the kind gentleman could please explain the potential benefit to the business owner for doing this change?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Mr. Speaker, the change in the tax code should
allow guaranteed payments under the pass-through entities to be included as indicated in the Internal Revenue Code. This will allow people to take that deduction on the Connecticut Income Tax and will therefore reduce their effective tax liability.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Of course you may. Please proceed.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the intent of this section would be for those business owners to take the federal deduction for those allowable deductions so they get the savings at the federal level through that, and then they'd also, in a sense it's almost backwards, but they wouldn't be able to take it at the state level to maximize their payment to the federal government for the SALT deduction and so they would actually be able to benefit from the federal deduction as well as the additional way around what would otherwise penalize them for the SALT reduction; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Meskers.
REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Mr. Speaker, through you, that is my understanding.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding as well that that appears to be potentially a pro-business change in the tax code that could benefit small businesses on their federal taxes through this pass-through entity tax that we adopted just a couple of years ago. And through you, Mr. Speaker, I see that one issue that did come up with the pass-through entity tax after it was passed is that unlike the income taxes, there's a threshold on when you get triggered for making those estimates and final payments, the quarterly payments and the final payment and in this bill, we're now setting that threshold to be at the same level as what the threshold is for income taxes for the pass-through entity tax or is it a different threshold?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is it's the same pass-through level, same tax level, sorry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So if a company paying on the pass-through entity tax has a liability for less than $1000 dollars, a very small business, you know someone who just does it on the side perhaps. They would not be required to do quarterly payments if they're below $1000 dollars in liability? They would only have to make that one final payment at the end of the year?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Yes, that is my understanding in my conversations with the Department or Revenue Services that currently, there is no threshold rate such that the payments are required to make quarterly so under this,
the cap is set at $1000 dollars as the limit or the minimum amount at which quarterly payments would be required.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think again, this section of the bill is potentially another pro-small business section especially those individuals that kind of have the small businesses, the ones that don’t necessarily generate a lot of revenue but it frees up their time and efforts and perhaps the cost of them to account to file those quarterly payments. This allows them to only have to file that one-time payment once a year rather than four to five times a year and I see that as a positive. Mr. Speaker, I see that we're also changing the way that penalties and interest are to be applied when making a payment that is four penalties and interest; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):
Yes, that is correct. The order of payments and priority of payments has been reversed under this bill. We were running into an issue where the penalties were served first and the interest was paid last and that was leaving us with an effective stranded interest payment and this will resolve that issue and allow the penalties and the interest to be collected in the order that incentivizes full satisfaction of the obligation to the state.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And my understanding is that this change is back to where we were I think only about two years ago; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Meskers.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

My understanding is in the conversations with DRS is that yes, we are amending it back to the status we had two years ago.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):
Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And throughout much of the rest of the bill it does truly make minor revisions, one changing from references of "he" to "the commissioner" making them gender neutral for future generations, various other changes like instead of referring to it as one month, it changes it to 30 days, small changes like that as well so overall, it appears that a number of the changes made here outside of those small little minor ones that I just described are actually rather pro-business and ones that should help out small businesses across the state so for those reasons, I will be supporting the bill here today and I encourage my colleagues to do so as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Davis. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Meskers, would you like to remark further?

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank
Representative Davis for his comments and I would like to send a strong word of support to the DRS for their hard work on this. I think the cleanup of the bill will lead us to a more work friendly or business friendly environment and I encourage support for this bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

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

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):
Thank you. I'd like to change my vote to the affirmative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you. So noted. Representative Lopes.

REP. LOPES (24TH):

Please change my vote to the affirmative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 7373 as amended by House A.

Total Number of Voting 143
Necessary for Adoption 72
Those Voting Yea 143
Those Voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 8

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] The House will be at ease.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The Chamber will come back to order. Are there any announcements or introductions? Any announcements
or introductions? Hearing none, will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 163?

CLERK:

On page 9, House Calendar 163, Substitute House Bill No. 6993, AN ACT CONCERNING TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO ACT AS A MORTGAGE LOAN ORIGINATOR AND DEFINING THE CIRCUMSTANCES CONSTITUTING A CHANGE OF CONTROL PERSON. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Banking.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Doucette, sir, you have the floor.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker. I move adoption of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill is an agency proposal. It does two things. First, it grants mortgage loan origination temporary authority from the
time the application is, um, to when the application is either denied or approved by the commissioner for individuals who are licensed as a mortgage loan originator in another state or employed as a federally registered loan originator. This is a conforming change to the federal law on the same subject.

In addition, it also clarifies the definition of a change in control for the purposes of filing an advance change notice with respect to a change of a director, general partner or executive for all licenses to mean a change in the majority ownership as opposed to a change in the day-to-day operations like a branch manager. This also streamlines our Connecticut banking law to be aligned with federal statutes regarding the same subject. I move adoption.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill? Representative Delnicki of the 14th, sir, you have the floor. Just ask the Chamber to quiet down so we can hear
Representative Delnicki. Representative, sir, please proceed.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for asking the Chamber to quiet down a little bit.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Pretty effective wasn’t it? [laughter] [Gavel]

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

You got that right. I have a couple of questions, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Now what is an out-of-state mortgage originator? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, this would be a mortgage loan originator or a loan officer who is licensed in another state and/or under federal law. Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you to the proponent of the bill. What protections in this bill are created to ensure that someone having this temporary authority to act as a mortgage loan originator is on the up and up and can be trusted to do it an honest, up board manner?

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Delnicki. Oh, Representative Doucette, excuse me.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, there are several specific protections outlined in the bill starting in line 370, the applicant cannot have had a license ever denied or be currently subject to any order from any other state. They may not have been convicted of a misdemeanor or a felony. They have to obviously have an application pending and be in good standing in the state where they are licensed.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and again, thank you to the proponent for the answers pertaining to that question. And through you, Mr. Speaker, when does an out-of-state mortgage loan originator have temporary authority to act as a mortgage loan originator in Connecticut begin?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, the authority would begin at the time that the application is pending and under review, and it would expire at the time that the commissioner has completed its reviewed and either approved or denied the applicant, but not more than 120 days after the date the individual submits the application provided the application is not identified as incomplete on the system.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Thank you again to the proponent and through you, Mr. Speaker, under what legal jurisdiction and laws would an individual having temporary authority to act as a mortgage loan originator be subject to?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, so they would be subject to the laws of the State of Connecticut, as outlined in this bill, they would be subject to the laws of the state where they are licensed. They would also presumably be subject to federal law governing mortgage loan originators.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Again, thank you to the proponent of the bill and through you, Mr. Speaker, one last question. In
section 3-12 it makes reference to change of control. What exactly does that mean?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is a conforming change to federal law. It means that change of control would be a change in the actual ownership or management of the company and does not include any changes in a branch manager or day-to-day operations that would, as I understand it, trigger the implications of this procedure.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Delnicki.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Thank you again to the proponent and just a couple of comments here. I believe this bill, it is an agency bill, addresses issues that only afford opportunity for conducting business in the State of Connecticut for a limited period of time but also ensures that bad actors do not have that ability, do
not get that chance and there are guarantees in there that ensure that that is the case. I think it's a good piece of legislation and I stand in support of it and I encourage my colleagues to support the bill and I thank the proponent for bringing it forward.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

House Bill 6993.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Voting</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The bill passes. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Are there any announcements or introductions? If not, will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 325?

CLERK:

On page 21, House Calendar 325, Substitute House Bill No. 7299, AN ACT MAKING CHANGES TO DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER PROTECTION ENFORCEMENT STATUTES. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on General Law.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative D'Agostino, you have the floor.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.
The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative D'Agostino, you continue to have the floor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As described, the bill makes various technical changes to the Department of Consumer Protection statutes. The Clerk is in possession of an amendment. It's LCO No. 8790. I would ask that the amendment be called and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 8790 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A?

House Amendment Schedule A LCO No. 8790, offered by Representative D'Agostino.

The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative D'Agostino, you may continue.
REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When you read both bills, well both together the bill and amendment, again, it's various technical changes and other wholesale amendments to various section to the Department of Consumer Protection Statutes. I'll note that in the original bill, we are striking sections with respect to mobile fueling stations. That's something that some members had asked about. That is not happening this year. You won't be able to call up and have gas come and refuel you on an app this year. We're still working on that so that is stricken out by virtue of the amendment. Other changes allow DCP to make more enforcement and fines with respect to licensure so long as they follow the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act. Other changes with respect to how architects are organized and how we regulate community association managers and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Representative Cheeseman of the 37th, ma'am, you have
REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please proceed.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you. Apart from the changes you’ve outlined, are there any other significant changes of which this Chamber should be aware?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

A younger and better looking Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, [laughter], yes, there's a significant change to sterile compounding. This is a process by which pharmacies create various cocktails if you will of drug combinations. It's a very technical process. It needs to be highly regulated. There were some instances a couple of years ago with a pharmacy in Massachusetts that wasn’t doing this properly and there was some mold that got in. These
are powdered drugs that are mixed together per prescription. The pharmacists are authorized to do that. They have to follow very specific procedures when they do so. The changes in the amendment allow that to happen but again, it's highly regulated and so the sterile compounding section is in here and is very important and I thank the Representative for helping me point that out.

