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

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

CHAPLAIN RABBI ALAN LEFKOWITZ:

Good Morning. I am often asked the differences between faith and belief. I know a lot of people of faith, but when I ask them about faith, they tell me
what they believe. Faith and belief are not the same thing. Belief is about knowing, and faith is about not knowing. Belief is about content -- I believe this, I don’t believe that. Faith is an attitude, a trusting of what is unfolding, of what is happening without knowing just what that is. Faith is fierce. You know that you don’t know. You know that you cannot know; and yet, we can embrace that moment without hesitation. So, how does worship fit in? Faith is cultivated through worship. Worship can be organized, improvised, ecstatic, contemplative. In actuality, worship, no matter how we worship, does not shore up or confirm beliefs; rather, it is supposed to strip us of our beliefs -- bringing us to a place of unknowing.

We ask our Creator for faith -- as faith opens body, heart, mind, soul, and spirit -- to a love without beliefs that get in the way; whether they are beliefs of politics, social conditioning, and religiosity. There is nothing wrong with beliefs -- let us do so lightly. But our work -- and we all see ourselves as people of faith -- is to release
our grip on belief and to surrender ourselves to faith. Amen.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, Rabbi.

Today on the Dais to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance we’re going to have the two organizers of ‘Dress Down Friday’ coming up. So can I have Representative Zupkus and Representative Abercrombie join me on the dais to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD) AND REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

(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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Is there any business on the clerk’s desk?

CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Favorable Report Senate Bills and a Senate Joint Resolution to be tabled for the Calendar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):
Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, I move that we waive the reading of the Senate Favorable Reports and the Bills and Resolutions be tabled for the Calendar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

If there’s no objections, so ordered.

CLERK:

And, the last piece of business is the daily Calendar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Are there any announcements or introductions?

Representative Zupkus.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for an introduction, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, in the galley today, I have visiting up here Bethany Community School 6th grade with volunteers and their teachers, and I have
to give a special shout out to Jack Keeley [phonetic] and his mom, Laura. They have been bringing the 6th grade class to this Capitol for quite some time now, and I think it’s wonderful how y’all come here to really see how our government works and understand our government. So, would y’all please give a warm welcome to Bethany 6th grade class? [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Welcome, children. I hope you enjoy your day at the Capitol. Will the clerk please call Calendar 112?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, I make a motion that we move House Bill 7153 to the foot of the Calendar.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

If there’s no objection, so ordered. Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Good morning, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Mr. Speaker, for a point of introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Mr. Speaker, it’s an honor here to have a previous Representative who held the 63rd seat, Mr. Phil Prelli, and also today his granddaughter is here with their school from Barkhamsted, which happens to be Representative Simanski’s district, but we all in the Northwest corner work together, and back then the 63rd District was a little bit different. So, we’d like to say hello to Adison and
her class up in the gallery. Give them a warm welcome. [Applause]. And, also thank former Representative Prelli for returning to the Chamber to visit us today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, and welcome. Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, the timing is perfect because both you and I were just downstairs donating suits, yourself and mine, and you do it every year. You’ve been a champion of it, and I just wanted to remind people I don’t know if -- I don’t know if you have either seen how many suits were donated downstairs. It’s so impressive. This body and all the people out there. But I want to do a shout out. I didn’t have personally anything, but I did put a little word out to my friends, and a friend of mine gave me 9 gorgeous suits for our Veterans, so thank you for all you do, Mr. Speaker, for the Veterans, and I appreciate my friend, Kevin Young, for what he did for the Veterans, and for
what everybody seem to be doing in this body. So, quite an extraordinary group there. They’re thinking they need a minibus to get all those suits out of there, so -- but it’s pretty impressive.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Representative Ackert for your contributions, and I’m -- I do believe we’re going to be setting records in the state for this wonderful drive, and I want to thank everyone for participating in it. Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, before we get to the business of the day, there is a birthday in the democratic caucus. From the great town of Newington, happy birthday, Gary Turco. [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 608?

CLERK:

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Good morning, sir.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate. Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in 2013, this body on a unanimous basis of both Chambers passed a first in the nation Trust Act. An Act which set parameters by which law enforcement in our state -- our state and local police forces work with or abide by requests from Immigration and Customs
enforcement with respect to the federal government’s authority and responsibility for enforcing immigration policy. Mr. Speaker, since 2013, there have been documented numerous instances in which that law has had some loopholes exposed in it, and it is time that we as a body, update, amend, and tighten that law.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us essentially does several things. First, it prohibits law enforcement from detaining someone solely on the basis of a civil immigration detainer. A civil immigration detainer is an administrative warrant issues by an executive branch agency -- a federal executive branch agency, ICE, without the signature of a judge and without necessary due process protections of law. This bill would fix that, would amend the statute, and require an ICE detainer, in order for someone to be held past the time in which they would otherwise be entitled to release from custody must be signed by a judge, accompanied by a judicial warrant, which has proper due process protections of law. The rationale for this bill is simple. That
everyone in our country is entitled to proper due process of law that has been firmly established by the Supreme Court, and folks should not fear of being held past the time in which they would otherwise be entitled to release from custody without probable cause and without a judicial warrant.

The second key thing that this bill does, Mr. Speaker, is it extends those that are covered by the Trust Act to certain individuals who are not covered under the original Act. Most particularly probation officers. Under the initial version of the bill in 2013, prohibition officers were excluded from the definition of law enforcement. This would close that loophole. This bill also tightens up the limits on state and local law enforcement sharing information with Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and it also provides for sharing of information back to the Office of Policy and Management so that this legislative body and the public at large can better track and monitor coordination with ICE and make sure that we react
accordingly as a legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, with that, the clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO No. 7531. I ask the clerk to call the amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize?

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO No. 7531, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”? It will be designated Senate Amendment “A”.

CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule “A”, LCO No. 7531, offered by Senator Winfield.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HENNESSY (127TH):

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

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the amendment makes some underlying technical and wordsmithing changes to the underlying bill. I move
adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before us is on adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule “A”. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the good Chairman. He indicates that these are some technical changes. I would like to be able to highlight exactly what these changes are and for what purpose that we have these changes being made. So, looking at line 1 of the amendment, we have in line 34 inserting the word “or”. What is the purpose for that change?

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

    Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose for the change in line 34 is to conform with the change made in line 35 where someone’s immigration status is removed as from the definition of confidential information necessitating the word “or” being placed in front of the roman at II.

    Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. In that provision, are we therefore making someone’s immigration status confidential or not confidential?

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. Not confidential.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Line 2 of the amendment it says in line 35 we’re striking “or” and then the roman numeral III immigration status. Is that what the good Chairman just referenced?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. For line 3, it says in line 75 strike “other than.” For what purpose are we striking that phrase?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, that we can insert the words “and any federal magistrate judge, judicial officer does not mean” and then continues on as “immigration judge.”

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. For what purpose are we doing that?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to make clear that an immigration judge who is not a federal judicial branch employee but rather is a federal executive branch employee does not count as a judicial officer. The import here obviously separating the authority of the federal constitution under Article
1 of the executive branch and Article 3 of the judicial branch, and as an executive branch employee to make sure that person does not count under the definition of judicial officer.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. What is the purpose of these individuals? Are they the ones who are authorized to sign off on a judicial warrant?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. By individuals, does the Ranking Member mean an Article 3 federal judge or magistrate or does she mean an immigration judge who is an executive branch employee?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Simpler than that regarding the line number 30, 75 that where discussing that those words are implement into regarding their purpose. Is there purpose because they’re the ones who are authorized to sign off on a judicial warrant?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. A federal Article 3 judge or a magistrate judge would be authorized to sign off on a judicial warrant or a state judge would be authorized to sign off on a judicial warrant.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, the good Chairman
indicated also a state judge. If the good Chairman wouldn’t mind elaborating what a state judge is?

Many times this body is asked to vote on a variety of different state judges with different titles and different abilities. So, if the good Chairman could elaborate and definite what a state judge is?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Under our state’s constitution, we have a judicial branch, which is made up of various judges. I believe there’s a statutory cap of something like 201 judges in the state of Connecticut. Of those, there are a variety of Supreme Court justices -- I believe 9 -- there are 7. There are Appellate Court judges, and then the remainder are Superior Court judges -- I believe. There is authorized to be 187, but currently, I believe the judicial branch only has about 150 judges, and there are 30 some odd vacancies.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. That does that definition of a state judge also include trial judge referees?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. If they’re acting in capacity as a judge, then a judge trial referee would qualify.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Would that also include magistrates in the state court?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative Stafstrom.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe it would include magistrates. Under our state court system, magistrates generally are lawyers. They’re not sworn judges who are acting in various capacities; be that in the small claims system or discovery disputes. I do not believe that magistrates are authorized under state statute to sign warrants.

Through you.

Representative Rebimbbas.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I thank the good Chairman for that clarification. In line 5 of the amendment where it says in line 97, strike “detain” and insert “arrest or detain” in lieu thereof -- if the good Chairman could explain why we’re making that change?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you, Mr. Speaker. Line 6 of the amendment, in line 120 striking a civil immigration -- if the good Chairman can elaborate as to why we’re making that change?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that change is made in order to conform with the definition of administrative warrant, which is
referenced on lines 4 through 9 of the underlying bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, the good Chairman could describe what the difference between a civil immigration detainer and an administrative warrant would be?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As defined in the bill -- underlying bill in lines 10 through 12, a civil immigration detainer is a request from a federal immigration authority -- generally Immigration and Customs Enforcement -- to a local or state law enforcement agency for a purpose of doing various things, most -- most especially holding someone for up to 48 hours post time that they would
otherwise be eligible for release from incarceration or detention.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. In line 7 of that amendment, it talks about striking detainer or -- and I believe we just referenced that in the lines 120 through 121; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. It’s a carryover from the previous line.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Regarding the amendment on line 8, it says
in line 23, inserting the word “or” -- what is the purpose of inserting that word?

Again, through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It looks like it’s intended to clean up a typographical error in the substitute language that came out of committee. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m curious regarding the substitute language that came out of committee. This is the first I’m hearing of substitute language that’s coming out of the committee. If the good Chairman would elaborate what that means -- “coming out of the committee?” Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I’m looking at the top of the underlying bill, and it says substitute Senate Bill 992. I’m trying to recall whether this was a JF out of committee or JFS, but if I misspoke -- whichever it is, what I mean to say is this is a cleanup of the typographical error of the bill that was voted out of the Judiciary Committee some months ago.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I thank the Chairman for that clarification. In line 9 of the amendment, it says in line 126 strike “or” and insert a comma in lieu thereof. If the good Chairman could indicate and explain what that change is for?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I believe this is cleaning up of the number sequencing and punctuation of the bill that was voted out of committee.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you, Mr. Speaker. Line 10 of the amendment talks about striking lines 127 to 132 in its entirety. If the good Chairman could explain why?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I -- I’m not entirely positive, but it’s my expectation that it was the decision of the Senate when considering this bill that that language was unnecessary.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, so through you, Mr. Speaker. As I read lines 127 through 132, it enumerated certain things that this underlying proposal, if passed, would be restrictive upon. So, could we assume therefore that in the use of time, money, facilities, property, equipment, personnel, etc. as enumerated in those lines now are not prohibited?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That’s correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. On line 11 of the amendment, it has 156 striking potential. If the good Chairman could
explain the reasoning behind that action?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think it’s for clarification purposes to the language of that -- that provision of the bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I’m actually concerned regarding that change in line 156 because if we leave the wording in there it reads necessary and furtherance of a criminal investigation of potential terrorism, and if we take out potential, it leaves investigation of terrorism, so when I think of -- which we’re required to do and law enforcement’s required to do and certainly attorneys are required to do -- is look at the plain language of a statute. I could interpret that that
action can’t be taken unless an actual terrorist attack, terrorist action has actually taken place. If we say potential, then certainly that could be an investigation maybe of some information that’s been provided as to what they believe may be in the plans of taking place, so that is a big change. That is a big interpretation change of the literal wording that we’re left with. Is that my understanding and a correct understanding? Well, I could tell you, Mr. Speaker, that’s my understanding. Is that the Chairman’s understanding?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no. With all due respect to the Ranking Member, I interpret this revision very differently. What I -- what I consider it as is when someone is investigating and has reasonable -- reasonable cause or reasonable believe to believe there is a terrorist act as that term is defined either under state statute or
federal law that can or would or has taken place that confidential information can be disclosed. I - - I think the term potential actually adds confusion because it could be read to me in that the criminal investigation can only be of a potential terrorist act as opposed to the act itself; whereas, I believe under the change of this language to make it clearer what is being investigated is any crime that could be classified as terrorism or an act in furtherance of plotting of a terrorist attack.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I appreciate the good Chairman’s explanation in that regard, and I would then say that in order for it to be clear because you certainly have two individuals who have sat through the public hearing, and this is not clear, that potentially we would either keep the word potential terrorism and/or actual action of terrorism or if potential wasn’t clear enough, we
could typically use a different term in that regard, but taking out potential, certainly, we could have this debate as a potential legislative intent, but my concern again is we’re left with the plain reading of the statute in that regard, and that is not my interpretation of it. And, this is something I believe -- in my humble opinion -- and I believe probably the majority of folks would think that any type of planning of a terrorist action or actual action of terrorism is severe enough that we should be providing as much clarity in our language as humanly possible, so I have great concerns regarding that change in that line as proposed in the amendment.

Also, in line 12 of the amendment, it looks at line 199 of the underlying bill, and once again, it is striking the word "potential." In this case, it’s "potential criminal suspects and individuals cooperating with law enforcement officers." If the good Chairman could explain the change in that line?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, again, Mr. Speaker. I’m not sure what a potential criminal suspect is. I suppose we are all potential criminal suspects at some point. I think the -- the intent of the bill here is if someone is suspected of a crime be that an underlying offense, larceny, conspiracy, any number of different offenses in which they could be guilting of that this provision would apply to them, but a potential criminal suspect I think is too wordy and potentially confusing in that really every citizen is a potential criminal in some way, shape, or form.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I thank the good Chairman for his explanation. I would disagree that I don’t believe that every citizen is a potential criminal suspect, nor do I believe that I would be
potentially a criminal suspect in all cases, but I could certainly appreciate cleaning the wording in that regard and leaving it as “criminal suspect left to the facts and circumstances in that regard of the investigation.” So, Mr. Speaker, what I’m going to do because there is a lot more I would like to address that was in the good Chairman’s introduction as well as in the underlying bill, but I’m certainly going to stop my questioning regarding the amendment. I absolutely disagree that all of the proposed changes in these amendments is technical in nature. It goes far beyond that specifically in my highlighting of the wording taking out regarding “potential terrorism.” Again, there is a terrorist act and then there’s the planning of, and I think that changing the potential -- the plain language of that would leave it to an actual action, which is very concerning.

So, regarding the amendment, I would absolutely oppose the amendment, ask my colleagues to do the same as in and of itself as we saw in this dialogue, there is potential serious confusion for that, and I
would say that in the best interest of any proposal that may or may not pass this body it should be absolutely clear, and it should be properly addressed. So, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I’ll reserve my comments to the underlying bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Polletta, did you want to remark on the amendment? Representative Yaccarino, did you want to remark on the amendment? Representative Stafstrom, do you have anything further to say?

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I simply ask that when the vote be taken on this amendment, it be taken by roll.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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. (All) Aye. I think the requisite 20 percent have been met. The vote
when taken will be taken by roll. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Did you want to remark on the amendment, Representative Dubitsky. Representative Dubitsky, sir, you have the floor.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you. I’d like to focus a little on the questioning that Ranking Member Rebimbas just discussed with the good Chair about the word potential, and the -- the good Chair’s statement that every citizen is a potential criminal suspect -- got that in quotes, “every citizen is a potential criminal suspect.” We’re not talking about citizens -- are we? We’re talking about people who are not citizens. We are talking about people who we don’t necessarily know who they are. We don’t have their identity, so what I’m concerned about is
investigations where we have law enforcement trying to figure out if Connecticut law enforcement has a person in custody that they’re looking for, and the person in custody is a potential suspect, not necessarily a suspect because federal law enforcement doesn’t necessarily know if they have the right person. There are a lot of people that are coming across various borders who we don’t know who they are. We don’t have their records. We don’t necessarily have their correct names. So, through you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask how a situation like that is enhanced and how the people of this state are made safer by removing the word potential in line 199?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated, I think the removal of the word potential is merely technical in this instance in that it clears up the language. Because if we read up on the underlying
bill, the bill specifically allows that any confidential information of an individual who comes in contact with law enforcement may be disclosed to an immigration authority if -- skipping down -- necessary and furtherance of a criminal investigation of terrorism. A criminal investigation of terrorism could be the terrorist act. It could be conspiracy to commit terrorism. It could be gathering materials to support a terrorist organization. It could mean any number of potential crimes that could be charged either under state or federal law that could count as criminal investigation of terrorism. Again, I don’t believe that this refers to the act itself, but I am concerned of what is potential terrorism. I think I understand what a terrorist act is or what conspiracy to commit terrorism may be. Those are -- I believe -- plain meaning terms, but I’m not sure that the term potential terrorism has plain meaning in the law and as such I think striking that one word makes this provision of the bill that much clearer.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubtisky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect to the good Chairman, he has -- he’s looking at the wrong section of this -- of the amendment. I asked -- my question was directed to line 199, not line 156. Line 156, which the good Chairman was discussing talks about potential terrorism. I was talking about line 199, which talks about potential criminal suspects. Very different thing -- potential criminal suspects. People who we are not necessary sure are the right person. So, through you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the good Chairman address his remarks to line 199, and the word potential that is proposed to be stricken in the amendment.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. My apologies for looking at the wrong section when the Representative said the previous discussion on potential. There was two, and I incorrectly assumed he was talking about the wrong one. With respect to lines 196 through 200, this underlying provision talks specifically and solely about the training provided by the Office of Policy and Management, and by removing the word “potential”, the language of the bill would read, “such training may entail how law enforcement officers or other officials performing similar duties will adhere to provisions of this section in how they will interact with crime victims, criminal suspects, and the individuals cooperating with law enforcement officers.