Aside from that section, again, we're talking about some changes also to the building trade sections when people do inspection and testing in your home, for example of the HVA system, HVAC system, it needs to be done by a licensed contractor because when you do even just inspection and testing, often you're taking apart a system and you want to make sure that a professional is putting it back together so there's sections in the original bill with respect to inspection and testing for plumbing, heating, cooling, electrical work that sort of thing. Those are the other two major sections of the combined bill as amended.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and would the good Chair like to comment? There was a request from the architectural industry to make some changes with regard to employee stock ownership plans?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, another good question. This is similar to a change that we made last year with respect to engineering firms. Now, we're doing the same thing with respect to architectural firms. They can be organized pursuant to an employee stock ownership plan provided that two-thirds of the controlling membership are architects. We will not require 100 percent because you may have a professional employee, an accountant whose part of the executive board of that firm but isn’t an architect. Those changes are again very similar to what we did for engineers last year. It helps frankly make our state more business friend to architectural firms.
This is a change that you're seeing throughout the country and we are adopting it here.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and I want to thank the Chair of General Law for his elucidation of those matters. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. ACKERT (8TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I appreciate --

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Smith, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just realized now looking through this bill I actually have a potential conflict of interest so I'd like to recuse myself from any further hearing on this.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The Chamber will stand at ease. The Chamber will come back to order. Representative Ackert, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment that I would like to call but before I bring that out, I'd like to take a look at the language of the bill. It's on lines 98 and 99 and what it deals with is additional fines for contractors not properly advertising the business license number and so what it is, is that a contractor shall provide their license number on a yard sign, they'll put a proposal together. On that proposal they have to put their license number on it. You know many, any time pretty
much that their name is submitted or advertised, you
know the little pizza joint that gets your license,
they want to advertise business on it, you have to
have your license number on it and the current fine
for that right now is already I think a hefty $250
dollars per fine so the bill raises this to $500
dollars per violation so maybe you had your pickup
truck and it's on a job site and the inspector goes up
to that job site and finds that your license number is
not on the vehicle. They cite you for a $250-dollar
fine.

I think what it's trying to accomplish is more
revenue for the department which I get, you know but
what the department really needs is more license
inspectors. They really need to have more bodies
doing the job out there making sure that the bad
contractors aren't doing, you know, aren't performing
work that they're not supposed to be doing and so I
just am against raising this fine to $500 dollars and
would like to strike that so if I could, I'm not sure
if it's online, make sure I have a copy of it and it
is filed and would like to bring this out so, Mr.
Speaker, the Clerk has amendment LCO No. 7113. If you
could ask the Clerk to call it and I be allowed to summarize.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 7113, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule B?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule B, LCO No. 7113, offered by Representative Ackert.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So essentially in line 98 it strikes the words "may be" and in line 99, it eliminates the additional fine of the $500 dollars and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule B. Will you remark further
on the amendment? Representative D'Agostino, you have the floor, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly appreciate the spirit in which the amendment is offered. I guess I would just clarify that the language in the amended bill that we previously called, not this amendment, that language that we have in the bill as amended prior to this is up to $500 dollars so there's discretion with DCP in terms of what they can do. They don’t have to fine $500 dollars. They don’t have to fine $250 dollars. They don’t have to fine anything. They can say this is your first offense, you know we're not going to fine you. I think we leave it up to our administrative agency to have that kind of flexibility and this just gives a little more teeth to that flexibility. We've heard in conversations on other bills how there are some recidivist contractors where you do have to take a little bit of a larger bite but by no means establishes a mandatory fine. The language is up to $500 dollars rather than the up to $250 dollars and it just sort of expands the tools in DCP's tool box and
so while I appreciate the minor nature of this amendment, I would urge that it be rejected. We want to make sure that we've got a broad scope of powers here in terms of the first-time offender who may not get fined versus the recidivist who really does need to be hit with a $500-dollar fine and so I'd urge rejection of the amendment and ask that it be taken by roll.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

When the vote is taken, it will be taken by roll. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Ackert of the 8th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I do appreciate the good gentleman's comments. The people that I know that have not had a license number on their vehicle, good intended contractors, people that didn’t have it multiple times and it was up to $250 dollars and guess what? They got fined $250 dollars. There was no slap on the wrist type of thing and they were not intentional. This is you forget to put your license on your business card or you forget to put it on a
sign that you put in the front yard, something along
that line to a number on a van. You're really not
impacting people in a manner that I think that a $500-
dollar fine to a contractor starting out their first
job out in the trade, trying to make a living, making
their way and you know the sign company hasn’t got
their license number on the back of their pickup truck
and they get a $500-dollar fine, probably their income
for the week as a new contractor so there is no reason
to raise this for any reason and so I stand in
opposition of this piece and would, I stand in support
of the amendment but for the reasons I can't support
the raising of the fine.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the
time.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. LOPES (24TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand a little bit
confused but mostly because I actually agree with the
Representative from the 8th district. There are a lot
of situations where as he spoke where things can come up, where you'd be put in a situation that wouldn’t be helpful while running your business. The one I think of all the time is someone who has just you know just 2000 business cards printed up, you forget to print new ones or you use the old ones. Next thing you know you have cards out and they don't have your license number on them. There's a fine and he is correct that a lot of times when you do face a situation, there isn’t a lot of discretion. They're going to fine you whatever the fine is so in this case, I'm not going to make a big fuss out of this, but I will be supporting the amendment. I think the rest of the bill seems to make sense. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, will staff and guests please, oh, Representative D'Agostino, you have the floor, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We don’t really negotiate bills on the floor but I mean as Chair of
General Law, I'd like to propose to the proponent and my good friend in our caucus, I hear what's being said. I've also heard the concerns though about again, some contractors on the other end of that spectrum who violate the law. I mean I would be open to a friendly amendment that said first-time offenses shall not be fined and we go up to $500, but we still go up to $500 dollars. I would consider something like that a friendly amendment to address the concerns we've just heard, but also give DCP the teeth that it needs to address the folks on the other end of the spectrum.

Through you, to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The Chamber will stand at ease. The Chamber will come back to order. The Chair recognizes Representative Ackert, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and with the agreement that we're working on right now, I withdraw the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

If there is no objection so ordered.
Representative Currey, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

If there are no objections, so ordered. The House will be at ease. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 107?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg, 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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My father was a physician. He practiced medicine in the town of Westport for over 40 years building one of the largest internal medicine practices in Fairfield County. Because of that, I became somewhat of an M.D. snob to be frank. I wouldn't even see a D.O. and then in my father's old practice, my doctor, went the concierge route and the next thing I knew, I was seeing a P.A., a physician assistant and I was initially a little concerned until I had the experience of working with a P.A. and found I was being taken care of just as well I had been before within the context of a team approach whereby there were always M.D.'s available and present and I felt very well cared for. What I'm talking about is recognizing a reality in the way that medicine I practiced today, where physician assistants typically in a team setting provide a lot of the care that the M.D.'s really don't have the time to provide these days.
So, Mr. Speaker, this bill simply recognizes that reality. It is a scope of practice change. It changes only one word. It changes functioning as a dependent to functioning as a collaborative relationship with a physician to provide patient services under the supervision control, responsibility and direction of such physician. So it doesn’t change any of the supervisory responsibilities. There’s still an agreement between the M.D. and the P.A., but it recognizes the facts on the ground that physician assistants are playing important roles in the delivery of care and this will lead to a more efficient delivery of that care than under the current dependent relationship. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will you remark further on this bill?

Representative Pettit, you have the floor, sir.

REP. PETTIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would concur with the good Chairman and comment that in my prior practice, I worked with both physician assistants and advance practice nurses to the betterment of our patients' care, especially in the field of chronic illnesses. I
took care of people with diabetes. The team approach is very critical. This bill was the result of a lot of negotiation between physician and PA's and I have a few questions, through you, Mr. Speaker, for the Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, sir.

REP. PETTIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the good Chairman, I understand that this bill currently preserves the current supervisory roles in statute between physician assistants and the physician they're working with. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's a really important point that the good Representative brings up. This does not change the basis in which that relationship works in that it's still up to the M.D. to determine the nature of that relationship and to come to an agreement on that basis. So the
supervisory role remains critical for the M.D. to perform.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Pettit.

REP. PETTIT (22ND):

Thank you, sir and to continue in that vein, a number of states have apparently adopted collaboration as part of their statutes and require physician assistants to work under the director of a physician. Through you, Mr. Speaker, does the good Chairman know if that remains the case in those states where this type of collaborative statute has been passed?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, at last count, I believe eight states have now moved to this language where there's still the control of the M.D., but it is now a collaborative relationship and to my knowledge, they're all functioning well in those eight states.

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

Representative Pettit.

REP. PETTIT (22ND):

Thank you, sir. Through you, Mr. Speaker, again, with our discussion with the physician assistants and physicians at the table, the physician assistants we dealt with and the folks they were working with noted that they were not under this legislation seeking independent practice per se, and they had recently gone through a scope of practice. Through you, to the good Chairman, this bill appears to confirm that they still wish to work in collaboration with physicians?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's a critical point here is that they are not seeking independent practice. They are physician assistants. They may be given some measure of discretion within the team effort, but they will, as far as I can tell, always be under the supervision, under the collaborative relationship with the M.D. and that they were very
clear in our discussions, they were not seeking independent practice.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Pettit.

REP. PETTIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that's all the questions I have for the Chairman. I think this is a good small step forward in terms of codifying collaborative practice between physician assistants and physicians. I think they're an integral part of the healthcare team in the modern era. Given our aging population, we're going to need to depend more and more on physician assistants and APRN's. I think this is a good bill and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you very much, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill? Representative O'Dea, you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly, I wanted to thank the good Chair and the ranking
member. In going through this bill, I like the collaborative approach and I too am the son of a surgeon who was somewhat of an M.D. snob as well and I do appreciate the comments by the Chair. I too was put onto a PA and was concerned, but I appreciate the good work that went into this bill and I encourage my colleagues to vote for it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill? Representative Comey of the 102nd, you have the floor, madam.