As indicated before to the good Ranking Member, I believe the word “potential” is a little too ambiguous and too broad in that as indicated certainly, you know, any of us driving home today could, you know, cause a serious auto accident and may be charged with a misdemeanor offense. That would make us potential criminal suspects with
respect to the crime of reckless driving. So, I think potential criminal suspects is far, far, far too broad in that it doesn’t actually address an instance where somebody has the mens rea to commit a crime; whereas, by striking the word potential, we limit it accordingly.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I appreciate the good Chairman’s answer. My problem with that answer though is that it does not address the scenario that I posited, which is we have -- the local law enforcement or state law enforcement has a person in custody, and the federal law enforcement is looking for somebody that fits a similar description, and they would -- they don’t know for sure whether or not this particular individual is the person they’re looking for, and they contact local law enforcement, and they want to have some type of interaction with this person, not necessarily a suspect, but a
potential criminal suspect. And, although -- so lines 196 through 200 deal with the training of law enforcement officers performing their duties -- so, through you, are we to interpret the removal of the word potential to mean that the training will only encompass interactions with people who are actual criminal suspects and not people who are potential criminal suspects?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay. I appreciate the answer of the good Chairman. So, how -- what training then will law enforcement officers and others performing similar duties get in the -- in how they interact with potential criminal suspects?

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. As indicated, I think the word potential and suspect -- or not as indicated, but let me try to rephrase this. I think the word potential and suspect are redundant. If somebody is a suspect in a crime, then there is the potential that they have committed that crime, and there’s an investigation ongoing and presumably, there is some reason law enforcement has to believe that that person has committed the crime; hence, the reason they’re a suspect.

    Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don’t practice law in the criminal field, but I have certainly heard -- as most people in this Chamber have -- the term person of interest. A person of interest isn’t necessarily a suspect. My understanding is that to
reach the level of being a suspect there are certain factors that the law enforcement needs to check off, that first off, that they have positively identified the person that they’re looking at, and they have said, this person is a suspect. I think that by removing the word potential in line 199 what we’re doing is we’re raising the bar, and we’re telling law enforcement that this person must be an actual suspect and not just a person of interest, not just somebody who they’re looking into to see if they may be the right person, if they may be suspect of committing a crime. We’re essentially cutting out a whole group of people who federal law enforcement may need to look into in some way -- a person of interest, a potential person of interest, somebody matching the description. We hear it all the time -- police offers on the street they see somebody who matches a description of somebody who is -- who has been described as a certain height, wearing a certain type of clothes, being male, being female, heading in a certain direction away from a bank that’s just been robbed. That person isn’t
necessarily a suspect, but it’s somebody who law enforcement may want to talk to, may want to interact with to get some more information to find out if it’s the right person. We know that very often law enforcement has the name of a person who they believe is a suspect. They may even have a photograph or a description, and they’re out looking for Joe Smith. They’re out on the street looking for Joe Smith. They know Joe Smith lives in a certain area. So, they see a guy walking down the street, kind of looks like Joe Smith, same height, same build, dressed like Joe Smith does, and they say, well, let’s go talk to that guy. Let’s go see if that’s Joe Smith. Well, that guy is not a suspect. That guy is not a criminal suspect. It’s a potential criminal suspect because if it happens to be Joe Smith, well maybe Joe Smith is a suspect in some crime, but until law enforcement interacts with that person, goes and talks to them, goes and sees them, they have no way to know if that person is Joe Smith. They have no way to know if that person is a criminal suspect, but that person is a
potential criminal suspect. So, my -- my concern about line 12 of this proposed amendment, which again is LCO 7531, is that by removing that word it is not just a cleanup. It’s not just a technical change of -- of fixing a redundancy. It actually changes the substance and it not only raises the bar of who law enforcement might be able to talk to, but it also leaves this gap, so the gap is that law enforcement -- so -- so line 196 through 200 talks about the training of law enforcement with regard to interacting with crime victims, potential suspects, and individuals cooperating with law enforcement. By removing that word potential, it only talks about the training of how law enforcement interacts with crime victims, actual suspects, and those -- and individuals cooperating with law enforcement. There is a gap where it leaves out potential suspects. Now, I think that’s a major problem, and that hammers law enforcement in one of the basic functions of their duties, which is interacting with people who are potential suspects, who they don’t know whether or not the person that they’re looking
for, the person that they’re talking about is a suspect. Now, how does that play out in a -- in a situation with regard to immigration and naturalization or the -- or ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement? How does that play out in that situation? There -- ICE is looking for somebody. They think there’s somebody who is -- who has been participating in a criminal organization of some sort. They have a general description of the person. They know that they’ve -- they’ve just come across the border, and they believe that there is a plot. They have raw data, raw intelligence to indicate that there’s a -- a plot of some sort to -- to -- to cause an attack in the United States. Perhaps, they think there’s some intelligence out there that they’re going to shoot up a school, and they have a general description of the person they’re looking for. They don’t know -- they don’t have his name, and they -- but they -- but they’re pretty sure from intelligence that that person has just made it across the border -- made it across the Canadian border, coming down through New Hampshire.
And, they understand that a person generally matching that description has been picked up by local law enforcement on a charge of possession of an assault weapon in a school zone. So, they have this information that a person generally matching this description has been arrested for possessing an assault weapon in a school zone. And, at the same time, they have this raw intelligence that there is a plot of some sort to shoot up a school by people from another country, and they know they have some intelligence that somebody’s just crossed the border or is going to be crossing the border for this purpose. So, they reach out to local law enforcement, and they say, we think this might be the guy, but we don’t know. We have no idea if this is the person that our intelligence is pointing to. We want to interact with this person. We want contact with him. We want to talk to this guy and find out if this is a guy who is just some crazy from Waterbury that decided they were gonna walk through a school zone with an assault weapon,
or is this the guy we’re looking for that just came across -- that we believe just came across the Canadian border, came through New Hampshire, and we think he might be associated with some type of plot to shoot up a school. He’s not a suspect. He’s a potential suspect. We would like to be able to interact with this guy.

Removing the word potential in line 199, as proposed in LCO 7531, would affect that interaction because it’s not a suspect, it’s a potential suspect. And, the significance of that should not be discharged as just a technical amendment with no substantive meaning because it has true substantive meaning. This is not simply a technical change. This is a substantive change, which in the instance I just described could have a very, very significant real-world effect on the ability of law enforcement to interact with this person who is in custody of local law enforcement.

Now, so for that reason, I would -- that reason alone, I would advise against the -- this amendment. But a couple other quick points, if I may? In line
5 of the amendment, it proposes that we change in line 97 the words detain and put in instead arrest and detain, and what this section does, what this proposed amendment does is it is one -- it is the first in a list of things that police may not do, so under the underlying bill, the police may not detain an individual pursuant to a civil immigration detainer unless it’s accompanied by a warrant issued by a judicial officer. So, under the proposed amendment, we would be saying that the law enforcement officer may not arrest or detain an individual pursuant to a civil immigration detainer.

So, through you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the good Chairman of the Judiciary Committee is it common practice for law enforcement to arrest an individual pursuant to a civil immigration detainer?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe so.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there any provision of our current law that would empower a law enforcement officer to effectuate an actual arrest pursuant to a civil immigration detainer?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe so.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then, I would ask the good Chairman if there is no provision in law to permit or empower a law enforcement officer to effectuate an arrest pursuant to a civil immigration detainer why are we adding or why is the proposal to add in line 97 the word arrest?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Simply to make it clear that a law enforcement officer, law enforcement agency in the state cannot arrest, pursue untraceable immigration detainer. I believe for them to do so would be a due process violation under the 5th Amendment of the United States Constitution where possibly an illegal search and seizure under the 4th Amendment, and therefore, making it very clear in our statute that we do not want our state and local law enforcement agencies putting themselves or the state or a municipalities at civil litigation risks as a result.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you. Are not law enforcement officers only to effectuate arrests pursuant to established and enacted statutes?
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, at the moment from what the good Chairman said, there is no enacted statute that would empower a law enforcement officer to effectuate an arrest pursuant to a civil immigration detainer. So, my fear in adding this word arrest to line 97 is it -- it muddies up the statute. It mucks things up because it -- it tells a law enforcement officer what they can’t do in a specific instance when they are only permitted under law to do what is articulated in the statutes. So, what this does is it creates a negative in -- a negative connotation that although there is -- that a law enforcement officer is not empowered to do something under the statute in this particular
instance we’re gonna say but you can’t do this. So, if I’m a law enforcement officer, and I’ve gone through my law enforcement training, and I have this list of things that I am empowered by statute to do, I can arrest based on the following criteria. And, then I see this and say, but in this instance, I can’t do this. Well, that would lead me to believe that somewhere in these statutes it allows me to do something, and now it’s trying to take that away, so it creates this weird dynamic where an officer can only act under specifically articulated statutes, but in this one instance, it says, but you can’t do this.

So, the -- the -- it seems like it’s a carveout. That you can’t do this should be a carveout of things you are allowed to do, but if you’re not allowed to do it in the first place, there’s no reason for this carveout. Not only doesn’t it make sense, but I think it adds uncertainty to our statutes, and it makes it difficult for people who are trained in what they can do to figure out does this change what I’ve
already learned or is this something different? So, for that reason, I would also oppose the amendment LCO 7531.

Now, in line -- in line 2 of the proposed amendment, it asks that we strike line 35 of the underlying bill -- I’m sorry. In line 35, we strike the words “or immigration status.” So, I heard the good Chairman -- I heard the good Chairman’s discussion with our esteemed Ranking Member with regard to that, but I -- I -- I apologize. I just did not fully comprehend the purpose of that -- of removing that. Confidential -- what we’re doing in this proposed -- what we would be doing in this proposed amendment would be removing immigration status from the term confidential immigration -- confidential information, and if you would, I would ask, through you Mr. Speaker, if the good Chairman would just reiterate for me why that is being proposed in the proposed amendment?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As indicated before, to make clear that someone’s immigration status is not confidential.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, how removing that -- removing immigration status from confidential immigration -- if the good Chairman would give me a scenario where that might come into play in the real world?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I am -- without getting into the entire underlying bill, I think the intent here is to limit the amount of information that can be shared from local and state law enforcement to federal immigration authority, so
someone’s immigration status would not be considered confidential in the way that their sexual orientation or whether they were victim of a crime or their social security number would be. That -- that simply is not information that we are defining as confidential and can’t be shared. In other words, it could be shared.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, do I interpret this correctly that the -- the confidentiality -- confidential information that is defined in lines 32 through 38 of the underlying bill that that without this amendment is the information that can be shared with law enforcement?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, I don’t understand the question.
Representative Dubitsky, could you repeat your question, please?

Sure. In the underlying bill, lines 32 through 38 define the term confidential information and there are a number of different pieces of information that are identified as making up the -- the defined term confidential information. So, under the -- in the underlying bill without respect to the amendment, how can this information be handled? Can this confidential information be disclosed to federal law enforcement?

Through you.

Representative Stafstrom.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Let me -- let me see if I can answer it this way. If this amendment does not pass, then someone’s immigration status would be considered confidential information that could not be shared by local and state law enforcement with
federal authorities unless it falls into one of the other exceptions under lines 152 to 157 of the underlying bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Okay. So, just so I have this straight. So, without regard to the -- to the amendment -- I’m just on the underlying bill here for a second. Just to -- just so I’m clear as to what this -- the proposed amendment is. Confidential information under lines 32 through 38 that would be information that cannot under the underlying bill be shared with law enforcement?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. I would draw the proponent’s question -- the questioner’s attention to lines 159 to 151 of the underlying
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

I’m looking for it. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Did the good Chairman say lines 159 through -- what were the -- what were the line numbers?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom, could you restate the lines?

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

149 to 151, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

I see it. Thank you. Okay. So, under the amendment, what it would do would be remove immigration status from the definition of confidential information that could under certain circumstances be shared with federal law
enforcement. Got it. My question would be then how is local law enforcement -- how is how is immigration status determined by local law enforcement for the purpose of determining whether or not it can be shared with federal authorities?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don’t believe that it’s local or state law enforcement -- local or state law enforcement’s job or responsibility to determine someone’s law enforcement. That’s part of the import of the bill, but to the extent that local or state law enforcement were aware of someone’s immigration status, maybe that person volunteered the information to them or you know it’s -- it’s a known person to them or -- or what have you, then that would not be considered confidential information.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I -- I thank the good Chairman. So, just so I can understand the good Chairman’s answer. So, if somebody is arrested for a crime by local law enforcement, and they don’t voluntarily say, hey, I’m here illegally or I just snuck across the border, the local law enforcement isn’t going to attempt to determine that immigration status; is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, if let’s say local law enforcement is aware that this person has been -- has been -- has been deported a dozen times and has continued to re-enter the country illegally,
and is fully aware that this person -- they’re fully aware of this person’s immigration status, under this amendment, would local law enforcement be prohibited from disclosing that to federal immigration authorities?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Not under the amendment but under other sections of the underlying bill and most instances, yes, they would be prohibited.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Why?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. Lines 115 to 119 of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m looking at 115 through 119 of the bill, but my question is why would we prevent local law enforcement from disclosing to federal law enforcement that a given person who has been deported multiple times and has re-entered the country illegally multiple times, why would be prevent them from disclosing to federal law enforcement this individual’s immigration status?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

[Sigh] Representative Dubitsky, keep in mind, we’re still on the amendment. You’re referring to the underlying bill. You didn’t really relate this to the underlying bill. Can you make that clearer, please?

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Sure. Well, in -- in the amendment, what we
are -- in line 2 of the amendment, it removes the words immigration status from line 35. Line 35, identifies defines the term confidential information, so as the good Chairman has indicated previously, by removing the words immigration status in line 35, we are removing that term from the definition of confidential information, which is the information that can be disclosed to law enforcement, so this amendment, what it does is it tells local law enforcement that immigration status is no longer a piece of information that can be disclosed from local law enforcement to federal law enforcement, and my question was why would we prevent local law enforcement from disclosing to the federal law enforcement that a given individual known to local law enforcement has been deported and illegally re-entered the country multiple times? Why would we do that as proposed in this amendment?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the good gentleman is reading the amendment backwards. In fact, as indicated, if this amendment did not pass, the restrictions on local law enforcement under the underlying bill would be more severe as immigration status would be defined as part of confidential information. So, in fact, by not supporting the amendment, they -- there is -- there is even less information that could be shared between local law enforcement and federal immigration authorities.

But with that said, why we would place limits on local and state law enforcement’s ability to communicate immigration status to federal authorities is in fact twofold. First and foremost, it’s that local and state law enforcement have enough to do on their hands. They should not be out doing the federal government’s job of enforcing immigration policy. That’s the job of the federal government. The federal government is free to enforce its immigration policy as it so chooses, but there is no requirement in the law for them to be
able to deputize or to utilize our state and local law enforcement to do that. The second reason is in fact a probably more significant one, which is our people living in the state of Connecticut should have an opportunity to seek government help and seek the assistance of state and local law enforcement when they need it. The gentleman uses the situation of someone who is deported multiple times, but I would use the situation of someone who is a victim of a crime, maybe an individual who is the victim of wage theft by their employer trying to go to the Department of Labor for help. Maybe it’s the situation of someone who is raped and is seeking to go to the police in order to report that crime and to have it prosecuted. The title of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is the Trust Act, and the reason why is so that people living in the state of Connecticut can have trust in local law enforcement that they can go seek the help that they need without the fear of local and state law enforcement turning them over to the federal government and Immigration and Customs Enforcement.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The good Chairman brings up a number of issues. First off, if I have misinterpreted this amendment, I certainly apologize. My understanding from the good Chairman’s answers was that confidential information as identified in lines 32 through 38 was the information that was or that is under a set of standards laid out later in the -- in the bill, was information that was able to be disclosed by local law enforcement to federal law enforcement, and that by removing the term “immigration status” from that definition what we were doing or what we would be doing under the proposed amendment is preventing that particular piece of information from being disclosed to local law enforcement. If that is incorrect, I would ask the good Chairman, through you Mr. Speaker, to correct me and point me to the section of the bill that makes that clear.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I’m not sure what the questioner means by that section of the bill. I’m a little confused on where he is going with this.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’ll -- I’ll go back. Just so I’m clear of what this -- the removal in line 2 of the amendment of the words “or immigration status” in line 35 of the underlying bill -- just so I’m clear what that change would do I would ask the good Chairman to identify for me how confidential information as defined in lines 32 through 38 can be disclosed to local -- to federal law enforcement and if they’re -- and if he could point me to a provision in the bill that explains how that
information can be used?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STASFROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. On lines 149 through 158 of the bill, beginning at line 149, there is a general prohibition on state and local law enforcement sharing what is defined as confidential information with federal immigration authorities. There is then laid out three exceptions, so it’s a general prohibition, you shall not share the information unless you meet one of three criteria. Those criteria are an authorization in writing from the individual who’s confidential information is to be shared, the provision we spoke about at the beginning of the questioner’s dialogue, which was the furtherance of an investigation of a terror -- of a crime of terrorism, or on line 159, as otherwise required by law, which I would take to mean generally those instances where there is a valid federal subpoena for the information that is
signed and authorized by -- by a court of law.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is precisely how I interpreted it, so I’m -- I’m not sure how the good Chairman or why the good Chairman thinks I have the amendment backwards. My interpretation of it is just as he described that confidential information is something that may not be disclosed except under certain circumstances, so again, if the term immigration status is removed -- well, let me ask you this, through you Mr. Speaker. If the term -- if this amendment goes through and the words or immigration status in line 35 is stricken, is the immigration status of an individual who is custody able to be disclosed to federal law enforcement if one of the three exceptions in lines 152 through 158 are present?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As indicated, if this amendment is adopted, I believe, unfortunately, the questioner is talking about sort of apples and oranges, I think. There would be other requirements under which immigration status could be disclosed and as such, the provisions at which we’re discussing would not be applicable.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then, I would -- that certainly raises the question under what circumstances would local law enforcement be able to disclose an individual’s known immigration status?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I would refer the
questioner back to lines 115 through 126 of the underlying bill and assuming there -- there was not a violation of one of those provisions, then the immigration status could be disclosed if it was known.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

[Pause] Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m looking at lines 115 through 126 of the underlying bill, and they don’t appear to provide local law enforcement any authority to disclose the immigration status of an individual to federal law enforcement. What they appear to do is they appear to prohibit local law enforcement from doing just that.