REP. COMEY (102ND):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just rise in support of this bill. I have spoken with many PA's in my district and other doctors and what I was told that it would do is that it's already happening in practice and because the relationship has matured over time and it's evolved, that this supervision relationship is no longer necessary and that collaboration is already defined at the practice level and it also sort of levels out the playing field for the PA's and the APRN's that there isn't one group that is favored as
hiring over another so I just wanted to thank the Public Health Committee for taking this up and I also encourage my colleagues to vote for the bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill 6942.
Total Number of Voting 144
Necessary for Adoption 73
Those Voting Yea 144
Those Voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 7

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The bill passes. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Abercrombie, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of an announcement?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, madam.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sorry, not trying to do your part also. Ladies and gentleman of the Chamber today is Tuesday. Friday is dress down day. We still have a lot of members that have not contributed. Please, please, this is for the veterans so please come and see my colleague, Representative Zupkus, or myself with your donations. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):
Thank you, madam. Are there any announcements or introductions? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 452?

CLERK:  

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):  
Representative Fox, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):  
Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):  
Good evening.

REP. FOX (148TH):  
I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):  
The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Fox, you have the floor.

REP. FOX (148TH):  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk is in
The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Hearing none, Representative Fox, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill has essentially four components three of which are major, one of which is lesser in stature. The first component of section one of the bill requires that EDR location be certified in writing to the Secretary of the State at least 31 days before the election. This section pertains the EDR and the
process by which EDR is undertaken by the state. It seeks that EDR locations be certified and municipalities are able to request additional EDR locations so long as they submit their requests to the Secretary of the State. In addition, it addresses the staffing of EDR locations and each municipality must submit a staffing request and report to the Secretary of the State prior to the election. The section is sections 2-5 is what I referred to as the minor portion of the bill. It concerns delivering the results of the election electronically to town clerks or assistant clerks for special elections to fill vacancies in different offices. The third part of the bill addresses the AVR, automatic voter registration. This section requires the Department of Motor Vehicles, the DMV and public higher education institution to provide Secretary of the State approved electronic voter registration that complies with MBRA process application voter registration. Section 8 requires the Secretary of the State to develop and implement a system through which individual may submit electronic signatures and section 12 through the end is the third portion which addresses parolee voting
rights, permits individuals who are on parole in the State of Connecticut to be reinstated as voters. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark on the amendment? The ranking member, Representative France, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I really want to thank the good Chairman and the work that we've done to bring forward this bill. We've had a long conversation throughout the session of ensuring that increasing voter access, increasing the opportunity for people to vote, but with always with the mindset of ensuring the integrity of that vote. There are a lot of provisions that have been in the compromised bill working with the good Chairman within this bill brought forward that do just that and so what I do, this is a substantial change in the bill that was presented originally for public hearing. I just want to walk through what the changes were and summarize those and then Q and A back and forth with the Chair,
through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to commend the ranking member for his efforts thus far on the bill. Thus far, we have had a productive conversation although he and I realize we may not ultimately in the end agree on some issues, we at least barely have the conversation respect each other to do so.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and so for the original bill that was presented, House Bill 7160, went through public hearing, the changes between that and the bill that is before us now so that the people in the Chamber as well as those that are watching and observing the proceedings so the first section, the first three sections were removed from the original bill. So the first section dealt with the academic credit for volunteering and that was essentially
setting up a process for the Secretary of the State and the Commissioner of Education to establish standards that would’ve provided an opportunity for students in high school to provide volunteer word and establish credit. That part was removed. There was no public testimony from or testimony from the State Department of Education on this during the public hearing and it was deemed there are already opportunities that are provided across the state for this.

The second section dealt with making election day as a holiday.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative, pardon me for one second. [Gavel] It's a little noisy in the Chamber. I'm having trouble hearing the Representative from the 42nd. You may proceed.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So as I was proceeding onto section 2 of the original bill was removed that dealt with making election day as a holiday. That was deemed as no longer necessary with the other changes that were made as part of the voter access bill.
Section three dealing with Election Day registration, so 3 and 4 of the original bill dealt with Election Day registration. Section 3 was removed which would’ve extended the hours of Election Day registration beyond the end of voting day of 8 o'clock. That was deemed not necessary anymore, as we are providing opportunity later in the bill that we’ll get to for additional locations which should alleviate the challenges that we saw in the last election cycle.

So as we move on to what is now section 1 of the bill that is before us, the amendment, it essentially the change there that is enacted, and through you, Mr. Speaker, from lines 20 through 41 of the amendment, the opportunity is there for a location addition by the registrar and through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the process for a registrar to apply to the Secretary of the State for additional locations for EDR and what, how does that process work?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the
question. The process as outlined will provide a register must be certified in writing to the Secretary of the State not less than 31 days before the Election Day. The written certification requirement pursuant to this shall include the name, street address and relevant contact information associated with each location essentially identifying the components of where, when, why, how, things of that nature that the additional location will be made pursuant.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that explanation and one of the things that we did to kind of clean up some of the language, there was a phrase "if any" in the original bill that would’ve implied that there was not an election official required to be at the EDR location. That has been removed in the amendment so that there is a certainty that there will be an election official present at the EDR location and I appreciate the good Chairman's work in making that happen.

So as we move on to lines 31 through 41, there
are a couple of additions that were made, specifically lines 35 to 37 dealing with registrar shall apply not later than 90 days and the Secretary shall make a decision not later than 30 days after its receipt. The intent of that in the original bill did not give a timeline for the Secretary to respond to the town and so this now gives the Secretary of the State 30 days to review the language and finally, the opportunity for the town then to have 30 days which is a reasonable time I think to respond before having to certify the requirements of that location.

Another addition was in lines 39 through 41 so the provision, so if the good Chairman could explain the rationale for adding those lines into the amendment?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the proponent, the representative for the question. This would essentially require that the components that we previously discussed in the prior question will be
applicable to any new voting location so that the staffing and things of that nature will have to be submitted and approved in advance.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer and I appreciate that context in helping the people in the Chamber and the people monitoring to understand the differences between what was presented and the testimony that was given. Moving on, in the original bill, which was lines 132 to 134, dealt with the 8 o'clock timeline that was no longer needed and so was therefore removed. Moving on, the remainder of, coming back to section 1 of the bill is the original language that has been in statute with no additional changes to that. As we move on to lines 165 through 173, we've added new language in here related to the EDR and the validation of the process of starting on that line, through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the intent of this language, 165 through 173?

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the Representative for the question. For the ideas particularly in these lines 165 to 173 it is an idea originated from the other side of the aisle, one which I appreciate and welcome. Essentially review of the EDR process and sets up a procedure by which not later than five days after the determination of the registrar of voters that an admitted applicant cannot be verified because the registration of commission notice for such applicant was returned undeliverable, it provides information back to the state so that if need be we can essentially review the EDR per procedures in each town.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

I thank you for that explanation. So essentially what we have is we have people who are showing up on Election Day and are registering to vote and the
process after that is that the registrar will send a letter out to validate or welcome the voter to the voter rolls and if that letter comes back as undeliverable, that voter is then moved to an inactive list but under the current law, there's no action taken beyond that so now, what this will do is allow or require within five days of return the registrar of voters will be required to provide that information to the State Elections Enforcement Commission for adjudication. If they deem an investigation is worthy, but they are now responsible for reviewing these people and to determine if there was some potential fraud or something that was done inappropriately on the Election Day registration. I think it's a strengthening of the Election Day registration process in that language.

Also a change that's tied into this from the previous bill there was, the language was struck related to the whole process essentially of determining a vote so it was in the original bill, 71 to 60, lines 155 through 186 were taken out but they've now been retained with this amendment so it's a positive change retaining that structure of the, of
the process.

So moving on to section 2 of the amendment, the next three or next four sections, so sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 dealt with modernizing the notification requirements for US Senate vacancy, Congressional vacancy, Assembly vacancy and judge of probate. Under current law, the only require, the requirement was that the state marshal had to provide notification to the registrars directly which required the marshals to travel to our 169 towns to thank you, Mr. Speaker, starting as indicative of the other sections, on 191 and 192, it says delivered electronically to such clerks or assistant clerks, through you, what is meant by deliver electronically? What means does that cover?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that meant by email, what we know as email, so electronic delivery.

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

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that and I agree. I think that I the anticipated means but certainly any means of electronic transmission, I would imagine email is the appropriate right now but in the future it maybe something else but it just modernizes this process so we don’t have the manual effort of the state marshals having to go individually town by town so that deals with the substantive change. The other things that it did, from the original bill the section A, so there's a section A and B in each one of these sections, it did not, it removed the first section because that was no longer needed based on the change and only dealt with the electronic delivery.

So we move on to section 6 of the amendment. So as we move forward here, the changes here which is adding the social services, labor department, this is where we get into the automatic voter registration that is envisioned under the, under the Department of Motor Vehicles to comply with the Motor Voter Act. So as we move through that section, there are some minor
changes and understanding those through you. So we look at lines 284 and 285, so we have in addition to the requirements of subsection A, we now accept and provide subdivision 2 of this subsection, what is the intent of adding that and it's several places throughout?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That deletes an obsolete provision about, I believe, is that the section that deletes the obsolete provision about the furniture?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

And that, that was a provision that was in the original language in the original statute that put the requirement on the Secretary of the State to provide furniture to the other departments which clearly shouldn’t be a problem or process that the Secretary of the State should be concerned with and each
department would know what their, you know furniture requirements are or what they would need to do to meet the requirements of statute and then part of the budget to submit that.

So we move on to lines 301 through 303. We changed or by mail through electronic system pursuant to subdivision 2 of the subsection. What is that electronic system?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, he's referring to lines 301 to 303, I believe the electronic system is the, give me one second, again, I believe the stated permission which is submitted in person, by mail or through electronic system so I believe that is via the internet.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that. That is envisioned what the
automatic transmission would be and I appreciate the answer from the Chair for clarification. Now, as we move forward on line 335, there's a change from the original language that says the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles "may not" and now the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles "shall" provide an electronic system. What is the intent of that and it appears that the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles is now going to "have" to provide as opposed to a "may" to the Secretary of the State and what is the intent in that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the intent of that is to codify the electronic motor, motor voter system.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer and what, so we already have the motor voter enacted through the DMV so why would the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles need to
provide that information to the Secretary of the State. What is the intent in having to provide the electronic system that the motor vehicle department already uses to the Secretary of the State?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, the codify the electronic motor voter system created pursuant to the Department of Justice Memorandum of Understanding from 2016? Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if that's?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that. I believe as we're expanding the automatic voter registration, the intent is the Secretary of the State would like to use the system that the Department of Motor Vehicles already created to leverage that existing system onto the other agencies that would be enacting the automatic voter
registration, but moving on, so in lines, there's new language in lines 341 and 342 that effectively say leading up to how we're gonna verify eligibility requirement and it says the addition is through documentary evidence presented by the applicant or other official records and so through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the intent of adding that language as compared to the existing language in the statute?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just trying to locate the language. Give me one minute. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The proponent is seeking to clarify lines 340 through 342; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and yeah, that is correct. It's actually 341 through 342 is the new language that says through documentary evidence presented by the
applicant or other official records. You know what is the documentary evidence? Certainly everybody knows what an official record is but what would that be and why, what is the intent in adding that specifically into the language?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The intent of this language is to get the Real ID Program.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer and I agree. I think it will just be more specific and more clear on what
is expected of the commissioner as they you know validate the new voter. As we move on, there's new language in lines 347 through 370 so as we walk through that, you look through that the first section 347 through 356 deals with applying, a person applying for a motor vehicle operator's license and eligibility and through that. So through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of lines 347 through 356?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

The purpose of lines 347 through 356, I'm just trying to pull it up, give me one second. Lines 347 through 356, Mr. Speaker, this is the automatic voter registration section. If the person has satisfied all the eligibility factors under the other sections here including the attestation if necessary, they are registered. Motor voter system includes a prominent warning that they can opt out and that they will be registered if they don’t opt out.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.
REP. FRANCE (42ND):

I thank you for that answer and clarification. So moving on to the next subsection, 357 through 363, it says if the commissioner determines that a person applying for a motor vehicle operator's license, a motor vehicle operator's license or identity card who is not a U.S. citizen, shall not provide such person the opportunity to apply for admission as an elector. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the process that the commissioner uses to ensure that the employees are trained in this process to understand what this new line of statute will be?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The process involved is that this portion of the system already has protections in place to prevent non-citizens from being registered to vote so this drive only licenses from being registered or asked if they want to register so the system itself is set up in such a way that individuals will be notified whether or not they
can vote, they can register to vote.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

I thank the good Chairman for that answer and I agree. I think in addition to that, I think the reason we have this specifically called out and added language in this to be very clear about that process that the Chairman just described and finally, the new language 364 through 370, there is somebody who's coming in for a renewal identity card or such, if they don't have an identity card for US citizenship, they shall attest to that citizenship or precondition of said commissioner. What is the process for attestation? Is there a form, a certification and what is the penalty if that attestation is invalid?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that there is a form that will come up on the screen that
they will attest to and affirm to just as they would any other legal document. The penalty, I believe for this and I can confirm this would be a class 3 felony.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that and I think it's important to ensure that we are maintaining the integrity of the vote as I said at the outset, that has been a long discussion that we've had with the good Chairman throughout the session, is ensuring that anytime that we are you know adding access or creating opportunities for access for voting, that we ensure the integrity of the vote with that and I believe that is what we're doing with that language.

Moving on in the amendment to line 392, we have the same change of a "may not" to "shall" conforming with the previous change that was there that we already discussed. So moving on in the amendment, so lines 409 to 412, there's new language. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the intent of adding that language to this amendment?
Representative Fox.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the intent under that is because further on in the bill there is a manner by which the Secretary of the State can set up a system for electronic signatures and so this ties into that section.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative France.

I think that is true. That is exactly what it's for. There are several instances as we come forward in this that the process the Secretary of the State could create to create an electronic signature in whatever manner that is taken into or conforming language for that. In addition, I believe on lines 430 and 431 we have similar language to conform with that.

Then given the electronic signature we now have in lines 442 to 443, if it is not submitted by signature electronically authorizing the Department of
Motor Vehicles or any other state agency to transit to the registrar so that then accounts for the individual who may not have the electronic signature available to him or her.

Moving on, as we move down to starting in lines 466, the Secretary of the State shall develop a system, I believe through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the intent. I believe this is the intent of what the good Chairman just described but for clarification, what is the intent of lines 466 through 473?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The intent is that the Secretary of the State will be allowed to develop an [inaudible - 08:13:40] system through which they prevent any person from submitted an electronic signature.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):
Thank you for the answer and I want to be clear on this. The one benefit to this is that by having an electronic signature process, and I use this in my work all the time, the identity of the individual is carried forward in that electronic signature so it essentially gives an electronic fingerprint if you will to the individual and makes it easier for validation of that individual. So as we look through there in that line, line 469, so there's a question that I had as I read this. So chapters 141 through 154 includes or is the entire section of the election law statutes so what the Secretary of the State creates and develops and implements will apply to all election law in the State of Connecticut. So as we move on into section 9, this is where we start expanding the opportunity for automatic voter registration so as we walk through this section, the new section here and the changes that have been made, so when we look the beginning section of lines 477 through 482, it looks like we're now empowering individual agencies to provide assistance to people who are applying to be electors in this state and through you, Mr. Speaker, what are the, what's the
process for training and who will conduct that training to ensure that these new people that are going to be assisting residents of the State of Connecticut to become electors?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I presume that the training will be completed by those in charge at each individual agency.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer. I guess my concern is that we're now empowering agencies that don't interact with election law or election process. They're not the registrars so I didn't see in here a provision for the Secretary of the State to provide such training so I'm curious as to you know how the agencies that we're talking about, social service agencies and others that are going to help people become electors of the state,
what the process will be to ensure that they have the appropriate training from the Secretary of the State and election law and that they're providing appropriate guidance?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The National Voter Registration Act currently empowers the Secretary of the State to designate in accordance with this act the appropriate offices and methods by which individuals shall be trained and guided so my understanding is that is how this will be carried out.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

And I thank you for that. I want to assure that, you know certainly the intent is that the Secretary of the State would be directly involved in ensuring that these other agencies that are going to enact this automatic voter registration policy, if
this bill becomes law, that the Secretary of the State will provide that in a substantive way and that the members of the social service organizations and other voting registration agencies that are being designated by this bill will take avail of that. So moving on, as we move forward to lines 513 to 520, I think this is where the intersection previously concerning the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles to provide or shall provide the electronic system, this is the intersection of that direction to the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles and to the Secretary of the State. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what is the process that the Secretary of the State will use to ensure that the piece of software that has been developed for the motor vehicles will apply and be able to be used for these other voter registration agencies to comply with this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Representative is asking for the process by which the Secretary of the
State will make certain that these agencies have these new programs?  

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

That is correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I presume that it will be taken care of by the fact the Secretary of the State is required to do so and will do so to fulfill her duties.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer and I agree with the good Chairman. The process the Secretary of the State already had to have approved what was used in the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Commissioner of
Motor Vehicles and I would imagine there would be a similar parallel but maybe some update to that required, given the different agencies that we're dealing with, but the Secretary of the State would be charged with that under this statute to ensure that's complying.

So moving on to section 10 of the amendment, as we move there in the change to that starting in lines 529 going through 533, if the good Chairman could explain the rationale for this change and what the intent of adding this language is.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This section allows other state agencies to register voters, to do so through an electronic system to save money, time and resources and allow convenience for all eligible voters.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.
REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that and as we read, look at that language it's essentially that you know any time that a resident intersects with one of the new voter registration agencies, there is an opportunity to register them to vote creating greater opportunity for individuals within the state to vote and thereby creating greater voter access and this provide that opportunity to ensure that each time that you have this intersection with a resident of the state, that these new voter registration agencies are complying with the law.

So as we move on through section 11 which deals in the higher education intersection, what is the intent of the changes that are made here dealing with our public institutions of higher education.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the individual for the question. The intent is that this will require colleges to provide electronic systems to
register to vote.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

And that is a great summary of that and I think that providing the opportunity for electronic registration avails the students who are either residents of the State of Connecticut or are here from other states the opportunity to vote. The Supreme Court has offered that if you are a student in a school, you have the option of either voting in your home of residence from where you live or you may vote in where you are at your college so this provides an opportunity for doing it, using the same electronic system that we discussed previously.