So, again, I would ask under what circumstances can local law enforcement disclose to federal law enforcement the immigration status of an -- of an individual who is in local law enforcement custody? If there’s some provision of lines 115 through 126 that I’m not seeing, I would -- I would ask that the
good Chairman explain that to me.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Ritter, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

This bill is passed temporarily if there’s no objection. So, ordered. (Gavel). Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, there’s going to be an immediate democratic caucus. We don’t expect it to take more than a half hour, so why don’t we reconvene on lines 15 through 26 at one o’clock. Sound good to everybody? And, I would move that we recess at the Call of the Chair. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The Chamber is in recess while Representative Stafstrom prepares an answer. Thank you. (Gavel).
(On motion of Representative Ritter of the 1st District, the House recessed at 12:29 o’clock p.m., to reconvene at the Call of the Chair.)

(The House reconvened at 1:20 o’clock p.m., Deputy Speaker Ryan in the Chair.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The Chamber will come back into Session. Representative Orange. She’s -- yes, it is. It’s right there. It says O-R-A-N-G-E. Representative Orange.

REP. ORANGE (48TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of an announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Or an introduction even.

REP. ORANGE (48TH):

Or that, or both.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. ORANGE (48TH):
Thank you. Representative Haines and I have a group here from the Colchester, the Jack Jackter Intermediate School, and they are senior student senate, and they represent their classmates in the school, and I did go down and visit them in the school and invited them to come up here, and join us for a session day, but I see that you’re keeping it kind of quiet today, Mr. Speaker. So, I -- for those of you in the Chamber, if you would give our guests a special welcome, it would be appreciated? [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you all for coming and visiting with us today. I hope you found it enjoyable and educational. Are there any other announcements or introductions? I’m hearing none. We will go back into recess. Stand at ease. Sorry. [Pause].

The Chamber will come back to order. Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 225?

CLERK:

On page 13, House Calendar 225, House Bill No. 7175, AN ACT CONCERNING SURETY BAIL BOND AGENTS.
Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Insurance and Real Estate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Scanlon, sir, you have the floor.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Scanlon, you may continue.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a department bill that makes several changes in the statutes related to surety bail bond agents, and I move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Moves acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill, which we have done. And, will you remark further on the bill? Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did you -- through you, did you -- is there anything that the Ranking -- or sorry. The Chairman wanted to say about the bill first before I ask a few questions?

Through you.

No? Thank you. Then, I just have a couple of brief questions, Mr. Speaker. Can you please explain the -- what this changes as far as continuing education requirements?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. If the good Ranking Member will maybe be more specific with her question?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato, could you be a little more specific?

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

Were bail bondsman required to have continuing education prior to this bill?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The bill limits how often the commissioner may examine agent’s books and records no more than once every three years and no more often than deemed necessary.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

And, through you, Mr. Speaker. If the Chairman -- Chairman could please explain the change that this bill makes regarding fees that must be paid in
by the individual bail bondsman?

    Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. It changes the dates in which the fees are collected.

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

    Thank you. And, did anybody testify against this bill?

    Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. I do not recall.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, what does this
bill change about the examination of books by the commissioner -- books of bail bondsman?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It limits how often the commissioner can do that examination.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a good bill. I know we’ve worked on this, and this bill, of course, comes up year after year, and we’re hoping this would be the last year. And, I have one final question to the good Chairman; if there is a fiscal note on this?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):
There is not.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Pavalock-D’Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D’AMATO (77TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, it’s a good bill. I hope to get it through this Chamber for the last time, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Thank you.

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? Representative Vail of the 52nd. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, the previous Representative asked about if there was any opposition to this, and I recall I think the Bail Bonds Association they -- they opposed the bill -- they were in favor of some parts of the bill, but as it was currently written in committee, they had opposed it. And, I wonder if you had an opportunity
after the fact to speak with them?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Scanlon.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I have not personally spoken to them about this. I know the department has been working with them. This bill, as the Ranking Member eluded to, has been before us on numerous occasions, and I believe this bill is a product of some changes to subsequent bills that have been before us of this nature, but I have not personally been engaged in negotiations with them directly as this has been an agency bill, and they have been doing so to my knowledge.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Vail.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

And, I thank the Chairman for his answers.

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 members take their seats? The machine will be open. [Bell].

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

CLERK:

House Bill 7175

Total number Voting 141

Necessary for Passage 71

Those voting Yea 117

Those voting Nay 24
Absent not Voting 10

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel). Are there any announcements or introductions? The Chamber will stand at ease. [Pause].

The House of Representatives will reconvene immediately. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives will reconvene immediately. Members to the Chamber. [Pause].

The Chamber will come back to order. Are there any introductions or announcements? Are there any introductions or announcements? If not, will the clerk please call Calendar No. 494? Yeah.

CLERK:

On page 33, House Calendar 494, House Bill No. 7349, AN ACT CONCERNING IDENTIFY THEFT VICTIM ACCESS TO RECORDS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Blumenthal, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance 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 Blumenthal, you still have the floor.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under our accelerated rehabilitation program, records of a person who is in that program and their criminal file is sealed, that creates a problem for victims of identify theft who cannot gain access to the records that would determine how their identity or identifiable information has been misused. This bill aims to address that problem by creating a limited exception to that sealing requirement so that the victim may gain access to the complaint and the law enforcement files relevant to that case. And, with that in mind, the clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO No. 7982. I ask that the clerk please call the
amendment, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO 7982, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A”, LCO No. 7982. Offered by Representative Petit, Representative Stafstrom, Representative Rebimbas.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? I’m hearing none. Representative Blumenthal, you have the floor.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment makes technical changes designating the identity theft offenses to which this bill will apply. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment. Certainly, with all of those names that were enumerated, how could we not support an amendment like that? With that said, all jokes aside, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the amendment passing. It is certainly the technical changes that the good Vice-Chairman had indicated. And, I’m just going to take this opportunity obviously to just, you know, point out certainly what the good Vice-Chairman highlighted regarding the underlying proposal that certainly the amendment goes towards that, but this is a narrowly tailored situation regarding those victims of identity theft, but for these records, it’s very difficult for them to address obviously the grievance it has caused them in this issue of having their identify taken away from them and then the inability to correct that without the appropriate documents from the court really truly is revictimizing these victims.
So, this is a very good proposal, so I do rise in support of the amendment and the underlying bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye. (All) Aye. Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Cheeseman of the 37th.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you. I want to thank the Chair and Ranking Member for their work on this bill. Identify theft is prevalent. More than 17.7 million Americans experienced it in 2016, so I am happy to see this is going to make it easier for those people who’ve been victims to restore their identifies and resolve their lives and problems.

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

Thank you. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further? Representative Lemar of the 96th District. Sir, you have the floor. Representative Lemar. Representative Lemar, do you wish to speak on the amendment? Thank you for your attention, Representative Lemar. We appreciate that. [Laughter]. Will you care to remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us after that delay? Will the staff and members please come to the Well of the House? Will the members take their seats? And, the machine will be open. [Bell].

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 members voted? Will all members check the board to make
sure their vote has been properly cast? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will announce the tally. Clerk announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 7349 as amended by House “A”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The bill as amended is passed. (Gavel).

Representative Lanoue of the 45th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. LANOUE (45TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate it. I rise for a point of personal privilege. I would like to introduce to you the future State Representative from the 45th District, Ms. Sydney Hart. She is visiting today from Griswold High School, and she’s a member of the team legislative
council that I meet with once a month that helps advises me on a lot of different issues facing the teen population and how it relates to legislation, and I’m very happy she’s visiting. She’s been a great asset to the community. She’s involved in the Model United Nations, and I think we’ll be seeing more of her up here in the years to come, and I hope the Chamber will give her a warm welcome today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you. We hope you have an enjoyable day while you’re up here. It’s good to meet you. Representative Klarides of the 114th, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

Hold -- hold on. There’s a lot of cords. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please proceed.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have a special
guest with us here today. I have Charlie Sticka who is a graduate of my alma mater a little bit before I graduated in 1956, and was a two-time All American on the football team. He was part of two undefeated seasons in ’54 and ’55, and scored a record 37 touchdowns. He is a resident of Wethersfield, and still swims every day at the YMCA and keeps himself active, as you can see by taking a look at him. I wanted to get him up here when my nephew was up this coming weekend because he’s starting at Trinity in the fall, and he’ll also be playing football. But we’re so proud to have Charlie who is a member of the Connecticut Hall of Fame and now the Trinity Hall of Fame here to say hello and give him a good House Chamber welcome. [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Good to see you here, sir. Thank you for coming up. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Any other announcements or introductions? I’m hearing none. Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 183?

CLERK:
On page 60, House Calendar 183, Substitute House Bill No. 5833, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A PILOT PROGRAM FOR THE EXPANSION OF ADVANCED MANUFACTURING CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad, sir, you have the floor.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance 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 Haddad, you have the floor.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the bill title suggests, this is a bill that establishes a program for expansion of our very successful advanced manufacturing certificate programs that currently exist at our community -- many of our community colleges into public high school satellite locations
over time across the state.

Mr. Speaker, I ask--the clerk has an amendment. It’s LCO No. 10177. I would ask that the clerk please call the amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO 10177, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”? CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A”, LCO No. 10177. Offered by Representative Haddad, Representative Rochelle, Representative Turco.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection? I’m hearing no objection. Representative Haddad, you may continue.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a strike-all amendment. It replaces the bill. It does essentially the same thing. There are a few modifications. One is it limits the number of high
schools that can be set up as a satellite location to only one per year. It also adds some relief from the -- for the Board of Regents from some leasing regulations through DAS to expedite the -- the program. And, importantly, it also adds the possibility of having independent colleges who also offer certificate programs in advanced manufacturing the ability of partnering -- participating in a pilot and partnering with public high schools to offer their programming at their high schools. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule “A”. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further? Representative Hall of the 59th, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. HALL (59TH):

I will hold my questions, Mr. Speaker, for the underlying bill.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Thank you. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye. (All) Aye. Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Hall, would you like to comment now?

REP. HALL (59TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the proponent of the bill. Can high schools or colleges do this now?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. And, in fact, there are some examples of very successful collaborations that already exist in the state of Connecticut. One such collaboration happens at Derby High School. I think that there will probably be some folks who have a little bit more intimate
experience with that program that might speak later on this legislation, but that -- in that instance, Housatonic Community College and Derby High School have a collaborative agreement. They offer -- Housatonic has some equipment at Derby High School. They provide high school students the ability to take in their 11th and 12th grades to take what is essentially the 9-month certificate program at the community college over two years at the high school. What -- what that allows those -- the benefit of those high school students is that they graduate from high school with not just a high school diploma but also an advanced manufacturing certificate, and also half the credits required to earn an associate’s degree at Housatonic should they decide to continue their education at Housatonic. The advanced manufacturing certificate program, as you know, both at Housatonic and also we anticipate will be the case with graduates from the Derby program, has 100 percent placement rate of its graduates, and those jobs earn up to $60,000 dollars. We often talk in this Chamber about how successful this
program is. This offers us a way to partner with other educational institutions -- high schools in Connecticut -- to expand the opportunity of -- of enrolling in these certificate programs across the state, and to do it in an affordable manner, and I think that the value of this legislation is to set as a goal that we should continue to use this example across the state, and expand the program as much as we can.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Hall.

REP. HALL (59TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And, you -- can you please talk a little bit about the criteria that the board is going to use to select these high schools?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker. The criteria
are outlined in the legislation. It starts I believe in line 12 and continues on. They will be looking for partners -- high school partners in areas where there’s a need for workforce that needs to be trained in advanced manufacturing. The bill also specifies additional criteria including ideally looking at places where there are economically distressed municipalities where residents don’t have access to a current advanced manufacturing program, and whether obviously sufficient space in the local public high school to -- to accommodate the program.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Hall.

REP. HALL (59TH):

Thank you. A few more questions through you, Mr. Speaker. The actual pilot program itself; will this be a mandate to any of our municipalities and high schools?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.
REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No. This is voluntary on the part of local high schools if they decide to apply for the program. They would --

their applications would be judged using the criteria we just talked about. The Board of Regents would select the best candidate and work to achieve an agreement with one of them per year.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Hall.

REP. HALL (59TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, through you. Can you talk a little bit about the fiscal note and where the funds for this program will be looked for?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker. The -- the fiscal note in fiscal year ’20 is none. After that, it really depends on the agreement that can be struck between the Board of Regents, which is a
state agency and would carry some cost, and the local municipality or -- or high schools that’s elected. You know, obviously, there is a cost of providing these programs, and -- and what happened as I understand it in Derby is that those costs were divided between the local school district and the Board of Regents. Eventually, that agreement led to Derby paying essentially tuition for the students that are enrolled in the program and Housatonic provides the staff and the equipment. And, so it has worked to the mutual benefit of both the Board of Regents institution through Housatonic whose staff gets to have some of their staff costs be shared and paid for by the local school district, and the local school district gets the benefit of providing a program to their students.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Hall.

REP. HALL (59TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Can you talk a little bit -- you talked a little bit at the very
beginning? The good Representative spoke about the credits. Who and -- who will earn these credits? Will they be high school credits? Will they be college credits? Or will they be a combination of both?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Pending the memorandum of understanding but what has happened in the instance that I’ve been talking about with Housatonic and Derby, the students earned both high school credits and college credits, and those credits are applied towards the certificate program, and with the aim of having the certificate program be completed by the time they graduate high school.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Hall.

REP. HALL (59TH):

And, through you, Mr. Speaker. Will this be
for state colleges only or will there be some private colleges that are willing to participate in this program?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Yes, through you. Up until late last night, this was just public colleges, but some of our private institutions were very interested in participating. They operate at advanced cert, and you know, Goodwin College in particular, and operates in advanced manufacturing certificate program. They actually have a mobile classroom, which is another way that we can lower the cost of providing the instruction at a local high school if that local van were available, and it might be available for part of the -- of the time to help lower the cost of the capital expenditure that’s required, making sure that there’s equipment available for the students to train on, but this would allow the Board of Regents when appropriate to
partner with Goodwin College to provide the same benefits as a community college to a local high school if -- if that’s what seems to make the most amount of sense.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Hall.

REP. HALL (59TH):

And, through you, Mr. Speaker. When would this -- this program be able to start according to the amendment?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Yes, through you. Ideally, this would start in the fall semester of 2020, but that does depend on us finding the correct partners and executing a memorandum of understanding.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Hall.
REP. HALL (59TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of quick comments, through you. We -- actually, this did come out of committee unanimously. It -- it’s a really a great concept for those who aren’t traditional learners and want to take a different path than a four-year degree, so it was -- we heard quite a bit of testimony on this throughout the -- the hearing, and I fully support it. We are blessed to actually have a program very close to our high school through as Naugatuck, which is the gold star standard for advanced manufacturing in my area, and they do partner with all our local high schools in the area, so we are fortunate to have them there, but I know parts of the state aren’t quite so fortunate. So, this program will be a real wonderful avenue for these students to be able to have the exposure to these advanced manufacturing programs that graduate 97 percent of their students that are employed right out of the -- of the graduation door. So, I stand in support of this, and encourage the -- the rest of the -- my
associates to support as well.

    Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Thank you, Representative. Representative Wood of the 141st, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too sit on the Higher Ed Committee, and was very interested to hear this legislation. I do have a quick question to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

    Which of the fields that are currently being taught in these community college programs that are offering the advanced manufacturing?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

    I’m sorry. I couldn’t quite hear all of that question. If she could repeat the question, I’d be happy to answer it.
REP. WOOD (141ST):

What are the advanced --

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Could you please repeat the question, Representative Wood?

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. What are the advanced manufacturing fields?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. You know, there are eight different community colleges that currently offer an advanced manufacturing certificate. I -- to the best of my knowledge -- many of those programs are tailored to meet the specific needs of area -- of area -- of employers. I -- I have some of the criteria for the one that’s run through Housatonic that we’ve been talking today -- about today, and -- and the instruction that those students receive are in areas of blueprint reading, introduction to machine technology, and those sorts
of things -- C&C operations, and so really the -- the program is designed to help meet the needs of area employers and can -- there’s some latitude given to the different communities to tailor a program that would work best for their students.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Wood.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Thank you for that answer. Norwalk High School has a program called Norwalk Early College Academy, which does -- it’s not manufacturing, but it is skill based and it offers two years. You get four years of high school and a two-year community college degree from Norwalk Community College with job skills, and I think it’s a tremendous program, and I applaud the Representative Rochelle for bringing this forward to the committee. It did pass unanimously. I think it makes tremendous sense to be able to offer a four-year education -- high school education and two years of college and a specific training for a field in which you can get a job, so I support this, and I encourage the Chamber
to do it, and again, thank you to Representative Rochelle for this.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Klarides-Ditria of the 105th, ma’am, you have the floor. Okay. We will move on to Representative Cheeseman of the 37th, ma’am.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And, it’s a pleasure for me to hear about Higher Ed bills because I miss you guys. I’ve -- I served last term. Anyway, I want to echo the remarks of the Chairman and the Ranking Member. I think these advanced manufacturing programs are wonderful, and as I so often tell the Chamber in my part of the state and the speaker’s part of the state, we have what I believe is the gold standard in terms of producing that manufacturing pipeline in our Eastern workforce investment board, currently partnering with Norwich Academy, and a number of other high schools in Eastern Connecticut to provide these
advanced manufacturing skills to increasing numbers of young people, and I will add in addition to the state and federal funding they get they were successful in receiving private foundation funding from the Golecki Family Foundation. The understanding was they would add three high schools every year to the program. They’re now up to 16 high schools that want to be involved after two years, so again, I thank the members of the Higher Ed Committee for introducing this as we know these are fabulous careers for young people that don’t require huge amounts of college debt, and provide amazing opportunity. So, kudos to the committee, and I urge my member and my -- everyone in the Chamber to support the bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative MacLachlan of the 35th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few comments on the bill. I want to commend the good Chairman, the
good Ranking Member for his efforts on -- on this important piece of legislation, and you know, I think we’ve -- we’ve spoken a lot about in this Chamber flipping the narrative on Higher Education, and the insistence that we tell, you know, young people that in order to success they have to invest in a four-year traditional college degree, which often times leads to somewhat close to a mortgage worth of student debt, and today is a great step forward to make us just a small transition in that narrative where we’re encouraging young people to instead focus on acquiring skills and skill sets that will allow them to buy a home, start a family, and -- and live the life that we actually promised them without walking into, you know, the trap of crushing student loan debt.