So we move on to section 12 and this is one section as we looked at the change hear dealing with parolee voting and as we move into this section, this one section I don't believe had a public hearing but it does have an intersection with the following section that did have a public hearing and it appears that it's conforming language, but I want to walk
through it just to make sure, certain that my read of it is the same as the Chair's. So as we look at section 12 and we you know come through the changes that are here starting on line 565, it says that in the case of a person who's forfeited such person's privileges as an elector, etc, what is the intent of adding this language here? As I said, I don't believe this had a public hearing, but it may be conforming language with the following section.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The intent here is to make clear that a person who is returned to confinement because of a parole violation also loses the right to vote. It's important as policy but also makes it, but also because it makes administration in the system more manageable.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):
Thank you for that answer and that is right. So the original bill that came through which was House Bill 7213 was the bill that came for public hearing dealt directly with the granting of parolee's their voter privileges back as soon as they were put on parole and left the institution that they were incarcerated in and I think this is a conforming change to ensure that should there be a violation of parole and they are returned, that we had enacted that statute to remove the voting privileges again when they became incarcerated so it provided that mechanism if there was a violation of parole and the individual was returned to incarceration that those voting privileges would be similarly taken away as if they had been at the beginning.

So as we move on to the final section of the bill, section 13 is dealing with the core issue of restoring the voting privileges of individuals that are on parole. So thank you, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the current law, if you are somebody who committed a misdemeanor and are convicted and in jail, your privileges are retained and similarly on parole they would still be retained so through you, the
intent of this then would be to deal with felony
convicts that have satisfied their incarceration
period and are now moving out onto parole as deemed by
the Commissioner of Corrections. Through you, Mr.
Speaker, is that accurate?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, yes, the intent is once
released from confinement that the individual’s voting
rights will be reinstated.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you for that answer and are there any, for
the individual who’s being released from prison onto
parole under the supervision of the Department of
Corrections, are there any prerequisites or is it an
automatic restoration of the voting privilege?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.
REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not certain what the Representative is getting at with this, but there's one caveat to the bill. If you are incarcerated for violating a title 9 which is election law violation, you will not have your rights reinstated upon being released from confinement until your parole or probation is completed.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

I appreciate the good Chairman for pointing that out. So it's very important for people to understand that if you are incarcerated and convicted of some kind of a voting irregularity or you're convicted of a felony related to voting that even though you're on parole, you would not have your voting privileges restored until you completed that parole, but all others would be. Final question on the walk through the amendment. So on lines 609 and 610, deals with a person confined in a community residence shall have such personal electoral privileges restored. What is
a community residence as defined in this?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding of a community residence of is a defendant who is released from confinement but in a halfway house of sorts.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative France.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

I think that is the intent. Certainly we have statute covering that very thing already, defines that and it's already cross referenced in here so I thank the good Chairman for the answer. I'll just kind of summarize. I think that what we have here is a balance between increasing voter access while maintaining integrity. We have some fixes from things that happened in the last election cycle related to Election Day registration. We have put in place the steps that we believe will correct or give the opportunity for correction for many of those things
that caused long waits and caused people to potentially even walk away because they didn’t want to wait in line. I think those are positive things that are there, certainly modernizing the notification process through electronic means is a positive thing and I think that brings forward to and in summation, I would just like to thank the good Chairman for the work together to bring this forward and compromise in good faith and the time and patience he's walked through the changes here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Labriola of the 131st, you have the floor, sir.

REP. LABRIOLA (131ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to oppose this amendment because it constitutes a major shift in policy. I'd like to discuss the differences between parole and probation and also discuss why this is such an affront to the victims of crime in our state.

It's a major shift in policy because currently, a person who is on parole for a misdemeanor has the
right to vote. A person who's on probation has the right to vote. What this amendment purports to do is allow people who are on parole for felonies the right to vote and these are of course serious crimes. A felony means that a person can be incarcerated for more than a year and we're talking about sexual assaults, burglaries, murder, robberies. In fact, pretty much any crime there is a felony component to it. Any set of facts, a prosecutor could charge a felony. So an assault could be a felony assault, a larceny, a robbery, a burglary, any kind of death that happens in a motor vehicle accident, there could be a felony version. This amendment would allow a person who's on parole the right to vote after committing such a heinous offense.

What we're talking about is the difference between parole and probation. A person who's on probation has already served his sentence or perhaps they didn’t have to go to jail at all, they just had to go on probation. A person who's on parole is a sentenced prisoner. They're under the control of the Department of Corrections. A person who's on probation is under the control of the Department of
Probation. Major difference. For the first time in Connecticut, we are seeking to allow a parolee the right to vote, a parolee who by the definition of this bill has committed a serious felony. I've represented in court victims of crime, but mostly I represent defendants, people accused of crime. For more than 30 years I've done that and I can tell you that most cases are pled out. A defendant pleads guilty. Only about 1 percent of all cases go to trial so 99 percent of cases or more, the defendant is pleading guilty, is admitting culpability, is admitting their involvement and their responsibility of serious crimes. Again, this amendment deals with felonies, not misdemeanors, felonies so this defendant knows that they've committed a horrific crime. They're pleading guilty to it and they know that they're going to go jail. When they're given parole, they're allowed to go free but if they violate that parole, then they are immediately remanded back into custody. There's no case. They don't go to court. They don't hire an attorney and try to defend whatever new charge happened. They're immediately brought back to jail. That's the difference between parole and probation.
When a person's on probation and they get arrested for a violation, that's a new case. They go to court, they can have a lawyer, they don't necessarily have to go back to jail, but a parole is under the control of the Department of Corrections so when the parolee makes some kind of a violation, he is immediately remanded back to custody. He is a sentenced prisoner. We're talking about letting a sentenced prisoner for a felony, a serious crime, letting that person vote and I can tell you the thousands and thousands of clients that I've had or that I've seen in court. Not one who commits a felony, not one of the expects the right to vote. I've never had any of them say to me, when I'm in jail, will I be able to vote? They know they're not gonna vote. They're losing their freedom. They're being incarcerated. Of course they're not gonna vote. This is huge shift. This is not something that there's a problem. This is a solution looking for a problem.

You know where's, where are the parolees who are saying I want the right to vote? Where's the outcry from the parolees? Where are there parolees saying you know if I could only vote after they've pled
guilty to a horrific crime. They have admitted responsibility. Ninety-nine percent of all cases of this type, the person has pled guilty or they’ve been found guilty by a jury of their peers. There’s no outcry from these parolees for the right to vote.

What about the victims of these crimes? What about the victims of the sexual assault or the burglary or the death because of a motor vehicle accident or the murder? Who stands for them? Who stands for the families of the victims? Who stands for the crime victims? We're considering the rights and the responsibilities and the privileges of a parolee, of the perpetrator. We're considering the rights and the privileges of the perpetrator, but who stands for the victims? Who's speaking out for the victims? Who's considering what the victim wants?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I stand for the victims. I urge my colleagues to stand for the victims and oppose this amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Lavielle of the 143rd, you
have the floor, madam.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Good evening.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good evening to you as well.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I have just a couple of questions for the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

You may proceed, madam.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. So I am going to confine my questions and my remarks to a couple of things in section 1 and my questions regard section 1 and I will refer to the conversation that the Chair and ranking member had with each other just a few minutes ago in the description of what happens in the amendment. Do I understand correctly that the intent of the first part of section 1, lines 16 through 41, part of the intent there is to allow a registrar of voters to apply to the Secretary of the State to have more than one Election Day registration location in that registrar's town?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Representative for the question. That is correct. If a registrar of a municipality deems that an additional EDR location would be appropriate, then they are entitled to apply to the Secretary of the State for that possibility.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. So in other words we're dealing here with the expansion of, the geographic expansion of access to electronic, excuse me, Election Day registration and this is a concern for me and I've always had it about Election Day registration, but here it is. As we go through, we see in the existing statute a lot of information about the process for Election Day Registration and during that time, when someone shows up to register to vote in a district,
they're required to provide certain identification and if I'm correct, well, what are those pieces of allowable identification that the voter must present to register to vote anywhere, not just in Election Day Registration?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, in order to be able register to vote, an individual must be above the age of 18, a bonafide resident of the municipality in which they are trying to vote, and a resident of the United States of America.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

But what are the pieces of identity that are acceptable for that purpose?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.
REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of EDR voting?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I'm sorry, could the good gentleman repeat the question please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

For the purpose of EDR voting?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Sure, that'll do. I think they may be the same for any other purpose of registering to vote but yes, EDR specifically. What kind of identification is acceptable?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.
REP. FOX (148TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An individual must provide a birth certificate, driver's license, or Social Security card.

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

    So either a driver's license or a Social Security card are acceptable? I heard that properly?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

    As well as a birth certificate, through you, Mr. Speaker. So three options, Mr. Speaker, birth certificate, driver's license, or Social Security card.

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

    Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

    Thank you. But since the voter can provide any one of those pieces of identity, does a driver's
license or a Social Security card provide proof of citizenship of the United States?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the individuals are asked to provide one of those three options and I'm trying to think if my driver's license says I'm a, I don't believe my driver's license says I'm a citizen of the United States.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Well if I may, my husband's does not say that he is not a cortisone citizen and he is a legal resident of the United States, but he is not citizen. That's his driver's license. His Social Security card doesn't either. Now, I won't trouble the good gentleman with any further questions. I do have a point to make here.

I know this is the case widely with any type of
voter registration, those pieces of identity are acceptable so if I go down to the town hall today and I register to vote and I'm not a citizen, but I provide one of those pieces of identification, they will register me and if they have some suspicion that I may not, you know if they hear later that I may not be a citizen, they can look it up, they can come after me for perjury after I have attested that I am citizen and they can either send me to jail or they can make me pay a fine and they certainly won't accept me as a registrant to vote.

But here's the problem. With Election Day Registration, you show up right then and there, your piece of identity is accepted, you register to vote and you vote. And the next day you wake up in the morning and the election is decided and then there's a process outlined in this bill for verifying where people live and so on. It doesn't really say they're gonna verify that they're a citizen but there is, you know, there's time to do that and maybe they find out that I did that and I wasn't a citizen and I, you know, they do to me whatever they're gonna do to me. But my vote? My vote counted because I registered to
vote and the next minute I voted and that's it. The election's decided and nobody will ever know which vote was mine so they can't call off the election because somebody who really shouldn't have voted, voted. And this has always been a concern to me with Election Day Registration. Because we ask people to attest and I believe that's true in the rest of country but regardless, we only ask people to attest. We don't ask them to prove they are citizen. If they show up with a birth certificate that shows they're born in this country, that can help but they're not required to.

So here we are with a process that does actually through just the way that it's designed allow people to register to vote. If they're not eligible, vote at the risk of punished, but that comes later and meanwhile, the election is decided and we have destroyed the integrity of the electoral process and because certainly this bill does not introduce Election Day Registration as a concept, but it does expand access to it and I think that's just creating more problems for us that we have not yet solved in the area of the integrity of the election process so
that is a very grave concern that I have with this bill. I thank the good gentleman for his answers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? The gentleman from the 5th district, Representative McGee, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Good evening.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Mr. Speaker, I'm so delighted that we're having this conversation. I remember last year we had a similar conversation when we talked a little about access to having your right to vote. In Maine and in Vermont, incarcerated individuals never lose their right to vote even while they are incarcerated. In 14 states and the District of Columbia, incarcerated individuals lose their voting rights only while incarcerated and receive automatic restoration upon release. In 22 states, felons lose their voting
rights or incarcerated individuals lose their rights during incarceration and for a period of time after, typically while on parole and/or probation. Voting rights are automatically restored after this time period. In 12 states, incarcerated individuals lose their voting rights indefinitely for some crimes or requires a Governor's pardon in order for voting rights to be restored.

I'm reading this information for one reason and one reason only. That's to highlight how far Connecticut will come if we were to pass this piece of legislation. I know that there's a state nearby namely New York that has passed similar legislation but for me, this means more than just passing a bill. You're giving individuals their right, their right to exercise their voices. So this reform will definitely reduce disenfranchisement and will restore justice and fairness to our democratic process. I am dedicated and very committed and appreciative to the Speaker, uh, the Speaker, obviously to you but also to the Chair of the GAE Committee and all of his efforts to really bring this conversation to the forefront.

I know the bill addressed many other things but I
really wanted to just hone in on the part around formerly incarcerated so through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you so much again the kind gentleman, Representative Fox, for all of his work. Thank you so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you very much, Representative. Will you remark further? Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask when the vote be taken, it be taken by roll. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is on a roll call vote. All those in favor of a roll call vote, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The requisite 10 percent has been met. When the vote is taken, it will be taken by roll call. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Wilson Pheanious of the 53rd, you have the floor, madam.
REP. WILSON PHEANIOUS (53RD):

Yes, sir. I rise to speak in favor of this bill in general. I realize that there are many complex provisions, but they all seem to speak to giving people the opportunity to vote and to make a decision or to have some control in their lives. Particularly, I'm affected by the provisions that refer to people that have been incarcerated, are out of incarceration either because they've been paroled or because they've been on probation. It seems to me that voting, like having a job, like taking care of your family, like investing in your community is one of the ways that people retrieve their citizenship. The way people make a life for themselves, the way people correct mistakes they may have made and reinvest in the community that we all have to live in and it seems to me that no matter how much of the time that a person may have served, they may be out on parole, they may be on probation, I'm not sure it matters and I don't know that it would matter so much to the victim of a crime to prevent someone from reinvesting in their life so that fewer crimes will be committed in the future. When someone has nothing to hang onto, when
someone has nothing to go back to, when someone cannot get a job, cannot get housing, cannot vote, cannot invest and care for their family, cannot reinvest in life, that's how you perpetuate additional crime and trouble. When you let someone reinvest in themselves, in their community, when you enfranchise someone to take control of their life, that's how you get people and keep people out of jail and I just have difficulty finding the utility in preventing that from happening. And so while I recognize the complications and all the hard work that has been done by many people in trying to bring a bill such as this forth, I want people to think about how it is that someone who has perhaps not even made a mistake, but perhaps decided there was so much evidence against them that they would plead guilty because they cannot fight the system, there are those people. There are those people who have made a genuine error in judgement or sometimes even hurt somebody, but unless you're gonna take the rest of that person's life, it seems to me you need to give them the opportunity to reinvest in their life and voting is a critical and crucial part of being a citizen in this country and so I speak in support of
this provisions of this bill and of giving men and women who find themselves on the wrong side of our justice system the opportunity to reinvest in our community, in their families and in our lives in such a way that perhaps they won't go back. Perhaps they won't throw the rest of their life away. Perhaps they'll recognize some control over their ability to do good in the future and I don't see how it serves a victim of crime to keep someone out of that path where they can correct their lives and where they can make a contribution so I support this bill and will be voting accordingly and I hope others will do the same. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Haddad of the 54th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just rise to say that I appreciate all of the hard work by our esteemed committee chairpersons and ranking members in trying to find a bill that will address a number of
different concerns that people have about voting rights in the State of Connecticut and I think on balance, when this bill passes at the end of the day, we will have done a great service to voters in the State of Connecticut.

I will just say very briefly that earlier this evening, an assertion was made that certain provisions of this bill would alleviate problems that occurred in my community on Election Day specifically regarding Election Day Registration and I think that probably overstates the case. I am not happy that this bill eliminates the provision that allows voters in line or citizens who are in line and wish to register to vote at 8 o'clock but who haven't been processed yet, this would deny them the right to vote as the underlying bill would and I think that the cross check which isn’t used in many other states, any other states to protect voter integrity in fact is a real barrier to the exercise of a citizen's right to vote on Election Day should they see so. So I'm not happy that those two sections have been removed from the bill in this amendment but on balance, I think that the legislation is certainly a step forward and contains many very
important provisions that will serve our state very well in the future. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Have all members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to 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:

LCO 9885, designated House A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Voting</th>
<th>144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those Voting Yea 84
Those Voting Nay 60
Those absent and not voting 7

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The amendment is passed. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Candelora of the 86th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I listened to most of the debate tonight and I can appreciate the sentiment of the bill and some of the change that it's seeking to do. I think one of my frustrations with how we handle our election laws in the State of Connecticut tend to be so partisan and elections are not just for registered Democrats but they're also for registered, Republicans, unaffiliates, independents and many other minority parties as well, yet it seems every time our GAE Committee puts forth significant pieces of legislation that we can't work together in concert to try to put together a reform that works and time again, we continue to put forth this election law reforms and locally what I hear from my town clerk and from my registrar of voters is can you please stop?
They're exhausted.

EDR has made our registrar of voters work well into the night and if many people recall, they're getting up at 4, 5 o'clock in the morning the day of Election Day after working the previous two days putting together lists and making sure that our ballots are all structured properly and they cannot continue to take the pile on of these new changes and this underlying bill now as amended, while I think it helps to try to look at some of those reforms, I'm saddened to see that we're not hearing what our registrar of voters and what our town clerks are telling us.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Representative, will you pardon me for a second? [Gavel] It's a little bit noisy in the Chamber. If you could take your conversations outside, please. Thank you.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. But tonight we heard members talking about you know a piece of this bill dealing with allowing parolees to vote and I think as Representative Labriola eloquently
pointed out, what about the victims? You know we're affording somebody a right who as a public policy we made a determination that that right should be forfeited and we're not giving consideration to the victims.

I heard language tonight talking about restoring fairness, restoring justice, bringing disenfranchisement away from the process and returning the ability to vote for certain individuals. I heard us talk about individuals not being able to fight the system and therefore, they may just plead guilty and forfeit this important right to vote and I heard also comments about this bill being of a great service to the State of Connecticut. And I can appreciate all of those perspectives, but I find it very frustrating and very hypocritical in the light of what we saw this past election cycle. You know the reforms that we hear today that were put into place as one Representative pointed out, expressing his frustration with the EDR system in his particular district, it seems as though the problems that we are raising and we are fixing are only those problems that maybe affected our particular races but those people whose
voices weren't necessarily heard, who were
disenfranchised, in particular in the State
Representative race in the 120th district, we did not
address that issue and so with that, the Clerk has LCO
9765. I ask that it be called and I be allowed to
summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9765, which
will be designated House Amendment Schedule B?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule B, LCO No. 9765, offered
by Representative Candelora and Representative
Perillo.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you so much. As I mentioned, we had a
contested election commission which met and heard
facts of a particular case in which 75 voters were
given the wrong ballot in electing a State Representative in the 120th and that race was only decided by 13 votes. Both Democrats and Republicans who testified had said that mistake did in fact occur and so I think this is the third amendment I've offered to try to get this issue addressed in the chamber because as our Supreme Court has pointed out, under our laws, we have the jurisdiction to adjudicate the matter and today we have almost less than a week left in session and this matter still has not been resolved even though the Contested Election Committee filed its report, I believe it was February 4.