In my neck of the woods, we have some of the state’s and some of the country’s most important manufacturers. Representative Cheeseman spoke of Electric Boat supported by the Connecticut Workforce Investment Board, doing incredible work to encourage young people to fill the gaps that our economy is
experiencing right now in high tech manufacturing.

So, I want to just thank the -- the committee and this Chamber for its work on this legislation, and I will be happy to support this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Doucette of the 13th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too rise in strong support of this bill, and thank Representative Rochelle for -- for bringing it forward, and for the committee for considering it. And, it's great to hear the stories from around the state. I visited a job fair at Manchester Community College a couple of weeks ago. There were 22 employers, I believe. They had about 300 job openings cumulatively. I heard from the director of their program there about how they like to work collaboratively with Manchester High School, and would like to -- like to bring in more students. I know Goodwin College is doing it locally as well here across the river.
It’s frankly I think -- and I believe we had more pilots in this bill when it came into and was reported out of our committee, and now, it’s only one. So, it’s a shame we can’t do more of this. This is the type of targeted investment in workforce development that we need in the state. We need to be doing more of this, and hopefully, we will in the future with the success of this pilot. So, again, strongly supporting this, and encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative O’Neill of the 69th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, a few questions to the Chair of the Higher Education Committee?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Pleases proceed, sir.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you. I heard earlier that there was a
change from the beginning of this bill that related to the involvement of institutions other than public ones at the Higher Education level, and I notice that there’s a reference to qualifying independent institutions of Higher Education, so I guess my first question is -- is that what was referenced -- these independent institutions of Higher Education in terms of newly found interest in this program?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the answer is yes. Could you -- I couldn’t quite hear all of the question. I think he was asking about whether or not we were allowing independent institutions of higher education to collaborate where appropriate, and the answer is yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative O’Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The gist of my
question actually was really more focused on is the addition of independent institutions of higher education something new with the amendment that was adopted?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

And, the next question I have is there’s -- there’s no definition or reference to a statutory definition of what is an independent institution of higher education; and so if I could ask, what is the intent or what is the meaning as the Chair understands it of that phrase as used in this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The -- the bill references independent institutions of higher
education as defined in section 10a-173 of the general statutes, but I think that maybe a more appropriate answer would be that it’s further qualified by saying that offers in advanced manufacturing certificate program and -- and currently the net effect of those two provisions together I believe that -- that participation would be limited to just one of our independent colleges in Connecticut, only one operates in advanced manufacturing certificate program, and that would be Goodwin College in East Hartford.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative O’Neill.

REP. O’NEILL (69TH):

Excuse me. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, the -- the -- and I apologize for missing the statutory reference, but is a qualifying independent institution of Higher Education, does that include for-profit organizations?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I’d have to check section 10a-173. I don’t recall exactly, but I can tell you that I don’t believe that there are any for-profit institutions in Connecticut that operate on advanced manufacturing certificate program.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative O’Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I’m pretty sure if I recollect that Goodwin College while at one time it was a for-profit has switched back to be non-profit structure. It has been now for a number of years. What is the -- it talks about a partnership between the regional or other local school district and the advanced manufacturing program institution. What are the parameters? What does that partnership consist of? What would be -- what would be the -- the things that the -- the regional school -- we’ll start with the regional
school district. What would they be providing to make this partnership happen? We’ll start with that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The -- in the broadest parameters, I think what we’re talking about is space at the high school to house the equipment necessary to train the students. In the case of Housatonic and Derby collaboration, that equipment is owned by Housatonic Community College. It’s housed at Derby High School. Additionally, the agreement needs to outline the number of students that might take -- participate in the program and how the staffing cost for the participation might be divided between the two institutions, and I’m trying to think -- there is some capital costs initially to finding the equipment necessary, and so I think that the -- the -- the arrangement in total would have to also find the necessary resources to purchase the
equipment, if necessary. The bill also contemplates a public/private partnership so that there might be an area manufacturer who might be willing to donate some equipment to the -- to the project making it a real community collaboration to try to add the certificate program to the local high school that would benefit the local community as a whole.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative O’Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, just -- and the other side of the equation for the partnership being the college; is there a sense of -- we’ll put it this way. The one that currently exists -- I guess that’s being used -- is the model of Housatonic and Derby. If -- what is it that Housatonic provides to Derby? I understand there was equipment that’s housed at Derby. Is there anything else that Housatonic provides as part of this?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. There may be others who can speak more with more knowledge than I do. My understanding is that in this case the instructors come from Housatonic Community College, and the cost is picked up by Derby High School for those instructors, but additionally, the site can be used in the evening by Housatonic Community College. Again, that’s outlined in the memorandum of understanding. In fact, this bill would require that these sites be allowed -- that it would allow the community college to run its advanced manufacturing certificate program at the satellite site for non-high school students, but for regular members of the general public who wish to enroll in the program, and pay the regular tuition to the college.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative O’Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, the -- the arrangement that has been cited a few times -- the Housatonic/Derby arrangement. It sounds like there is a memorandum of understanding, some sort of a fairly detailed agreement that exists between the two facilities -- two institutions. Is it -- is it the intention that that should serve as a kind of template or model when the Board of Regents is creating the program to allow for the school districts and the colleges to create these partnerships?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think what we heard in public testimony and that members of this body can attest to is that that program works very well, and I think it is an excellent model. This bill wouldn’t restrict the arrangement to the strict terms of that model if -- if a different community and a different college can come to an arrangement
that they feel would be mutually beneficial, but certainly, that program is served as the inspiration for this legislation. It has worked quite well, and I think it -- it -- it will be of great benefit to members of the community. I think it serves as a very good model moving forward.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. The Chamber will stand at ease. [Pause].

Representative O’Neill. The Chamber will come back to order. Representative O’Neill.

REP. O’NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I -- what I think may be my final question, although I always hesitate to characterize the question as a final one. Is the -- the program that the Board of Regents is ordered to create -- is it the -- the model agreement or is it a set of standards to be met? What is it that the Board of Regents is expected to produce to make available in order to facilitate these partnerships?

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

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The advanced manufacturing certificate program is one that has been run by eight different community colleges and is very successful. I think that this bill seeks to expand that programming and partnering with high schools is a way that we can do that in -- in a way that I think might add satellite locations that will give greater accessibility to students around the state. What this -- what the pilot program requires is that the -- you know, at this very essence is that the Board of Regents will look for partners in public high schools to see if they can arrange -- come to an agreement from a memorandum of understanding regarding the model that would be best used in their community. I think that the example we have given is a very good one, and all accounts say that it has worked well, and certainly, one that I think the Board of Regents is interested in duplicating and replicating around the state, but
the -- but the -- the bill before us really just sets up a process and really a goal or an expectation that the Board of Regents will seek a partner, in this case, one per year for the foreseeable future to -- to -- to seek a collaborative arrangement with, and that that collaborative arrangement would be up to the Board of Regents and the local school system within the confines of saying that they’re going to provide an advanced manufacturing certificate, but the parameters are left to the parties to agree to.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative O’Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess maybe -- and I’m glad I didn’t denominate it as my last question. And, is there anything that the region -- rather Board of Regents is going to do that is -- would -- would limit or restrict districts that want to do this? Right now, there seems to be nothing sort of official. This is an ad hoc thing that was
done it sounds like by a community college and a public-school system, and they did this all by themselves without any help from the Board of Regents it sounds like. Is the idea that the Board of Regents is gonna just encourage people to do these things or send out emails or something like that saying, hey, this is an idea you might want to try? Because I’m a little not clear as to what the Board of Regents -- what the deliverable is so to speak from the Board of Regents, so I’m just wondering what that would look like?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The Board of Regents obviously has the staff and the expertise necessary to provide this instruction to high schools. High schools wouldn’t be able to replicate the construction of a new program without incurring a pretty great expense, and so I think that the expertise or the deliverable is that they would
bring that staff and the capability of offering the actual instruction to students, and what they benefit from that -- the community college would benefit from that because they get to use the site in the evening to -- to -- to expand the program and provide that instruction to non-high school students. The benefit to the school is that at an affordable price they can offer that instruction to their own students in their school system, and that works to the benefit of the high school students as well.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative O’Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no further questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Ackert of the 8th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple
questions to the proponent?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please proceed.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I appreciate the dialogue that’s been -- that’s taken place. So, would the good chair -- you know, I believe the legislation that was a committee bill and a Higher Ed joint -- jointly approved legislation had up to eight in the original legislation, and why was the -- and it’s up to eight. It didn’t say it had to do eight. It was up to eight. I think it passed probably unanimously out of the committee because we believe this is a good piece of legislation. Why the what I would seem to be kind of a pretty strong pullback down to one per year?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think that
we’re trying to do this within the resources that are available to the system. There’s certainly a cost to the system of they agree to expand the program, and that all of the costs are not covered by the local school district, but we’ve also heard additionally from the system itself that they think that a pace of one per year is what they can reasonably accommodate given their current resources, and so we wanted to provide some assurances to members of this Chamber [Laughing] that the fiscal note wasn’t gonna get too out of hand, that it was gonna be affordable to -- to the system and to -- could be reasonably fit inside our budget. And, after consulting with members -- folks from the Board of Regents, we agreed that one per year was the appropriate goal.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

   Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the good gentleman for his answer. Do we know how many individuals have -- are in the Derby program now and
how many people -- how many jobs that are, you know, essentially gonna potentially come out of that program?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. I’m told that in Derby that number is 25 students.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I appreciate the good gentleman’s answers, and -- and I think that -- and I get the number. I get the dollar thing, and I think the individuals did -- the good Chair’s response on that end, but we’re talking about job creation again, we’re talking about job creation. Of course, I know we all struggle on the dollar end of it, and I know that the good Representative from the 13th District had mentioned that -- his conversation sounded like my same conversations that
there’s a need -- just the ones that he talked to for 300 advanced manufacturing jobs just in the folks that he talked to, and we had the opportunity -- Connecticut -- Connecticut jobs essentially that were here -- Connecticut businesses that were just here, we talked to some of the top businesses that are here -- the UTCs, and then what’s your biggest struggle, and the number one thing was man -- people power, right, well-trained people power, right. Men and women in the advanced manufacturing area. That’s our number one problem, and it looks like we’ve done a pilot to me in Derby. It sounds like it’s a good program, and I -- so I don’t -- I think that we’ve gotta find a way to use our resources better that are out there, and maybe that bill that we passed earlier on giving out you know some dollars for people that come up with good ideas. We have some great high school technical schools, great high school technical schools that close at 2 o’clock in the afternoon, and used to be open at nights for -- for folks, and we could do advanced manufacturing there.
So, I really think that we need to look beyond just some of these -- limited -- I get it. It’s a dollar thing, but I think that the payoff would be great as we expand this, but I thank the good gentleman and look forward to supporting this legislation, again.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Klarides-Ditria of the 105th, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. Klarides-Ditria (105TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few comments on the bill as amended?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please proceed.

REP. Klarides-Ditria (105TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Recently, I was able to tour the advanced manufacturing program at Derby High School with my sister, and as we know, one size does not fit all as far as kids in high school going on to college, so this program does afford kids the opportunity to explore advanced manufacturing, and
Connecticut does have a huge need for a workforce trained in advanced manufacturing, and Derby’s program has been incredibly successful, so this bill gives us the opportunity to now expand that to other towns on a yearly basis in the state of Connecticut, but more schools when they become part of this program they’re gonna fill that void that we have for advanced manufacturing jobs. As we’ve heard with many representatives before me, we have a huge need for advanced manufacturing, so I encourage all my fellow Representatives in this Chamber to support this bill. It’s a good bill, and it ought to pass.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Rochelle of the 104th, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. ROCHELLE (104TH):

I rise in strong support of this bill, and want to thank everyone who also rose in support of this bill. I come from and represent Derby along with -- along with House Minority Leader Klarides, and Representative Klarides-Ditria, so we know this
program firsthand.

About a year and a half ago in early 2018, I toured the Housatonic Community College advanced manufacturing certificate program, and I want to share with some of my colleagues a little bit about the program. So, we have 12,000 open manufacturing jobs in the state of Connecticut right now as we speak. The jobs are there, we don’t have the manpower to fill them, and that gap is because we have not trained enough folks for these jobs. We have an opportunity today to do something to authentically move towards getting people who want these good paying jobs into these good jobs. These jobs start between $15 and $30 dollars an hour, so this is good middle-class jobs, and this is the ground level of pay. So, folks that go through this program can go through this program, get their certificate, start in these good paying jobs, and then save up towards their associates or go back for their four-year degree in a field that desperately needs workers. We know that manufacturing is the third largest growing sector in the state of
Connecticut right now. It’s growing at a rate of six percent. We have also heard that if we could just grow our economy by three percent we could be out of this debt crisis, and we could all stop squabbling about money. So, it would be a wonderful thing to feed manufacturing and get these folks into these good jobs and do something that really has benefit for everyone, you know, in all of our communities. I’m excited to have been able to learn about this so early on. I’m excited to have it seen it come to fruition. We just ribbon cut last month in Derby, and I know that while we have 25 students in the program now, we’re already -- our superintendent is talking to our surrounding schools and -- and working on agreements with them to have their students brought in too, so this is a school within a school. This can become, you know, a model where we’re bringing the best and the brightest who want the most from all the surrounding schools together, getting them these jobs, and really supporting an economy that -- that -- that wants our support and wants our -- our workforce, so thank you
everyone that’s showing support today, and I look forward to seeing this go forward.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. The Chamber will stand at ease. [Pause].

The Chamber will come back to order.

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is good legislation, and as the bipartisan group of folks who have spoke before me so far have attested to, I think there seems to be some enthusiasm for this. After we started the debate of this, my -- our LCO attorney correctly pointed out that there’s a small drafting error in the amendment “A” that we adopted, and so as a result, just to correct that, I’d like to ask the clerk to call LCO No. -- LCO No. 10196, and I ask that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO 10196, which
will be designated House Amendment Schedule “B”? 

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “B”, LCO No. 10196. Offered by Representative Haddad, Representative Rochelle, Representative Turco.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection? Is there objection to summarization? If not, Representative Haddad, you may summarize the amendment.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The -- the only change from the under -- from the first amendment that we have already adopted is reference originally in the original amendment this program was referenced a satellite location for the advanced manufacturing center. The new amendment uses the correct terminology, which is that we’re referring to an advanced manufacturing certificate program at a public high school. These changes add a public high school for a satellite location. I move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule “B”. Will you remark on the amendment? Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Hall of the 59th, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. HALL (59TH):

This is a small technical change, and I would support it as a friendly amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just very quickly. I rise in support of the -- both amendments, and I just would like to say there are 22,000 job openings, so -- so this bill is really looking forward. It’s forward thinking and really accommodating our students for our workforce needs
going forward, but I just have one very quick question to the proponent of the bill, if I may?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The Chamber will stand at ease for a second.

[Pause].

The Chamber will come back to order.

Representative McCarty, you had questions for Representative Haddad. Is that where we were?

Representative Haddad.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Yes. I just had one quick question for point of clarification, if I may? I’ll wait a moment. [Laughing].

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please -- please -- please ask your question.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you. Yes, to the Chairman of the Higher Education Committee. Thank you very much. As I was looking through the bill as amended, when you -- when you come to line 71 in the bill, it makes
reference to with the approval of local boards of education, and then it talks about adults for the classes. I just want to be sure I understand is this pilot program also going to include possibly residents and adults in the program?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative, could you hear the question?

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please -- please answer it then.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Yes. [Laughing]. Okay. I will do that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, yes. The advantage to the college is that once they agree on a memorandum of understanding with the local community that a part of the advantage would be use of the facility and the room and the equipment in the evening to offer the same program to area residents. You know, often -- again, we’re looking for satellite locations or public schools that don’t -- aren’t very close to
existing advanced manufacturing programs. We have eight of them around the state, but there are still areas of the state that where local residents don’t have close access to these advanced manufacturing programs, and so in addition to having the equipment and the space being used by high school students during the day, the idea would be that we would -- the schools would agree to allow the college to use this space in the evening to offer its advanced manufacturing certificate program using the space to area residents.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Yes. Thank you very much for that clarification, and then just a final comment. I am very much in favor of this bill, and I’m particularly pleased to see that there was a lot of thought that put into where the need is in this state, and that the program will be designed part of that criteria to look for where the actual need is
in different parts of the state, so I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

    Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All in favor signify by saying aye. (All) aye. Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Klarides of the 114th, ma'am, you have the floor.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, a few questions to the proponent?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Please proceed, ma'am.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you’ve heard tonight, we’re very proud in Derby of the advanced manufacturing program that we have and the collaboration with Housatonic Community College, and...
we would certainly love this to continue throughout the state of Connecticut. Of course, money is an issue in everything we do, but you’ve heard us talk about priorities, and manufacturing certainly is one of them. But if I may, Mr. Speaker, through you; can the proponent discuss the difference between our present college connections program and what this bill would do?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think that this augments the current college connections program. I know that that’s the terminology that the Board of Regents has used to -- to do these collaborations with area high schools to this point, and it not only sets a goal of doing one high school a year, it also as we talked about previously allows for some regulatory relief when the Board of Regents is entering into the lease agreement with the local school system. We report -- it was reported to us that arrangement, that lease agreement which needed
DAS approval took some time. There’s no money exchanging hands in that lease agreement. This is an agreement that’s made really defines the use of the space, the fact that there might be state equipment in the space, and terms that would allow the college to use the space in the evening, and so in this narrow instance of establishing these programs we have provided some relief to the Board of Regents from getting that -- from those regulations that would require DAS approval. They can do that on their own.

And, additionally, you know, this encourages the Board of Regents when there’s an independent college that might be able to provide the service. Frankly, in many instances, that might happen at a reduced cost to the state because a state institution wouldn’t be providing the -- the services to the local high school, but where’s that’s appropriate and where that seems useful about the school system and to the Board of Regents, then a local independent college could also be -- and that would be a change from the current college
connections program.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you -- thank you, Representative.

Representative Klarides.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, through you, I’m -- I’m just looking at some information and the Chairman can certainly clarify that for me if I’m wrong. The Board of Regents pays the upfront cost under the current college connections program for the first year, and then the school district picks up the rest? Is that accurate, Mr. Speaker?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is the current model. I think that the current legislation would provide some latitude to the community colleges. I think that they would -- they would certainly continue that if they had the resources to do it,
they had the resources to do that in the -- in the case as I understand it between Housatonic and Derby. My hope is and my expectation is that they will have the resources to do that on a limited basis, maybe one per year again moving forward, but that would be left to the memorandum of understanding between the public high school and the college that that decision can be made on a case-by-case basis moving forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Klarides.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you just for clarification and legislative intent. The Board of Regents must pick one school system per year to do this, and then that is purely voluntary, so if the Board of Regents basically contracts through the memorandum of understanding with a school district, that is an agreement between both of them, and nobody’s forcing any school district to get into this program if they don’t want to.
Through you, Mr. Speaker, is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. That is absolutely correct. I don’t think it would be appropriate to require this of any public school system, but I think that as you found I think in your area there are schools that are interested in doing this, and where that’s collaboration yields an agreement, I think it’s certainly worthwhile pursuing.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Klarides.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman for his answers. As I said earlier on, this is something that’s -- you know, we’ve been big supporters of manufacturing for many years. We certainly understand the need for it, and we understand that kids need to be trained for it. We
also understand that one size does not fit all as we heard earlier, and everybody should not be going to college, and kids should know their options earlier on so they can make choices in the kind of schools they would like to go to and the options they would like to choose for themselves. I just would caution in regards to the fact that I think DECD has intimated that they don’t know if they’ll even have money to do any of this going forward. The Board of Regents has intimated the same thing, and I will just leave this Chamber with this one note.

You have heard me talk about setting priorities in the state of Connecticut. I think there is nobody in this building that doesn’t agree that manufacturing has always been a huge issue, a huge thing we’ve supported, and a huge driver of our economy in the state of Connecticut, and that has been affected in recent years, and making sure kids have options and making sure we have those programs available. If DECD and/or the Board of Regents ultimately does not have the money to continue these programs, that would be a travesty for this state.
But what I will say is those are things we have to prioritize. Manufacturing and other issues I brought up. So, when we are throwing money down the drain for $10,000-million-dollar toll studies that’s why I get upset about it. That’s what I get annoyed about, and that’s what people out there get annoyed about. I support this bill, and I hope to God that we have money to continue these great programs. But throwing money at things that money should not be thrown at is not the best use of government. It is not the best use of our taxpayer dollars, and is not what taxpayers expect us to do when we stand up here and work for them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I want to thank Representative Haddad, the Chair, and the Ranking Member for their work on this bill, and I’d urge everyone to support it.
Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you. 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 take their seats and the machine will be open? [Bell].

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

CLERK:

House Bill 5833 as amended by House “A” and “B”

Total number Voting 141
Finally, the bill as amended is passed.

(Gavel). The Chamber will stand at ease. [Pause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

(Gavel) Will the Chamber please come back to order? Is there any business on the clerk’s desk?

CLERK:

Yes, Madam Speaker. Business from the Senate. Favorable Report, Substitute Senate Bill No. 164, AN ACT INCLUDING CERTAIN MENTAL OR EMOTIONAL IMPAIRMENTS WITHIN THE DEFINITION OF PERSONAL INJURY UNDER THE WORKER’S COMPENSATION STATUTES, to be tabled for the Calendar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

If there is no objection? So ordered. Tabled for the Calendar. (Gavel) Will the clerk please call Calendar 511?

CLERK:

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

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

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Yep. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the clerk has an amendment. It’s LCO 7546. I would ask the clerk to please call the amendment, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize?
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO 7546, which is designated Senate Amendment “A”?

CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule “A”, LCO No. 7546. Amendment was offered by Senator Cohen, Senator Miner.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? I’m hearing none. Representative Demicco, you have the floor.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, this amendment is fairly a simple one. It is a strike all, so it becomes the bill, and it -- it -- it takes jurisdiction over maple syrup and honey production from the Department of Consumer Protection, and it transfers it over to the Department of Agriculture, and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of
Senate Amendment “A”. Will you remark on the amendment? Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, through you Madam Speaker, just very quickly in regards to the amendment. If the good proponent could please explain the different between the underlying bill and the bill as amended, what some of the differences are and why it was amended and what the specific change was or were?

Through you, Mr. -- excuse me. Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I’ll be happy to. Yeah, so the amendment eliminates the provisions in the underlying bill that transfers from -- from consumer protection to the Department of Agriculture certain enforcement authority over maple syrup that’s prepared and sold on residential farms. It generally subjects maple syrup and honey producers to the Department of Agriculture
oversight.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, just to further clarify more on that issue. So, I understand what the bill does. I understand it’s a strike all. But how is the changes that the -- or the procedure that the good proponent just mentioned -- how is it different than what was originally proposed under the underlying bill?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Sure. Madam -- through you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, so -- so to be more clear, the -- the amendment exempts maple syrup and honey production from the Cottage Food Law here in the state of Connecticut, and also the food manufacturer requirements.
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And so through you, Madam Speaker. Under the underlying bill was maple syrup in the underlying bill and then it was then exempt under the amendment? What I’m asking is the difference not between existing law but the difference between the underlying bill that was passed out of Environment and the amendment that’s here before us. That’s -- that’s what I’m asking. For the change in that, not the change in regards to existing law. I just want to clarify that.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

If I may have a moment, Madam Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The Chamber will stand at ease. [Pause].

The Chamber will come back to order.
Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I -- as I tried to explain previously, and hopefully, this will be a better explanation. The amendment eliminates the -- excuse me. The amendment exempts maple syrup and honey production from the state’s food -- oh boy -- Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Cottage Food Law, and food manufacturing requirements, and it -- it subjects maple syrup and honey producers to the Department of Agriculture oversight.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I understand that. I think it -- and I apologize. There’s a miscommunication here. So, I’m asking for not what the bill does so much as the difference between the amendment because we’re on the amendment and -- and the underlying bill that was passed out of Environment. So, what was passed out of Environment
is now different under this amendment, and -- and how is it different than what was passed out of Environment? Because I think the good proponent is explaining what the amendment does, which is the underlying bill, and so I’m just asking the difference between the bill that was passed out of Environment and the bill that is here before us right now -- the differences. That’s -- that’s what I’m asking, and I apologize. I’m probably not asking the question clear enough, so just through you, Madam Speaker, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

   Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe that the difference that the good gentleman is asking about is in section 2, which refers to residential farms. [Sigh]. [Pause]. Madam Speaker, I would ask if I could -- the -- my good friend the -- the Ranking Member to -- to take a look at section 2, which I believe represents the difference between the two pieces of legislation.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I appreciate the good proponent’s answer, and I do support the amendment, and I support the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I’m just wanting to express that we did hear from a number of bee keepers and maple syrup producers in our district, which is also part of Senator Miner’s district, and this is going to make them feel much more comfortable, and so I am in favor of this amendment and the underlying bill.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative
Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I’m -- I’m going through the differences here between the underlying bill and the amendment, and perhaps I can add a little clarity here. Under the underlying bill, the production of honey and maple syrup removed -- was removed from the definition of Cottage Food Products, but it was not really added anywhere else, and it just said that the Department of Agriculture has responsibility for it. The amendment it appears provides another section where it gives the Department of Agriculture the authority and obligation to regulate maple syrup and honey production, and to license it. So, it’s -- it really seems to be just done in a different way but essentially does the same thing. And, I -- for anybody who was in favor of the underlying bill, I do not believe there’s anything in the amendment that would -- that would cause them any distress.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? I will try your minds. All those in favor of the amendment before us, say aye. (All) Aye. Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. (Gavel). Will you remark further on the bill before us as amended? Will you remark further on the bill before us as amended? If not, staff and guests will you please come to the Well of the House? Will the members take your seats? The machine will be open. [Bell].

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? Oh. Toni. Where’s Toni? Have all members voted? Will members please check the board to determine -- to determine if their vote is properly cast? If all members have voted, the machine is going to be locked. The clerk
is going to take a tally. The clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 233 as amended by Senate “A” in concurrence with the Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>137</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate.

(Gavel). Are there any announcements or introductions? I’m hearing none. We will stand at ease -- the Chamber will stand at ease. [Pause].

The Chamber will come back to order. Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 404?

CLERK:

On page 25, House Calendar 404, Substitute House Bill No. 5145, AN ACT CONCERNING REGIONAL BEHAVIORAL HEALTH ACTION ORGANIZATIONS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Public
Representative Steinberg, esteemed Chairman of the Public Health Committee, you have the floor, sir.

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

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill. You may proceed, Representative Steinberg.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As everyone knows, due to budget shortages, DMHAS had to merge the RACs, the Regional Action Councils, with the Regional Mental Health Boards. We have not created the Regional Behavioral Health Action Organizations of which there are five. This bill establishes these organizations in statute as we need to do. It also
requires DMHAS to study the efficacy of these organizations including evaluation of their services and making related recommendations, which I except we will -- we will take up next session. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Steinberg, do you have anything further to say?

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Good bill. It ought to pass.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative McCarty of the 38th, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just rise to support this bill and to point out that this is a very important piece of legislation to put these regional mental health boards and the RACs combined into the new Regional Behavioral Health Organizations and to secure that these new
organizations are in statute, and if I just may as one quick question to the good Chair of the Public Education Committee?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Not Public Education, but the Public Health Committee. [Laughing]. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, would you please point out that while we are putting this in statute now that there may be ongoing discussions to look at what the actual responsibilities and needs of the organization will be going forward?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Steinberg.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate the question by the Representative. This is why we have to do this bill. We’ve taken two organizations that had tremendous responsibilities and a very important mission to take care of those with mental
health, and we’ve merged them. So, it’s very important that we make sure that they’re effective, and the study is in place to ensure that by this time next year or even earlier we’re in a position to evaluate the efficiency, the efficacy of it. It is our responsibility as a legislature to make sure that people with mental health are taken care of from prevention right through the oversight of the organizations, and I assure you that that study will lead us to further discussion in the coming session in the Public Health Committee.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And, I certainly am reassured by the comments of the Chair, and I’d also like to point out the leadership of the Ranking Member on this issue and thank him for the opportunity to speak on this.

Thank you very much.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

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 members voted? If all members will check the board to make sure their vote is properly cast? The machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. The clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5145

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>137</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those voting Nay 0
Absent not Voting 14

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The bill passes.  (Gavel).  Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 80?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Sanchez, the esteemed Chairman of the Education Committee, sir, you have the floor.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question is passage of the Joint
Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Sanchez, you have the floor.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Mr. Speaker, this bill requires SDE to include the role of consent in sexual relationships in the school, health education component of the department’s healthy and balanced living curriculum framework, which is the state’s recommended health curriculum, by the year -- by January 1, 2020. Currently, the consent is not addressed in the framework, and SDE makes this curriculum available for use by local school districts. This bill also requires the State Board of Education to assist and encourage local and regional boards of education to provide instruction relating to the dangers and health consequences of using electronic nicotine delivery systems and vaper products. This bill adds -- adds this to the existing list of topics that SDE but assist districts with and requires SDE within available appropriations and using available resources and materials.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Will you remark further on the bill before us?

Representative McCarty, of the 38th, ma’am.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the bill in front of us, and I think they’re both two very relevant topics that should be included in our healthy and balanced curriculum that is a guideline for use with the local boards. If I may, just one quick question to the Chairman of Education?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Please proceed, ma’am.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could you just clarify for the Chamber that this is not a mandate on the local school boards, and the second part to the question that there is no fiscal implications on this bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Sanchez.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct. There is not a mandate to the local board of educations, and there is no fiscal note.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative McCarty.

REP. MCCARTY (38TH):

Thank you very much for that explanation, and once again, I think that these are guidelines and they’re in progress now at the State Department of Education, so I am in full support of the bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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 take their seats? The machine will be open. [Bell].

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? Representative from Hamden, have they voted? Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if their vote is properly cast? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked. The clerk will take a tally. I’ve already locked the machine. Representative Rochelle, for what reason do you rise? He’s good? No. For what — you have to tell us what you want. You have to pick up your microphone and speak into it because we’ve already locked the machine. How would you like to vote on the bill, sir?

REP. ROCHELLE (104TH):

I would like to record my vote on the affirmative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, sir.

REP. ROCHELLE (104TH):

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

Okay. The clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 7111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel). Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Fray of the -- Frey -- excuse me -- of the 111th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FREY (111TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it’s my pleasure to introduce several young ladies here joining us today. Two years ago in Ridgefield an organization was started called Ms. President U.S., which is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, community-based initiative dedicated to inspiring and preparing
girls to aim for highest specific leadership positions and know that they can achieve them. So, they meet on a weekly basis from October through March culminating with the election of president -- Ms. President from each community. This year there is a middle school president from Ridgefield, an elementary school president from Ridgefield, one from Hamden, one from Danbury, and -- unfortunately, I know -- right. I thought there was one more. So, Juliette here is the elementary Ms. President USA from Ridgefield, and Representative Godfrey I think would like to introduce and make an introduction from the Danbury one. So, I’d like to yield to Representative Godfrey, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Godfrey, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m pleased to be here with Kylli Macancella [phonetic] who is from Danbury, and one of our honorees today. I am so happy she’s here. I’m so happy they’re all
interested in civics and government and learning about the -- how things work. When you figure it out, would you let us know, please? We’ll know how things work. And, I’m especially happy to be introducing Kylli here today because she and I went to the same elementary school, St. Peters in Danbury. Although, I went a very long time ago. You’re still there now aren’t you? Yeah. Like when you’re grandparents age. [Laughter]. So, I’m very pleased that they’re all here being honored today, and I would ask the House to give them a warm welcome. [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Frey, did you want to say something else?

REP. FREY (111TH):

Yes. Just one last thing. The -- there are about 25 young ladies participating this year, and I think Representative Klarides I think you spoke to the group one time. I know former Lieutenant Governor Wyman did. Many, many elected officials, they made several trips up here. It’s a really
comprehensive program, and it’s very, very interesting to have spent but three or four times this past year visiting with the group. We do have a winner from Hamden, and I’d like to yield to Representative Elliot for introduction over there as well.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Elliot, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ELLIOT (88TH):

Oh, there we got. So, I rise for the purpose of introduction. I stand here with the Sheths and Gopika Sheth, and they are fortunately here with me today on the date where I’m dressed most appropriately [Laughter], and in the few minutes that we got to talk, Gopika was telling me a little bit about what she did to earn this award, and she gave a speech talking about the importance of public transportation, and basically, everything that I could possibly tell her she had already told me by the time I was done talking with her. So, thank you so much for being here. Congratulations.
Thank you. [Applause].

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, and again, congratulations to you all. Representative Abercrombie of the 83rd, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, just a friendly reminder tomorrow is dress-down day. I know most of you have already contributed. If you haven’t, please see my good colleague, Lezlye Zupkus, or myself, and just guys a friendly reminder I’m not your momma. I’m not trying to tell you what to do [Laughter], but dress appropriately. You know, we are on tv. We are elected officials. I know I probably shouldn’t have to tell you that, but obviously, I do. So, thank you everyone. [Applause] [Cheering].

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

I’m glad you said it, Representative. [Laughter]. Representative Mastrofrancesco, ma’am, you have the floor. You don’t have the floor then. Okay. Any other announcements or introductions? If
not, will the clerk please call Calendar No. 70?

CLERK:

On page 4, Calendar 70, House Bill No. 5355, AN ACT CONCERNING VOTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ESTABLISHING A SPECIAL TAXING DISTRICT TO MAINTAIN WATER QUALITY IN A LAKE. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Planning and Development.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey -- or is it McCarthy? Has the floor.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Question before the Chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative McCarthy Vahey, you have the floor.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill makes it easier to create a special taxing district
to maintain water quality in the lake by a simple majority as opposed to a two-thirds majority as required under current law, and Mr. Speaker, the clerk is in possession of an amendment LCO No. 7633. I would ask that the clerk please call the amendment, and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO 7633, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “A”?