What this amendment seeks to do is provide a process where when somebody has filed a complaint and a Contested Election Commission has been formed, that when the report is created, similar to our union contracts, that the General Assembly needs to act within 14 days of the Contested Election Committee supplying its report and if the Chamber fails to act within that 14-day period, it would provide a trigger wherein an aggrieved party can bring a challenge to the Superior Court and the Superior Court can adjudicate the matter and with that I move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule B. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Candelora, you have the floor.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and just to comment on this amendment, as I pointed out, this is a significant issue that occurred in the 120th district, so significant we have really not seen something like this probably in the history of the Connecticut electoral process and as I said, I am sympathetic to the underlying bill when we talk about allowing parolees to vote and being sympathetic to their level of disenfranchisement, but again, we have a group of electors that have no idea whether the outcome of that election was correct or not and whether relief should be awarded and yet, we continue to merrily along, trudge along passing bills and not adjudicating the matter as it should be. The Contested Election Committee was formed. The fact pattern that we had agreed upon was uncontroverted. I think all four of us agreed on the facts that we heard. We differed on
the remedy and I think we have a right to do that. The very least that we should have done as a General Assembly was come in and vote on that report. Now, I recognize that there are certainly more Democrats in this chamber than Republicans and it would be easy enough for the Democrats to vote and say no new election. Yet, that couldn’t even occur in this Chamber so for me, when I listen to us passing election reform bills, it is the height of hypocrisy that we have a fact pattern before us where we are the sole arbitrators of the relief and we have not, for whatever reason, whether it be arrogance or whether it be we just choose not to, we don’t make any decision. What does that do for the voters in that district and frankly, what does it do for the three people or so that ran in that race. When the Supreme Court had ruled on this decision finding that we had the exclusive decision making, I want to point out that they recognized that they had exclusive jurisdiction over the plaintiff's election challenge, particularly in the absence of the legislation sharing that jurisdiction with the courts in some way. So our Supreme Court recognized that the legislature has the
ability to delegate that authority to it and that is the intent of this amendment. If we don’t have the fortitude to make a decision on a contested election, then somebody needs to. This amendment is saying give it to the Judicial Branch in a case where the Legislative Branch can't do it. And I just want to point out as well, in the case, when they talked about it, the Supreme Court noted that given the seriousness of the claims, which these claims were in fact proven in our hearings, given the seriousness of these claims, its exclusive jurisdiction under the election clause, we must presume that the members of the General Assembly will carry out their duties with scrupulous attention to the laws under which they serve. We must and should presume that any officer of the State will act lawfully, correctly, in good faith and in sincerity of purpose in the execution of his or her duties and it is now May 28. This decision was made in the beginning of February and we've done none of it. So Mr. Speaker, I hope at least going forward, what this amendment does is it offers relief for people in the future that may have this kind of a horrific fact pattern occur so when we talk about
disenfranchisement of voters, this at least will fix that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment? Representative Perillo of the 113th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and before I make my remarks, could I just ask that when this vote be taken, it be taken by roll please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

When the vote is taken, it will be taken by roll.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Representative said, and to put this in context, none of the four members of this Committee disagreed upon the fact pattern. Everybody agreed that what was reported to have happened, happened. Now, if this were any other race, any other race in the State of Connecticut, this would have gone directly to the courts. If it were a race for mayor, for selectman, it would have gone to the courts. The race for Aldermen City Council, Planning and Zoning, Board of Education would’ve gone
to the courts. A race for Governor, Comptroller, Treasurer would’ve gone to the courts. The only two offices that don’t go to the courts are races for the House of Representatives and races for the Senate. It is recognized that in every other race, the proper body to judge these situations is our judicial system and we, to the Representative's point, have clearly illustrated we're not capable of doing it ourselves. It's been months. We've got a week left. This was done by February 4. The Committee reported and here we are and nothing. Absolutely nothing. Now perhaps the time for us to act in the 120th district has passed, I don't know, with a week left. At least we can try and fix it going forward. Let's admit we have a problem. We're a partisan body incapable of solving this one problem saddled by an absolute and clear lack of ability to act. Acknowledge it, accept it, it is what it is. We're flawed. A partisan body can't do this so let's at least going forward, God forbid this happens again. Let's at least going forward do it right. What the Representative has proposed in his amendment is reasonable. There is no reason why we shouldn’t do this on a go-forward basis. The facts
are the facts and the facts are that we can't execute. We fumbled this one and there's no reason to believe, and I was close to this as was the Representative, there's no reason to believe that we can do it right the next time. Admit it. Admit it. We blew it. Let's give it to the judicial system. Let's let them sort it out. They can separate the bodies and do it the right way, not the way we botched this so far. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Carney of the 23rd, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CARNEY (23RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to speak on the amendment. I've read this amendment that the good proponent, Representative Candelora proposed and I just, I haven't seen a more common sense amendment I think in the entire year and I don't think that an excuse that we haven't had a public hearing on it or that it's not germane or anything like that should apply here because we have had multiple public hearings, multiple meetings, multiple
investigations on this election. This is an election where 76 electors were disenfranchised. We're talking about taking away the disenfranchisement of future electors when this body can't even enfranchise those who were not able to vote in the election they wanted to. You know I share a polling location with Representative MacLachlan and if this happened in my area, I would be absolutely livid. I would be embarrassed by this Chamber for not taking an action. If Representative Fian [phonetic] were sitting on this side of the aisle, this Chamber would’ve taken an action. It's an embarrassment that we're not and I hope this amendment passes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will the members -- Representative Fox, I was a little too quick on the trigger there. Representative Fox, you have the floor.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand in
opposition to the underlying amendment. I believe that this Chamber has the authority to address the underlying matter and as such, this authority cannot be delegated so I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

CLERK:
House Amendment Schedule B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Voting</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The amendment fails. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative O'Neill of the 69th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment, LCO 9001. Would he please call and I be allowed to summarize?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 9001 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule C?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule C, LCO No. 9001, offered by Representative O'Neill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

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

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this amendment does is it would allow major political parties to dispense with conventions. It would eliminate the obligation under state law for major political parties to hold conventions and would allow them whether or not to hold conventions based on adopting their own party rules. I would move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule C. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I would request that when the vote be taken that it be taken by roll.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

When the vote is taken, it will be taken by roll.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment that is before you was originally a bill, House Bill 5041. It
had a public hearing on March 25 and it has a fiscal note which is a little unclear but I will acknowledge that it probably could result, the adoption of the amendment and if it becomes law, could result in there occasionally being some additional expenses at the local level to have primary elections in special election situations. The fiscal note isn’t totally clear on that point, but I believe that’s the upshot of the fiscal note. I share that with the Chamber just in case anybody is wondering if they take the trouble to look at the fiscal note. It's, as I say, not totally clear but I would acknowledge for purposes of tonight's discussion that it might result in some additional costs to municipalities to stage special election primaries.

At the public hearing on this bill, there was absolutely no testimony in opposition to it. There was testimony in favor of it. That testimony indicated a number of points about the current state of the law in Connecticut with respect to conventions. Under Connecticut law, the state political parties, major parties, the Republicans and the Democrats right now are the only two major political parties, are
required to hold conventions for almost all offices. They are required to have them for statewide offices such as Governor, Attorney General and everything else that runs statewide, for congressional districts, for US Senate races, for state legislative races if they're multi-town districts and the only one exception being that if a town, a legislative district is contained entirely within the boundary of the town, then there is not a need for a convention. There would be a caucus process to do a nomination.

The convention has been with us for a very long time and political conventions began in the 1830's as a reform from the process that was then being done especially at the national level that really probably resulted as much as anything else from the election of 1824 when the candidate who got the most popular votes, Andrew Jackson, was defeated for election in the US House of Representatives by John Quincy Adams and thereafter, conventions were adopted as a way to try to democratize the political process, the process of nominating candidates. And as far as I can tell, it then spread across the country and was adopted as pretty much the prevailing system during the 19th and
early 20th centuries. However, in the beginning of the 20th century and particularly in the western part of the United States and the mid-western part of the United States, as part of the progressive era reforms, there was a recognition that the system of government we had, while at the end of it there was voting, there were many stages in which decisions were made which were not made democratically in which a very small group of people were making the decisions that ultimately determined the outcome. There's a famous quote, I believe from Boss Tweed, "I don't care who does the voting so long as I get to do the nominating." And that signified that in many cases, once the nominations are set, the outcome of the election is frequently pretty well determined and so the convention as a mechanism of selecting candidates really confers potentially a lot of power on a small group of people, the people who are delegates to the conventions and the problem is of course that they may not reflect the views of even the members of their political parties, in the case of the Republicans, there are about 1200 delegates. There are 400,000 registered Republicans, actually slightly more in the
State of Connecticut and yet 1200 people go to the
convention to pick the candidates and in reality, 600
or so get to decide who gets the endorsement at the
convention. So that's the system that we've got and
I'm laying all this out because it may not be clear to
everyone even here, even who've gone through these
processes, how this system works.

Now, until a few years ago, the only way to get
to the ballot in Connecticut was through a convention.
About a decade, a little over a decade ago there was a
federal court case, I believe it ended up going all
the way to the US Supreme Court that said there had to
be another way besides securing the 15 percent of the
delegates that were at a convention to get to the
primary ballot and we in this Chamber, and I remember
voting on it and there are probably other members
still here who did vote on it, we had to pass a piece
of legislation to provide for a petition bypass
process to enable people to petition their way onto
the primary ballot. The federal courts have in fact
already recognized that a pure convention system is
fundamentally unacceptable and denies people the
opportunity to participate fully in our political
process.

Now in the time since that has happened, there have been a few people who have petitioned. The one that I remember most vividly was a congressional candidate who bypassed the convention process and petitioned directly to get to a primary ballot for one of the congressional districts and this past year, we had a candidate who did the same thing at the congressional or the gubernatorial level rather, Mr. Speaker.