CLERK:

LCO NO. 7633, designated House Amendment Schedule “A”, and offered by Representative Zawistowski, Hayes, and McCarthy Vahey.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this
amendment simply clarifies that those eligible to vote -- a voter within the district would be an owner of real property located in such a proposed district. And, I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule “A”. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Zawistowski of the 61st, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. President. I do support the amendment. I will just hold my remarks for the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying aye. (All) aye. Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill before us as amended? Will you remark further on the bill before us as amended?
Representative Zawistowski of the 61st, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is not a mandate. It was unanimous in committee. It’s a good bill, and it ought to pass.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill before us as amended? Will you remark further? If not, will guests -- will -- excuse me. Will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Will the members take their seats? The machine will be opened. [Bell].

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 members from Stamford voted? [Laughter]. Have all members from
East Haven voted? [Laughter]. Again, have all members from Stamford voted? Again. Members from Essex? If all members have voted, will you please check the board to ensure that your vote is properly cast? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked. The clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5355 as amended by House “A”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>136</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The bill as amended passes. (Gavel). Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 266?

CLERK:

On page 16, Calendar 266, House Bill No. 7097, AN ACT CONCERNING IMPROVED PUBLIC ACCESS TO CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS FILED WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE STATE. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing
Representative Blumenthal, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance 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 Blumenthal, you have the floor.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill directs the Secretary of the State’s Office to make improvements to its concord commercial records database so that a member of the public who looks to ascertain the name or address of a business entity’s agent for service of process may do so by entering the name of the owner, office, or agent of the business entity into that concord database. This bill will improve
transparency, and I urge Chamber’s support.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill as we said. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further? Representative Rebimbas of the 70th, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the proposal before us. I thank the good Vice-Chairman for his summary. This is a very good also business bill in the sense of easy access to the information that will be necessary to the public for a variety of different reasons. So, I again thank the Secretary of State for her ability in order to update the system and be able to access this information. It’s a very good bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Please proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

    Thank you. Why is this necessary if the
Secretary of State is already doing this?

    Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Representative Blumenthal.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, my
understanding is that the Secretary of the State’s
database does not currently have this capability,
but that they are able to make this happen. This
bill has no fiscal impact.

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Thank you, Representative. Representative
Dubitsky.
REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Member 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 members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if your vote’s properly cast? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, the clerk will take the tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 7097

Total number Voting 138
Necessary for Passage 70
Those voting Yea 138
Those voting Nay 0
Absent not Voting 13

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel). Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 267?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Blumenthal, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill comes to us out of a problem that a resident in Connecticut where thieves are stealing animal fat stored at restaurants and other locations causing problems not only in terms of the valuable -- the value of those animal fats, but also that these scofflaws when they have car accidents and are not storing the fats possibly -- or excuse me -- are not storing them properly cause damage to the roads and drains, etc. It upgrades the penalty for such a theft to a larceny in the fourth degree. I urge passage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Representative Rebimbas of the 70th, ma’am, you have the floor.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the proposal before us. The good Vice-Chairman did an excellent job in summarizing this
proposal. This is certainly an issue and a problem -- this type of theft, and it is a safety concern as highlighted by the good Vice-Chairman, so it is something that was brought to us by the business community and certainly a member of the Representative who did an excellent job advocating for this, so I do rise in its support.

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. [Bell].

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 members voted? Will the members please check the board to
determine if their vote’s 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 7107

Total number Voting 138
Necessary for Passage 70
Those voting Yea 116
Those voting Nay 22
Absent not Voting 13

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The bill passes. (Gavel). Are there any announcements or introductions? Are there any announcements or introductions? I’m hearing none. Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 253?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Verrengia, sir, you have the floor.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Verrengia, you have the floor.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH):

Mr. Speaker, this expands the statutory definition of peace officer to include motor vehicle inspectors and the Department of Motor Vehicles who have received police officer standards and training counsel certification. Mr. Speaker, the clerk is in possession of an amendment LCO 8055. I ask that it be called, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO 8055, which will
be designated House Amendment “A”?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 8055.

Offered by Representative Verrengia.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH):

Mr. Speaker, this is a technical change. It
strikes section 3 in its entirety and renumbers the
remaining sections and internal references
accordingly. I move for adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Question before the Chamber is adoption of
House Amendment Schedule “A”. Will you remark on
the amendment? Will you remark on the amendment?
Representative Verrengia. Representative Sredzinski
of the 112th, sir, do --

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the amendment and encourage my colleagues to support the amendment, and I’ll reserve my comments for the underlying bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying aye. (All) Aye. Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the good Chairman explained, this expands the definition in our statutes to include DMV motor vehicle inspectors. They are post certified. They do carry firearms and have arrest powers. This just basically updates the statutes to include them. This does not change the scope of their duties. I urge my colleagues to
support a good bill. It ought to pass.

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

   Thank you, Representative. Representative Pavalock-D’Amato, ma’am, you have the floor.

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

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

   Excuse me. Could you please clear the way so I can see the Representative as she makes her comments? Thank you.

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

   I know. Even the heels don’t help. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for their hard work, and I as well encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

   Thank you very much. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

   Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the bill before us 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 their seats?
The machine will be open. [Bell].

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if your vote’s properly cast? If all members have voted, the machine is locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Representative Palm didn’t vote. Representative Palm, how do you wish to have your vote cast? Hold on a sec. Representative Palm. Just press your microphone.

REP. PALM (36TH):

I’m sorry for the delay. I’m voting in the affirmative.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The vote is in the affirmative. Thank you. Will the clerk please announce the tally?
CLERK:

House Bill 6276 amended by House “A”

Total number voting 139
Necessary for Passage 70
 Those voting Yea 137
 Those voting Nay 2
 Absent not Voting 12

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The bill as amended is passed. (Gavel). Will the Chamber stand at ease? [Pause].

Will the Chamber come back to order? Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 608?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom, sir, you have the floor.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move
for acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Just to remind you that we have had this bill before us, and we were on Senate Amendment “A” when we PTd the bill, so Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor. If you’d like to recall the amendment?

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the clerk is in possession of amendment LCO 7531, which was previously designated as Senate Amendment Schedule “A”. I ask the clerk please call the amendment, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO 7531, which was designated Senate Amendment Schedule “A”? CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 7531.
Offered by Senator Winfield.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as we began to discuss this morning, this bill makes various changes to certain lines of the underlying bill. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule -- I’m sorry. Senate Amendment Schedule “A”. Will you remark further on the amendment? Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I again rise in opposition to Senate Amendment “A” for all of the reasons that was previously highlighted and debated earlier when Senate Amendment “A” was called regarding this underlying bill. With that said, Mr.
Speaker, then I will reserve further comments for the underlying bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Thank you, Representative. Previously, we determined this would be a roll call vote for this amendment. Will you remark further on the amendment? Representative Dubitsky of the 47th.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, for my clarification, we’re still on House Amendment “A”?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

    Senate Amendment “A”, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

    Senate Amendment “A”. Thank you. All right. In Senate Amendment “A” -- I apologize. There are so -- there are a number of amendments I’m trying to figure out. Okay. In Senate Amendment “A”, we were talking last time about line 2, taking out the words immigration status, and -- from line 35. And, what I was trying to get to was what are the actual ramifications of removing the words immigration status from line 35? And, my understanding from
what the good Chairman indicated was that removing immigration status from that line made it so that would -- the immigration status would be one of the things that local law enforcement would be unable to convey to federal law enforcement under lines 149 through 151. And, because there’s been so much time since our discussion, I just wanted to make sure that I still have that correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As was discussed this morning, the import of this amendment of this line is to remove immigration status as confidential information. I’m not sure I agree with the summarization from the good gentleman. I think we sort of ran it at impasse this morning. Again, immigration status is not confidential information, so it could be shared under certain circumstances.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Understanding that confidential information can be shared under certain circumstances outlined in lines 152 through 158 of the underlying bill, but removing the words immigration status, would that not then remove immigration status from one of the pieces of information that could be disclosed under those conditions?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think disclosure of someone’s immigration status is not subject to the provisions relating to confidential information, and as I indicated this morning, would be subject to other disclosure restrictions. However, as I began to explain this morning, I think actually in most instances where immigration status may be known to a local or state law enforcement agent, that could be
shared in certain circumstances.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I would ask what those circumstances are.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, as indicated, as long as it doesn’t run a foul of lines 115 through 119 and is communicated as part of a custody status or custody release date communication.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think I will reserve my other comments for some of the other amendments as they come out.
And, I thank the Chairman for his -- I thank the Chairman for his time.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

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 come to the Well of the House? Will the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Bell].

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 the members voted? If all the members have voted, please check the board to ensure your vote’s been properly cast. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, the clerk will take a tally. The clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:
House Amendment Senate “A”

Total number Voting 139
Necessary for Adoption 70
Those voting Yea 81
Those voting Nay 58
Absent not Voting 12

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The amendment is adopted. (Gavel). Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Representative Stafstrom of the 129th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the clerk is in possession of another amendment LCO 8756, which was Senate Amendment “K”. I ask that the clerk please call the amendment, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO NO. 8756, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule “B” -- or -- I apologize. Senate Amendment Schedule “K”.

CLERK:
Senate Amendment Schedule “K” LCO No. 8756.
Amendment offered by Senator Looney, Senator Fasano, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? I’m seeing none. Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My -- during the Senate debate on this bill, it’s my understanding that there was discussion and recognition that the term ICE access under the underlying bill originally did not include the ability of law enforcement to put fingerprint data into the automated fingerprint identification system through the NCIS -- NCIC system. We want to make clear that that is still permissible by local and state law enforcement as such the amendment makes that correction. I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption
of the amendment. Will you remark? Representative Rebimbas of the 70th, madam, you have the floor.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Amendment “K”, specifically for that clarification that under no circumstance -- and if I may, Mr. Speaker, through you to the good Chairman just for clarification purposes -- under no circumstances whatsoever is there anything that prevents law enforcement as its been redefined to access or provide fingerprints into the database, is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That’s absolutely correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank the good
Chairman for his clarification, and for that purpose, I support Senate Amendment "A".

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Thank you very much.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

"K".

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

"K".

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

"K".

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):

Yes. Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Ziogas, you are on the board. Is that for the amendment? No? Okay. With that being said, no one remarking further on the amendment, I will try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. (All) Aye. Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment’s adopted. (Gavel). 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. [Bell].
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 the members from East Haven voted? Oh, good. Now, we can get done. Okay. Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Will members please check the board to determine if their vote is properly cast? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take the tally. The clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 992 as amended by Senate “A” and “K” in concurrence with the Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN (139TH):
The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate.

(Gavel). The Chamber will stand at ease.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Chamber come back to order please?
Are there any announcements or introductions?
Announcements or introductions? Representative Borer of the 115th, madam, you have the floor.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a great opportunity for us to thank on behalf of the Veterans Committee everybody who donated to our Save-A-Suit Program today. This is our fourth year, and each year we raise about 700 articles of clothing, and this year we’re very proud that we collected over 2000 articles of clothing. [Applause]. And, a special thanks to Tim Buckley who’s here with me. He is the Vice-President of Max Cure Foundation, and this year we had a special gift in that they donated $2500 dollars of their own funds to contribute towards the cleaning of all the suites for the Veterans, so thank you very much to Max Foundation and to Tim. [Applause].
Thank you very much.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very, very much. That’s greatly appreciated. Any other announcements or introductions? Representative Rojas of the 9th district, you have the floor.

REP. ROJAS (9TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For an announcement?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. ROJAS (9TH):

Just a quick reminder to the Finance, Revenue, and Bonding Committee we will have a meeting tomorrow at 10:30 to take up one referred bill outside the Chamber.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Ritter of the 1st District, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just while we’re all
gathered and slightly paying attention. We’re going to start tomorrow at 11 o’clock in the morning. We’re not done yet for tonight. We’re awaiting an amendment from the Senate, but we’re gonna start tomorrow at 11 o’clock.

Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. The Chamber will stand at ease. [Pause].

The Chamber will come back to order. (Gavel). Representative Ritter of the 1st District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

You never know with this thing, Mr. Speaker. Some days it’s working and some days it’s not.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

You’re not on the board.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

I move to -- we’re good. We’re good. I move to suspend our rules for the immediate consideration of the Senate Bill 1115.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Will the clerk please call -- oh, I apologize. Is there objection to suspension of our rules? Is there objection to the suspension of our rules? I’m seeing none. Our rules are suspended. Will the clerk please call Senate Bill 1115?

CLERK:


SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom of the 129th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee’s Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the clerk
is in possession of an amendment LCO No. 10226. I ask the clerk please call the amendment, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO No. 10226, which will be designated Senate Amendment “A”?

CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule “A” LCO No. 10226. Offered by Senator Winfield, Representative Stafstrom, et al.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? I’m seeing none. Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a strike all amendment. I move adoption, and then I’ll discuss.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative
Rebimbas on the amendment. Oh, I -- hang on.
Representative Stafstrom, on the amendment.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as -- as indicated, this is a strike all amendment of the underlying bill, and this amendment actually relates to the last bill we just took up, which was Senate Bill 9992, the Trust Act. As we discussed this morning, the Trust Act generally prohibits law enforcement from detaining someone solely on the basis of civil immigration detainer. The bill we just adopted closes certain procedural defects that folks have had concerns with since the bill was adopted originally in -- in 2013. It tightens up certain sections of that bill, and is -- I believe -- a step forward for the state of Connecticut.

The bill before us today, the amendment we are currently discussing makes some changes to the bill we just adopted. Rolls back or refines a couple of the things we just did in that underlying bill based on bipartisan discussions between all four caucuses earlier today. Mr. Speaker, let me if I could just
briefly walk through the sections of the amendment and what it does to underlying Senate Bill 9992.

First, section one of the amendment we are discussing redefines the term bail commissioner or intake assessment or referral specialist based on conversations we’ve had with the judicial branch to make sure that that term accurately reflects the job functions of those individuals. Section 2 of the bill, the major change from the underlying bill, is the underlying bill 9992 would have prevented Immigration and Customs Enforcement from having a state or local police department abide by a detainer request unless that detainer request was accompanied by a warrant issued by a judicial officer. What this bill would do is change that and make it clear that in Connecticut the requirement -- hence forth going forward -- will be state and local law enforcement can comply with an ICE detainer request where one of three situations occur.

First situation is where there is a warrant issued by a judicial officer. Mr. Speaker, it’s my understanding from discussions with the judicial
branch and others that a warrant can be obtained within three to four hours. There is always a judge on call on nights and weekends, and the like, and our law enforcement in the state know how they can get a warrant when needed, so that is requirement number one.

Number two makes clear under the bill that we are discussing now that if an individual is -- has previously been convicted of a class A or class B felony they can be held pursuant to a detainer request.

And, third, the underlying bill makes clear that an individual can be held just for the detainer request where they are a possible match to the terrorist screening database or similar database.

Under lines 56 -- sorry, 46 through 51 of the amendment, we make, again, changes to when immigration authorities will be granted access to interview individuals in the custody of Department of Corrections or the judicial branch or some other law enforcement agency. Under the original version of 9992, that would have been a total bar. Under
this bill, we changed that to make clear that immigration authority can be granted access to interview an individual in custody of law enforcement agency where they have previously been convicted of a class A or B serious felony, where they are a possible match on the terrorist screening database or where a court order has been issued.

Mr. Speaker, the final major change that the bill before us makes to the previous bill is there was a reporting requirement that would have required law enforcement agencies to report on a monthly basis to OPM. This bill changes that to -- so that the report only has to be issued every six months. With that, I urge support of the amendment.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Rebimbas of the 70th, madam, you now have the floor. I apologize for before.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not a problem. I appreciate the apologies, but more so, I appreciate
the opportunity to be able to speak on this bill, as well as the bill that was just passed out of the Chamber. I first and foremost want to take the opportunity to thank the good Chairman certainly, and also the Senator Chairman, Senator Winfield, as well as the staff that assisted us in taking the opportunity to sit down. I think the Chairman appropriately identified that this was a bipartisan communication that took place that certainly led to the amendment that we now have before us, and I just want to and I cannot stress enough the importance of the ability to sit down and have dialogues. With that said, the Senate amendment that we have before us is one of which we have at this time I am not able to support because it does fall -- in my humble opinion -- very short to the protections that we previously had that was passed in 2013, but I do want to highlight again what is in the Senate amendment, so for clarification purposes people know exactly what’s before us.

So, through you Mr. Speaker, to the good Chairman. A few questions for clarification if I
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you to the good Chairman. He had indicated that the judicial branch did highlight some changes regarding the definitions of bail commissioners, etc.; is that actually also an expansion of the proposal that -- the definition of law enforcement from the proposals that we had in 2013?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Stafstrom.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. It is. As I had indicated this morning when we were talking about the underlying bill 9992, there -- the 2013 bill did not encompass certain judicial branch employees. One of the things we seek to change in this year’s version of the bill is to include judicial branch employees as well.
Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. I think it’s important to highlight obviously what is taking place here today compared to what we had in 2013, but I’d like to actually go back to what the good Chairman’s description this time of procedural defects, and I believe earlier an explanation when the bill first came up it was described as loopholes. If the good Chairman wouldn’t mind highlighting exactly what the procedural defects that he believes has led to the proposal that’s before us?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think under the 2013 law, the intent of the bill was to prohibit all of those who are state or local employees who work
within the judicial functions or the corrections or police enforcement functions of our state to have limited interactions with Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, and that they would have those interactions only in sort of the exceptional cases. The rationale for that being so that members of the public who may be here undocumented can go and seek help -- seek redress. As I said this morning, someone who maybe is the victim of wage theft who wants to report that or someone who has been the victim of a crime who wants to report that. Trust -- hence the name of the bill -- that they can go and have a communication with either local or state law enforcement without the fear of being turned over to Immigration Enforcement authorities. The -- unfortunately, as I indicated, there was some certain job functions that were not included. I think the most glaring was probation officers, and I shared a story earlier today of an individual in Bridgeport who I’ve come to know who had her husband and another individual who was her father deported when they showed up for their very last probation
appointment, and we seek to extend what currently --
the current bar that would be on a police officer to
a probation officer.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr.
Speaker. So, that we can truly understand whether
or not these are procedural defects or loopholes as
the good Chairman describes, if the good Chairman
could provide us then with the details of this
Bridgeport story that he’s highlighting that
allegedly a husband and father was deported upon
showing up at their last probation appointment.
What exactly was the probation? What exactly were
the convictions that these two individuals faced?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The testimony that
the Judiciary Committee received on this indicated that the individual had been in the country for a lengthy period of time. He had been gainfully employed, was injured in a construction accident. One of the -- one of the biproducts or consequences of the construction accident he was prone to seizures, and unfortunately, had a seizure driving home one day, panicked, caused an accident, fled the scene of the crime, was ultimately picked up for that and was charged with leaving the scene of the crime as he, you know, rightly should have been. He was given two years’ probation. He served out the term of his probation, and when he showed up on the very last probation appointment, Immigration and Customs Enforcement was waiting for him.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, for clarification, was that the husband or the father -- the story you just highlighted?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Both. I’ve come to know the individual’s wife, as well as one of his four daughters.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess for clarification purposes, are we talking about one individual that happens to be a father and a husband or are we talking about two different individuals?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Rep.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I’m referencing one individual.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, thank you for that clarification. So, that one individual you had indicated was involved with a motor vehicle accident and fled the scene of a crime. Was there any injuries or deaths or what exactly was the damage?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Stafstrom.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don’t have that information in front of me.

Representative Rebimbas.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Does the good Chairman know what the exact conviction was to that individual?

Through you.

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don’t know the exact conviction. I believe it was some sort of reckless driving and fleeing the scene of an accident conviction.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Could it be possibly an A or B felony?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Considering the punishment receives was only two years’ probation, I -- I find it doubtful that it would have been an A or B felony.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.
REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but through you, Mr. Speaker. For clarification purposes, does the good Chairman know whether or not it was an A or B felony?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I cannot definitively rule out it was not an A or a B felony, but as I indicated, I do not believe it was.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the reason I inquire on that is because on the proposal that’s before us that was previously described A and B felonies still allows law enforcement as defined by this underlying bill to still detain someone for 48 hours on a civil immigration detainer, so I have
no reason to believe at this time based on the limited facts whether or not this would even make a difference for that individual and their story. So, through you, Mr. Speaker, the good Chairman also indicated victims of crimes being fearful of reporting and wage thefts -- through you, Mr. Speaker, regarding wage thefts, the Department of Labor as well as Worker’s Compensation, there are rights and for protection of individuals who are undocumented; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That’s my understanding.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I know I’ve said this on many occasions in many of our public hearings as well as here in this Chamber. I
think we need to be very careful whenever we perpetuate statements made that victims of any crime, any victim, or of any sort of wage theft, domestic violence, anything whatsoever should hesitate to go to law enforcement and report it. I think sadly when we repeat those statements we are perpetuating the victimization of individuals of not coming forward.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Are there any other procedural defects or loopholes as described by the good Chairman that he would like to highlight that’s brought the proposal before us here today from 2013?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I’ve summarized the underlying bill.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, through you Mr. Speaker, so that we know exactly what we are doing with this proposal compared to what we had -- in 2013 -- and I’m happy to say that I was serving the -- my good district of the 70th District and the residents of Connecticut up here when very carefully and I believe responsibly people from both sides of the aisle determined what they believed to be risk factors that should be taken into consideration when considering requesting law enforcement to detain someone for a mere 48 hours. And, in that regard, one of them was an individual who had been convicted of a felony. Currently, with the underlying proposal, we are further limiting that simply to a felony of A and B, which truly is severe there is no question about it, but I can assure you that C and D so forth, as well as some severe misdemeanors are also horrendous acts that people commit, and if you’re convicted of it, you’ve been found guilty of it.

Now, I could certainly take the time and highlight all the crimes that would fall under that
categories, but I just encourage people do a Google search -- State of Connecticut, felony, C, D, etc., and misdemeanors, and you can see for yourself what in fact we’re doing. In this regard, we’re further limiting only to A and B.

Through you, Mr. Speaker to the good Chairman, is there any reason whatsoever that we are not including other felony convictions other than A and B?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. This -- obviously, the proposal before us was a compromised proposal. I think there are certainly folks who would prefer not even to see this in here, and the reason being is that someone who was charged with a crime can be held for the underlying crime. They -- under our current bail system or retention system -- pretrial detention system. They can be held if the situation warrants it under our existing law for the offense
they have committed. Just become somebody has previously committed a crime some time ago and has paid their debt to society, particularly for a lower level offense, I -- I think it’s the believe of me and -- and I believe many others that -- that somebody should not be subject to being held for up to 48 business hours in a detention center where they have not been afforded the due process protections of law. They’ve not had a judge issue a warrant. They’ve not gone before -- the authorities have not had to state their case on why there’s probably cause to hold that individual, and in fact, we’ve seen instances throughout the country where individuals who are -- might be -- might be in a country legally and might even be U.S. citizens have been held pursuant to executive branch detention requests for 48 hours, maybe over a weekend, maybe away from their families, what have you, mistakenly without due process protections.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe we are a nation of laws that under the Fourth and the Fifth Amendments to the United State Constitution no one in this
country should be held in detention for any longer than absolutely necessary, particularly where due process has not been provided to them.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I’ll try to address all of the points that the good Chairman just gave in his lengthy response, but I find it quite interesting the word such as due process of law and paying debt to society was used in that regard.

Let’s talk about the due process of law. Through you, Mr. Speaker, is the good Chairman saying that a civil immigration detainer in and of itself is without due process of law?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. What I’m saying is I
believe a civil immigration detainer is merely an executive branch request. It has not been issued by the Judicial Branch. There is not necessarily a probable cause standard required for getting one, and it’s my understanding that it -- that there are courts in this country who have determined that holding someone pursuant to a civil immigration detainer alone without a judicial warrant is a violation of an individual’s constitutional right, and it could subject that agency that is holding that individual to civil liability.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you. Then, why are we making an exception for A and B and a terrorist list, and why in 2013 did we have 17 enumerated factors? Have there been any lawsuits filed in the state of Connecticut?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. There -- as I began my introduction of this amendment, the reason we’re making these exceptions is a bipartisan compromise that I thought was struck earlier today, and I’m forgetting the second part of the question.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has there been any lawsuits filed in the state of Connecticut as a result of the 2013 enumerated 7 risk factors?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware that there have been any.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.
REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m not aware of any either, so I’m not quite sure what we’re doing here eliminating 7 risk factors that were responsibly put into law in 2013. The one example we had of testimony of a potential situation we don’t even know if it’s an A and B, and based on every thing the Chairman just said -- “lack of due process of law” -- we shouldn’t even be making any exceptions. As the good Chairman had indicated, that any civil immigration detainer should not be honored under any circumstances whatsoever. This is concerning. There’s been nothing filed to challenge it. If we have issues regarding the civil immigration detainer, then we should be taking it up on the federal level.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. With a civil immigration detainer in fact, couldn’t there have been some type of due process of law already found in conviction for an individual?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If that civil immigration detainer is accompanied by a judicial warrant, which is what this bill would require.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Put aside the judicial warrant because that’s a new requirement, but we have had civil immigration detainers previously. Civil immigration detainers can be placed on a variety of different circumstances of which could be even individuals who have been convicted previously; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom. Can we stand at ease for a moment, please? [Pause].

Come back to order. Representative Rebimbas, ma’am, you had a question?
REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think I’ll move on to the next factor in that regard.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Okay.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

    I think the -- the question stands for itself and the response to that effect. One of the other factors that we had in 2013 was that a civil immigration detainer would be honored by law enforcement, and a person would be detained for 48 hours if there was pending criminal charged in Connecticut where the bond has not been posted. That has been eliminated in this proposal; is that correct?

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. The -- somebody could not be held solely pursuant to a civil immigration detainer; however, if the had
pending criminal charged in the state as I indicated earlier if the had not posted bond or if they were otherwise subject to remand of custody pursuant to our existing bail statutes in the state, then they could remain in custody.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Thinking through the current process that’s being proposed or the new process, if passed, that is being proposed would an immigration official be able to get a judicial warrant based on pending criminal charges in the state of Connecticut of that particular charge in addition to obviously what would have essentially have been the first civil immigration detainer?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. I believe they could. I think if somebody was charged with a deportable offense -- I believe generally they’re referred to as crimes with moral turpitude or some other deportable offense under federal law, then I believe immigration could go and get a judicial warrant to hold somebody past their posting of bond in the state of Connecticut, again, with that judicial warrant signed by the judge.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Just to kind of flush that out a little bit more. If it was a pending criminal charge that did not raise to a level of a felony A or B, would a federal official still have the ability to get a judicial warrant to meet the requirements of this new proposal on a state criminal charge?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, through you. It’s my understanding, and I know the Judiciary Committee had another proposal on this earlier this year that any crime in the state of Connecticut that’s punishable as a class A misdemeanor or higher, so a class A misdemeanor or any felony-type offenses, is classified under federal law as a “crime of moral turpitude” which is a deportable offense. It’s my understanding that Immigration and Customs Enforcement could go get a judicial warrant to detain somebody past their release under our state court system where someone is charged with a crime of moral turpitude.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, just to clarify that because I do believe the good Chairman used the wording of charged opposed to a conviction. Is it
required that it’s simply charges or a conviction?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It’s my understanding it’s simply charges.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I want to thank the good Chairman for that response because, again, there is an ability of an -- for a federal official to exercise a civil immigration detainer and exercise a new requirement here of a judicial warrant based on pending charges that clearly would be a misdemeanor class A or above in that regard. One of the other factors that was enumerated in 2013 was an outstanding arrest warrant in the state of Connecticut.

Again, through you Mr. Speaker, would it still apply that the arrest warrant is for a state
criminal charge of moral turpitude?

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

    Yes, Mr. Speaker, through you. The same standards would apply, and in fact, I sort of see this as a consolidation of -- of the factors in that respect because again if somebody had an outstanding warrant and was picked up on a subsequent offense, they likely have a fairly to appear or something like that, and there were be grounds under state law to hold that person for particular period of time in custody, but if the charge against them is a class A misdemeanor or higher, then it’s my understanding that I could get a judicial warrant and detain the person past whatever period of detention there may be under state law under that exception.

    Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Also, in 2013 -- and I believe rightfully so -- there was a factor there that one of them was identified -- someone that was identified by the Department of Corrections as a known gang member in the National Crime Information Center’s database -- now, if it’s a National Crime Information Center database, I presume by its title that it’s a gang member that has been determined to commit a crime; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I’m not entirely familiar with that database, but that would be my expectation and certainly, again, if the person did have pending charges that would qualify under the discussion we just had -- they could be held. I should also interject that certainly the provisions of this bill do not apply to other federal law enforcement agencies such as the Federal Bureau of
Investigations, so if the FBI was interested in the individual, then they may have their own recourse that is unaffected by this bill.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. So, my understanding is in 2013, if there was a civil immigration detainer and a person’s name, that same individual by which that detainer was taken for, was a known gang member in this database, an immigration official would simply be able to notify law enforcement, ask for a 48-hour hold, and certainly, based on their priorities whether or not it’s someone that then they wanted to go pick up, but under our current proposal, what we are essentially saying is even though the person’s a known gang member entered on the database all because there’s a civil immigration detainer, law enforcement -- or the federal official would not be able to contact law enforcement without a judicial
warrant; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWicz (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That’s correct.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWicz (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

So, even though we know there’s a civil immigration detainer, which obviously was based on some type of violation of immigration law or the person was found deportable or removable, and we know that the individual is a gang member actually on this database, now we have to wait. You can’t act on anything. You have to wait for that gang member who we have actual knowledge, has violated federal immigration laws to act again in a criminal way before we can take action. That’s concerning.

One of the other factors in the 2013 was certainly the federal terrorist screening database, and that’s something that’s being preserved under
the proposal that we have before us here today. So, once again, I want to thank the good Chairman and Senate Chairman for taking the opportunity to accept that request that we had made in that regard. One of the other provision is subject to final deportation or removal order. Now, deportation or removal order would come from an immigration court; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That’s correct.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, if there was a civil immigration detainer placed on an individual who has already been found by an immigration court to be either deportable or removable, that federal official could not without a judicial warrant take action upon an order that’s been entered by the
immigration court; is that correct?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

   Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

   Through you, Mr. Speaker. Local and state law
enforcement in order to, again, hold the person
beyond whatever state pending charges they have for
some period of time they would need to be -- afford
probable cause of due process and a warrant issued
by a judge, and the rationale for this is, again,
the cases of mistaken identity, which have been
documented around the country.

   Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

   Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the good
Chairman confirmed that a judicial warrant is
required. The good Chairman indicated something
about mistaken identity, and if the good Chairman
could elaborate for -- for us exactly what he is
referencing with mistaken identity?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. There was a recent very elaborate report done by the Los Angeles Times based on foible data and other information that publication was able to secure. The documented between 2012 and 2018, there were almost 1500 incidences where U.S. citizens, not just folks who may have been in the United States pursuant to a visa or otherwise documented, but actual U.S. citizens were detained pursuant to civil immigration detainers by -- issued by ICE for periods of time.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you, Mr. Speaker. My apologies. If we could just flush that out a little bit more. I don’t think I’m -- I’m
quite understanding -- 1500, was that nationally or in California?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Nationally.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Okay. ‘Cause I know we were referencing a town in California, and so that’s nationally, and that’s over what period of time? How many years?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Over a six-year period of time, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

And, do we know exactly what happened to the 1500 people? Were they detained for five minutes,
five hours, five days, five months?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe it was longer than five minutes or an hour. I believe these were significant detentions over some period of time.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I want to thank the good Chairman for sharing that information, and certainly, I will never believe that even one minute of mistaken identity is not an inconvenience to someone, especially 1500 over 6 years, but I’ll certainly be highlighting a little bit later about what exactly has taken place nationally, and we have specific stories out of California and New Jersey that it’s not an inconvenience to someone of
mistaken identity but local law enforcement that refused to detain someone on a civil immigration detainer, released them, where they then turned around and committed murder multiple times. So, with all due respect, again, I don’t want to do a mistaken identity or have anyone go through that experience of 1500 people over a period of 6 years nationally because even one death, one murder is one too many for the ability to ignore a civil immigration detainer even where California also is requesting that a judicial warrant be issued. This is very concerning.

One of the other factors, Mr. Speaker, that’s been taken out from the 2013 proposal is unacceptable risks to public safety; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. The fact there was unacceptable risks to public safety as
determined by the individual law enforcement

officer, which again was -- was deemed to be a very

subjective criteria.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, you

know, we did hear testimony in the Judiciary

Committee in this regard, and I can actually even

appreciate that factor number seven regarding

acceptable risks to public safety may be very

subjective, so I think reasonable minds could reach

an agreement that that may have been a factor that

either needed to be addressed or eliminated, but the

fact that we’re here in 2019 eliminating all seven

factors but four, felonies of an A and B and the

terrorist watchlist, I think is a very dangerous

path and action that we’re taking.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. For clarification

regarding the procedures that are being required by

an immigration official currently a person could be
detained for all the factors that have been enumerated and we’ve been going back and forth regarding with this amendment, obviously could secure. How about the interview -- interviewing an individual? What are the provisions before us that makes changes to that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Under the proposal before us, the Immigration and Custom Enforcement agent, a federal immigration authority would be allowed access to interview an individual who is in the custody of a state or local law enforcement agency where the individual, again, has either been convicted of a class A or B felony offense, is identified as a possible match in the federal terrorist screening database, or where the interview is -- is ordered pursuant to a court order.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you, Mr. Speaker. Hypothetically speaking if there is a civil immigration detainer, and law enforcement federal official has direct knowledge that the subject of that detainer is being questioned by local law enforcement for let’s say serial murder, does that immigration official have the ability to participate in that investigation directly with the individual?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How so and where in the proposal does it allow a civil immigration official with a civil immigration detainer to
participate in the let’s say interrogation investigation of a serial murder?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Where the individual either has previously been convicted or where the immigration authority has received court approval.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But in my hypothetical scenario, I didn’t say that the individual was convicted and it’s absent a judicial warrant. Through you Mr. Speaker, under my circumstances of facts, the federal official has a civil immigration detainer and has actual knowledge that an individual is currently being questioned by law enforcement local officials for serial murder, would that federal official be allowed in to also during the
investigation?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

   Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

   Through you, Mr. Speaker. If that federal official is an FBI agent or an Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearm agent or Homeland Security agent or any other type of law enforcement agent other than Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, then yes. They could assuming there was -- they were abiding by whatever due process standards or other requirements made beyond that that is unaffected by this bill.

   Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

   Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did I hear the good Chairman say if they were board or security that they wouldn’t be allowed in?