The convention process, I believe, is fundamentally at this stage broken. If you look at the recent past and by that I mean the last decade or so, we have had conventions where the candidates that were chosen were almost all challenged in a primary. Most of the time, those challenges have been people who secured the 15 percent who then went on to challenge in a primary and in many cases, though not all, the challengers were unsuccessful but the idea that the convention was the end of the political road or that it was the final word has I think been basically wiped out by the recent past that we have had. People no longer accept the outcome of the
convention as dispositive of the decision about nominating candidates. This past election cycle, 2018, on the Republican side we had an individual who never even bothered to participate at all in the convention process. We had many other candidates who went through the convention process running for Governor. I believe there were 8 or 9 altogether who did that. Half of them did not get past the convention because they failed to secure the necessary 15 percent to qualify to get to the ballot. There was one who petitioned his way on and then the others were people who did secure that 15 percent. The irony of course is that after spending hundreds of thousands of dollars each, those candidates who got to the primary through the convention process were discarded by the voters in the primary election and the voters chose as the nominee someone who had completely ignored the convention process. This is the first time in Connecticut history that I know of that anything like that has happened for a candidate for Governor or any of the other major offices actually that we have at the state level. So I think the voters have already indicated that they're not too happy or too bound by
the convention process that we have. Now, the
conventions as I say started in the 1830s and then a
reform to go to primaries began in the early 1900s.
At this stage, Connecticut is one of perhaps three
states that still use conventions as the main
mechanism by which you get to the primary ballot. In
other words, at least 45 or maybe 47 other states of
the Union choose their candidates by going directly to
the primary. We are an extreme outlier in terms of
the states around this country in how we select
candidates for nomination and we retain this
convention, this vestigial organ of our political
process long after almost everybody else in the
country has moved on. And I understand that
Connecticut has the reputation, the slogan of being
the land of steady habits, but I think the time has
come for us to at least offer the political parties
the option of not using the convention as the
principle method by which they pick their candidates.

In my testimony in front of the committee, I
pointed out that in addition to the fact that we are
such an outlier that the convention process is
something that may very well ultimately as a state
mandate be unconstitutional. There is a case, the one that dealt with allowing unaffiliated voters to vote in primaries which was decided by the US Supreme Court in 1986 that says very explicitly, that political parties are private organizations with first amendment rights and that those rights basically authorize them to allow people to vote in their primary conventions whether they want just members of their party or to allow unaffiliated voters to vote and if I could just quote briefly from that opinion. Justice Thurgood Marshall stated that political parties should have the right to choose the method by which they nominate candidates. I'm sorry, that was me speaking. [laughter] Don’t want to attribute my words to Justice Marshall. [laughter] The state argues that its statute is well designed to save the Republican Party from undertaking a course of conduct destructive to its own interest but on this point, even if the state were correct, a state or court may not constitutionally substitute its own judgement. The party's determination of the boundaries of its association and of the structure which best allows it to pursue its political goals is protected by the
Constitution and as is true of all expressions, of first amendment freedoms. The courts may not interfere. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, neither may the state legislatures. Now no one has challenged our current law about conventions and requiring them as part of the mechanism of electing or choosing candidates for election but I believe that it would be subject to constitutional challenge based on this case and the other case that said primaries had to have a bypass to get around the convention requirement as well.

Now in addition to that constitutional argument, I would also offer a couple of other observations. Conventions cost a lot of money. Testimony from another witness at the public hearing indicated that the Republican Party Convention in 2018 cost $60,000 dollars just to arrange it at the location that it was in which was the cheapest location that could be found and that within the State of Connecticut, there are very few venues that are large enough to accommodate a State political convention given the number of people that are allowed to be delegates. And in addition to that, the cost to the political party is the cost to
the delegates and what was cited in the testimony of one witness was the example of Joan of Washington. Now Joan of Washington sounds like perhaps a character from a medieval play or something, Joan of Arc or something like that, but Joan of Washington is actually a constituent of mine. She is someone that I actually know. She had to pay $1200 dollars, her bill for attending the convention, between the hotel and purchasing meals which you have to buy within the convention venue area, came to $1200 dollars. Now, Joan of Washington is a retired state employee. She is a woman who lives on a fixed income and in fact, in order to supplement her income, she works in a grocery store as a cashier. Joan of Washington should not in order to represent the citizens of Washington which is required through this convention process, really shouldn't be required to spend $1200 dollars. If you multiply that times the 1200 delegates, you're talking about a huge amount of money that the delegates have to spend for the opportunity to vote in these conventions. And I'm sure the costs are substantial for the Democratic Party as well. The number of delegates I believe is substantially at the Democratic
conventions than at the Republican ones.

The other thing that I would add is that the conventions lend themselves to a kind of political wheeling and dealing that does nothing to advance the idea that we are picking candidates based on who is best qualified for the office. Delegates are persuaded to vote for candidate A for office A in exchange for votes that are gonna come to a candidate that comes from their hometown or that they particularly like and so they exchange their votes back and forth and this wheeling and dealing has led in many cases that I have seen to candidates being put on the ticket or winning enough votes to get to a primary who are not really supported based on their beliefs or their experience, but simply because they have the ability to deliver enough delegates for someone else to secure the 15 percent to get to the primary ballot.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Chamber to adopt this amendment. It is a necessary change I think and it is something that is long overdue. Most other states did this close to one hundred years ago. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER ROSARIO (128TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Fox of the 148th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the proponent for bringing the amendment forward. I also want to applaud him for his efforts in getting the matter before our committee on this session. I will say I believe it's a massive change for election law, one that requires much more input by the community and those involved in the process. I also think there's questions of the underlying bill that need to be resolved such as, which was somewhat addressed and touched upon in the public hearing as to if there's no convention, the ballot order that has the endorsed candidates, how is that dictated and determined along with several other issues that I don't believe were answered in the underlying amendment. As such, Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to the amendment and ask my colleagues to oppose it. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, sir. Staff and guests please to the well of the House? Members take your seats. The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, please check the board to ensure your vote has been properly cast? Have all the members voted? Have all the 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. And the Clerk will announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Amendment C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Voting</th>
<th>145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those absent and not voting 6

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The amendment is rejected. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative France of the 42nd district, sir, you now have the floor.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I want to reiterate the great work of the, working with the Chair of the GAE Committee and bringing forth this compromised language and I believe it brings forward some of the things that we talked about at the beginning of this debate of you know increasing voter access while ensuring the integrity of the vote and I believe it also is trying to remedy some of the issues that we had specifically related to Election Day Registration in the past election and then as we go forward in the next election, we'll certainly monitor that and see if this is the remedy that's taking care of it or if we need to make changes. I think it also modernizes the language but I regret that the overall bill I will not be able to vote for. I have concern about the implementation of the automatic voter registration in
this fashion and we are opening up certainly in the
way that we've enacted the Motor Voter Law within the
Department of Motor Vehicles. There is a process to
ensure that

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Gavel]. Ladies and gentleman, the ranking
member of the GAE Committee is giving his
summarization of the bill. Please keep the noise down
so he can be heard. Representative, please proceed.

REP. FRANCE (42ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and as I was saying, my
concern deals with the implementation of the automatic
voter registration as we're rolling it out into other
agencies besides the motor vehicles. Certainly the
process that the commissioner of motor vehicles has
enacted, there is a remedy of process to ensure that
there is not the proper criteria established because
we have the difference between a driver's license
versus a drive only license first off, but secondarily
as we move forward, we're gonna bring and roll this
out into social service agencies and they are under
direction from this legislature not dealing with the
question of citizenship which is the first requirement
under our statutes for being eligible to vote and I have concern that we're gonna put our state employees in a bind of first enacting and then offering social service programs under guidance and direction from this body with not wanting to ask the question about citizenship and not allowed to, but then also going to be put forward in the process of helping them be facilitated to be electors where the first requirement is to be a citizen and if asked that question or that comes up and the individual who is being offered the opportunity to become an elector through these social service agencies instead of saying no, I don't want to be registered to vote because they know they're not eligible, they come out and say explicitly that they're not a citizen. Now that state employee is potentially in conflict with themselves of the state law versus federal law and how to remedy that so I would hope that as we roll this out we pay close attention to that, you know providing certain clear direction to our state employees on how to remedy that should they avail themselves of this and find themselves in that position so with that, I will be voting against. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, please check the board to 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 7160 as amended by House A.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Voting</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Yea</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Voting Nay</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
The bill as amended passes  [Gavel]

Representative Ritter of the 1st district, sir, you have the floor.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We will be back in tomorrow at 11 o'clock in the morning. We'll see everybody there, drive safe. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Reyes of the 75th.

REP. REYES (75TH):

Mr. Speaker, for purpose of journal notation, Representative Garibay, Orange and Tercyak personal, Representative Godfrey and Rose, sick, out of district Joe Aresimowicz, Speaker, and outside the Chamber Representative Genga, Rosario and Walker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Journal will so note.

Representative Betts of the 78th.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. For journal notation, Representative Kokoruda was out missing votes due to illness. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, sir. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Fox of the 148th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FOX (148TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The GAE Committee will meet tomorrow at 10 a.m. for matters before the committee. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. All right, Representative Currey, you were prepared, you have the floor.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adjournment subject to the Call of the Chair. Without objection, so ordered. We are adjourned. [Gavel]

(On motion of Representative Currey of the 11th District, the House adjourned at 10:50 o'clock p.m.,
to meet again at the Call of the Chair).
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