   Through you, Mr. Speaker.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I said Homeland Security official meaning somebody who was not a -- not defined as an immi -- let me look for the right term in the bill -- was not defined necessarily as an ICE agent but was -- you know, Mr. Speaker, I stand corrected. It would not -- not a -- I should not have included Homeland Security official. What I should have said was an FBI agent or an Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearm National Security. Any of those types of agencies.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the good Chairman for his correction. I want to give him an opportunity. Is there an amendment for Homeland Security?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No. I think it’s included under lines 43 through 44 of the bill. Certainly, if somebody was in -- in the hypothetical that was given, my expectation is if it was a serial murder that was committed across state lines the typical agency at the federal level who would be involved in -- in prosecuting and investigating that crime would be the FBI, and they are not subject to the provisions of this bill.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the good Chairman for his response. I guess that’s not -- it wouldn’t be a friendly amendment at the moment to make that change. With that, Mr. Speaker, what we have in the proposal before us actually prevents enforcement of immigration laws or the security of
borders including ICE and the United States Custom and Border Protection, so this goes beyond ICE. So, for all those folks protecting us at the border, for all those folks trying to keep each and everyone of us safe, also is being excluded from this, not just ICE.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. This proposal will be effective October 1, 2019; is that correct? Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That’s my understanding.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Mr. Speaker, through you. Is there a fiscal note associated with the proposal before us?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. On SB 1115 and this amendment before us, I am not aware that there is.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have concerns that we’re expecting all of the law enforcement as defined in this proposal that is very general, broad, and vast to be able -- if this is passed and signed by the governor -- to be able to actually implement and be trained by October 1, 2019. That’s concerning.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If a local law enforcement official mistakenly detains someone, what is the penalty provision, if any, under this proposal?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. There’s no penalty provision laid out in the bill. I suppose, as I
indicated earlier, someone who is wrongfully detained certainly may have a civil cause of action against the agency who detained that person.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Do we have any similar restrictions that the good Chairman knows that applies to the FBI agents or CIA?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding -- and again, it’s a little -- a little beyond my scope here -- but my understanding is that the CIA is not authorized to conduct investigations inside the United States on those living in the U.S., so I think that is a restriction on them. As for the FBI, it’s my understanding that, you know, as with
any other law enforcement agency there are certain restrictions. Again, back to the issue of due process and the need to get warrants to conduct investigations or -- not to conduct investigations but to conduct searches and seizures or to detain someone. They are certainly subject to the Fourth and the Fifth Amendments of the United States Constitution and the core progeny on those -- on those amendments.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker. Just for clarification purposes. Certainly, the CIA would have the ability to investigate someone who was physically present in the United States whether or not they actually reside in the United States; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to answer that question. I’m not an expert on what authority the CIA has or does not have. I would simply remark that whatever authority they have or don’t have is not affected by the bill before us.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I thank the good Chairman for his responses, and I understand obviously that he is not an expert in that area nor am I, but to that effect specifically, this proposal doesn’t affect those law enforcement officials -- the FBI and other law enforcement officials like we’re doing here for obviously border security and ICE in that regard.

Under the proposal before us, what is the ability for law enforcement to have communications with an ICE official?

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

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I -- if the proponent could point me to the lines of the amendment or the underlying bill she’s referencing? I’m looking for it.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Certainly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I can just give a case scenario. So, an ICE official has a civil immigration detainer, they get notice through the fingerprint database that an individual is being detained by local law enforcement, and so the ICE federal agent makes a phone call to the police station to get more information on the individual. What information is the law enforcement official able to give to that ICE agent?

Through you.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Very little.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My apologies. I don’t think I heard the good Chairman. I think he said very limited, but I don’t want to assume. I want to be clear.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom, could you repeat your answer, please?

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I said very limited. There is a specific prohibition in the underlying bill from state and local law enforcement from providing information regarding custody status or the release date of the individual in question.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, let me just take that step-by-step. So, if I’m an ICE agent and I’m calling the law enforcement official, can you confirm to me the name of the individual that you’re currently holding?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Stafstrom.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Not if that name is requested in conjunction with determining someone’s custody status.

Through you.

Representative Rebimbas.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, a custody status is information that I would need to know in order to determine whether or not I’m gonna go get a judicial warrant in order to ask then the law enforcement official to hold the individual for 48 hours; is
that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, if the individual has -- is not -- I’m not sure I’m understanding the hypothetical, Mr. Speaker. If the question -- if the question is can you confirm the whether someone is in custody or not who you have a judicial warrant for or is on a terrorist watchlist or has a class A or B felony, then yes you can confirm that, but outside of those bounds, you cannot.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I want to thank the good Chairman for his honest response. What I’m attempting to do is point out the proposal that’s being put forth is virtually unworkable. Because in
order for an ICE official with a civil immigration
detainer to determine whether or not they need to go
and get a judicial warrant as required by this new
law, if it’s passed, they are not even being
provided with the bare essential information such as
the name and status of whether or not they’re being
held. This is virtually impossible then to be able
to meet the criteria requirements that are being
proposed in this regard.

So, the scenario we went through earlier
talking about a crime of moral turpitude whether
conviction or being charged, I can’t get the
information, and when I say “I” I’m talking about
the local federal official. When there is examples
of false -- well not false -- but I guess mistaken
identity, I can’t get the information. How am I
going to be able to prevent that? How am I going to
be able to abide by the requirements of this
proposal if I can’t get the information?

It’s very concerning as well for any law
enforcement official who -- who swears to serve and
protect in their professional capacity if they are
not being allowed to appropriately provide information, collaborate with actual law enforcement officials, whether federal in this regard, to be able to appropriately serve and protect. This is concerning, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. There’s a variety of different items that are now being classified as confidential information, and specifically, that would be the status also of a victim of domestic violence or sexual assault; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That’s correct.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

And, why is that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don’t believe that that’s the type of information that should be shared with immigration enforcement officials. If -- as I indicated earlier when bringing out the bill -- if someone goes into the local police department and wants to share with the local police department that they have been a victim of domestic violence or sexual assault, that should be between them and their local police department. That should not be shared with Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Wouldn’t that information be important to determine whether or not a particular crime is of moral turpitude?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, it could be, and that’s why the bill provides an opportunity for the victim to waive the confidentiality and in fact to allow their information to be released to ICE where there isn’t an authorization in writing.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. -- Mrs. Speak -- Madam Speaker. Sorry. [Laughing]. A little switch there. It allows for a waiver of the victim. One of the things that I have heard at least repeated is how victims are fearful of coming forward to law enforcement. My concern is if we’re actually asking a victim to actually have to waive a certain right and knowing that that individual who’s being investigated or detained may turn around and be released is very concerning to that victim. There’s certain parts of this proposal that quite frankly in my humble opinion is very concerning for any victim,
especially a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, or any other victim of any other crime because even if that victim knew currently that there was a civil immigration detainer, that means whatever takes place in the local law enforcement that potentially now Immigration now has the ability to then get them after being held for 48 hours. That no longer is the case because that ICE agent now has to go get a judicial warrant of which they don’t -- they’re not even provided with the information -- the bare essentially as already been indicated by the good Chairman -- that would allow them to go get a proper judicial warrant in that regard. So, this is concerning to me as well.

Now, because we’ve had a few amendments, I’m just going to -- bear with me -- take a few minutes to be able to look and follow along with all of my notes on both -- on both of these matters and all these amendments and the items that we’ve discussed in this regard. In the amendment before us, again, there is no prohibition to an ICE agent to access public databases or public records; is that correct?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That’s correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Is there any type of restriction of an ICE official communicating with a probation officer or - or someone who is being paroled?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes. The definition of law enforcement in the underlying bill is amended to include bail commissioner as we previously discussed and adult probation officers.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Rebimbas.
REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, so through you, Madam Speaker. If we have an individual who’s on probation and has violated probation in some way or a parolee who has violated conditions that have been provide, this is information that then would not be provided to an ICE official unless the ICE official had not only a civil immigration detainer but a judicial warrant; is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes. As I indicated, that individual who commits that act can and should be punished to the full extent available under our state law. What this provision merely does is say in addition to that person’s state law penalties that information will be not shared directly by that state official to ICE if ICE comes into knowledge of that information on their own and that violation is a crime of moral turpitude they
can take appropriate action.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Madam Speaker, I’m going to highlight why that’s concerning once again. This expansion of a definition of what law enforcement is. So, if someone’s in violation of probation, more likely than not, I would hope there would be an outstanding arrest warrant. Under the 2013 factors that we had, that was one of the factors into consideration that that ICE agent with a civil immigration detainer would then be able to ask local law enforcement when that individual’s picked up to detain them. Currently, as this is written, that ICE agent isn’t even provided with that information, so now, they don’t know whether or not this person may potentially -- potentially be violating probation, so in other words, they could still be out there committing crimes, but ICE immigration officer has no idea whether or not they
are, so where we could conceivably have two agencies or multiple agencies collaborating and joining resources and maybe in fact some savings -- because any time we can have the federal government assist our local government that could be a savings in that regard -- we can’t do that. That’s concerning. So, whatever that civil immigration detainer was for whether it was a removal proceeding or deportation proceeding, and let’s say that that was for a serious crime -- human trafficking for example. Now, that ICE agent has no idea if the person simply is disappearing and may be doing all the right things or disappeared and is actually committing crimes, just hasn’t been caught. Because we can’t have the two agencies talking to each other because this proposal specifically prohibits that. It makes it very difficult again for either agency that we have entrusted to protect and serve the residents of the state of Connecticut, and I say residents of the state of Connecticut because this is -- if passed -- law in the state of Connecticut.

Through you, Madam Speaker, are those same
restrictions applied to the Department of Corrections?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Is the question do the same limitations on DOCs ability to comply with a civil immigration detainer outlined in the bill apply to DOC? Yes. They do.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman for that clarification on my question. My apologies if it wasn’t clear, but certainly, the response -- you did eloquently then respond to my question in that regard.

If I may, Madam Speaker, just take a moment or so to review my notes? [Pause].

Through you, Madam Speaker. If there’s a civil immigration detainer based on failure to appear
before an immigration judge and the individual is actually let’s say stopped by law enforcement, detained because they let’s say the motor vehicle is not registered, maybe driving without a license, that immigration official would have to go get a judicial warrant in order to exercise a civil immigration detainer; is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. The answer to that question is yes. I’m not entirely clear whether that hypothetical that isn’t already law pursuant to the 2013 Trust Act, which this body approved, or not, but it seems like it may be.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I’m sorry. I didn’t hear the last word that the good Chairman said.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

I said it may be. I said under the scenario that was just outlined as we sit here today even before this bill that may already be the case.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, are there also restrictions in this proposal, if the good Chairman can highlight, that not only is law enforcement restricted from having communication but they’re also restricted from providing any type of time allocated or resources or transportation of an individual that may be facing a civil immigration detainer; is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That’s correct,
and again, the intent of this proposal is certainly that our state and local authorities should be enforcing state and local law and should be investigating state and local crimes, and immigration enforcement activity should probably be left to the federal government.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, Madam Speaker. Does the good Chairman know whether or not local law enforcement works in conjunction with ICE on a variety of different investigations?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I’m not aware of the specific instances in which they do or they don’t.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

   Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, Madam Speaker. Regarding the use of resources and time for a civil immigration detainer, if an immigration official -- ICE let’s say for example -- was able to obtain a judicial warrant, would local law enforcement then be able to provide their time and resources?

   Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

   Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

   Through you, Madam Speaker. If there was a judicial warrant, then pursuant to -- our line numbers are a little off here, but yes, they would be able to arrest or detain an individual pursuant to a civil immigration detainer where that civil immigration detainer is accompanied by a judicial warrant.

   Through you.
Representative Rebimbas.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I wanted to specifically talk about the resources in time, not whether or not the person could be arrested or detained because that’s my understanding with the judicial warrant, but with the judicial warrant civil immigration detainer, can local law enforcement now allow an ICE official to come in and use facilities and resources if local law enforcement wanted to participate and assist?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

Representative Stafstrom.

Through you, Madam Speaker. Again, what -- what the local or state law enforcement can do is where there’s a judicial warrant they can arrest or detain the individual for a period of up to the 48 hours provided where they can allow an interview to be conducted by ICE. I suppose they could sit in on
that interview to supervise that interview if it was taking place, but those would be what is allowed.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, Madam Speaker, to the good Chairman. If I could just have a moment, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker, to the good Chairman. Does the good Chairman know what other states require a judicial warrant or something similar in addition to the civil immigration detainer?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. My understanding is that the states of California and Illinois have enacted provisions similar to this by statute. It’s also my understanding that there are other states who have taken this action by executive order of
their governor, particularly with respect to, you know, executive branch agencies that report to the governor. It’s my understanding New York is one of those states. There are also other states that have issued directives to law enforcement not to comply with an immigration detainer, which is course is a voluntary request without a judicial warrant for fear of court action. It’s my understanding that Massachusetts is one of those types of states, and there are also some 700 or so cities that have taken similar action.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I’m going to take this opportunity to thank the good Chairman for all of his responses. At least at this time, I believe most of my time now is going to be making comments. Certainly, I’ll reserve the right to make any questions, but certainly, if the good Chairman wants to -- to take a break, I just wanted to highlight
Madam Speaker, what I’ve attempted to do and hopefully, it’s come through is we had a law -- we have currently a law actually, and let me correct that. We currently have a law that was established in 2013 that carefully and responsibly highlighted seven risk factors that in a bipartisan manner we put together in order to -- what I believe and what was believed at that time -- to be something that could protect the citizenry of the State of Connecticut. What we have now is a scrapping of that law completely, but for the amendment that we passed earlier and that we have before us for felony A and B convictions -- convictions, not charged, convictions. So, you’re still restricted providing information to an immigration official if you are being investigated of an A and B serious crime.

And, also if you’re on the terrorist watchlist, then you may exercise the civil immigration detainers. Essentially, what we’re doing sadly is picking and choosing those offenses that may or may not be what we perceive to be more serious. Well,
Madam Speaker, I would offer that to any victim of a crime, any family member of a victim of a crime would say that all of that, all of the felonies, all of the pending charges, all of the open arrest warrants, all of these factors, including risks to public, although I’ll concede that that could be subjective and maybe we would have entertained making a modification or eliminating that. All of those protections now are scrapped.

So, let’s talk a little bit about California. There is a situation that I, again, I mean I’ll share the name. It’s in an article. It was published in March 2019, so clearly, after they passed a request similar to us that these ICE officials in addition to a civil immigration detainer now has to in addition to go get an arrest warrant or judicial warrant as we call it here in the State of Connecticut. This is what has happened -- an individual by the name of Carlos Carranza murdered a 59-year-old individual. The police say he stalked her before stabbing her to death. Carranza was arrested for possession of
methamphetamine and was taken by the San Jose Police for processing, and it wasn’t until actually later in a DNA analysis that they determined this individual. And, finally, those results came back on Monday, several days after, but this individual admitted to being a gang member. Let’s think back to current law that we have in the state of Connecticut that was responsibly passed bipartisan manner in 2013. That was and is a factor that we currently have. That means this individual who admitted to being a gang member under our state of Connecticut current law with a civil immigration detainer could essentially be detained by law enforcement once they were notified by Immigration, but under this proposal, that’s not enough. A judicial warrant is being requested, and similar to California, an arrest warrant was requested. Garcia declined to name the gang he was a part of in that regard, but he admitted he was, and according to him, the suspect was detained by the Department of Homeland Security at the border of Texas and deported in 2013.
So, this person already had -- again, probably the subject of the civil immigration detainer -- an issue that led to the Department of Homeland Security, the same individuals that we are restricting their communication in this very proposal, along with ICE. Our examples have been predominantly on ICE, but this includes specifically the Department of Homeland Security Border Security Patrol. It says that this particular individual, so two years later he was arrested and accused of possession of paraphernalia again, convicted of burglary in San Jose. In 2016, he was arrested on charges of battery of an officer, resisting arrest, and entering and occupying a property. That same year in October, Carranza was arrested in Los Angeles on battery charges.

Long story short, Madam Speaker, he in fact had six separate detainer requests against him via the Immigration Customs Enforcement, but yet, he could not be detained in the state of California.

We also have an individual by the name of Luis Perez who’s accused -- and again, this is an article
in November 2018 -- accused of killing three people in Missouri. Triple murder in Missouri. He was previously jailed and released in New Jersey on domestic violence charges. So, this individual fatally shooting two men and wounded two others on November 1, and fatally shooting a woman the next day. He too was held on domestic violence charges in Middlesex County Jail, and customs, ICE, officials said that they placed a detainer on Perez while he was in custody, but the request was not honored, nor was the agency notified when he was let go. This is concerning, Madam Speaker. Because, again, this is one more example of the restrictions that we are putting on our law enforcement regarding qualified civil immigration detainers.

And, I can go on, and I actually will go on. There’s another situation in California that took place of a random drive-by shooting. The individual was Gustavo Garcia, killed an individual on the random shooting, and again, he was previously deported and was arrested just days before his violent rampage in Tulare County by the Sheriff
there, and the officers were unable to coordinate with U.S. Immigration Customs Enforcement, and yet, he had a history of being removed twice before that. But this again is a tragic example that even they admit that they were unable to properly quickly communicate with ICE to appropriately attain what was necessary because one of his arrests was for a controlled substance, and he only spent 10 hours in custody; yet, it was known that there was a civil immigration detainer, but again, they were barred by legislation in California to act on the civil immigration detainer.

Now, Madam Speaker, these are just a few of the examples specifically of a state that already currently has legislation that mirrors exactly what we’re trying to do here today. Many times we say we should look to other states because what we try to do is we try to emanate, we try to replicate those things that are positive, those things that will benefit the residents of the state of Connecticut. What we’re essentially doing here, Madam Speaker, is we see what’s not working in a different state, and
we’re trying to implement it here in the state of Connecticut. If that’s not enough to scare -- it scares me -- but if that’s not enough to scare people, I don’t know what is because again what we’re doing is taking what we currently have in law that seems to be working. I have yet to hear examples of it not working in the state of Connecticut, and just ignoring it, highlighting -- thankfully, and again, I thank the good Chairman’s for their ability to work in a bipartisan manner and at least carve out the felonies A and B and terrorist watchlist, but it still provides me with some comfort but not enough comfort to say to my local law enforcement officials now you cannot do the job that you swore to do, which is to protect me, protect you, protect our families, protect all individuals in the state of Connecticut no matter what your status is here in the state of Connecticut, whether or not you are a U.S. citizen, whether or not you’re undocumented, whether or not you’re visiting, whether or not you’re just driving through the state of Connecticut. We are tying
their hands, so Madam Speaker, for all of the reasons highlighted, for all of the examples we have already seen of travesty that has occurred in limiting law enforcement’s ability to do their job and the unthinkable loss of life as a result of those incidents, there is no way I could here today, here tomorrow support any proposal such as this one. So, thank you, Madam Speaker, and I strongly encourage that everyone seriously consider what is the status of our laws in the state of Connecticut today. How is that working? What has been the dialogue here today? And, see whether or not it’s worth putting us at risk.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good evening. It’s great to see you up there.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good evening.
REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

I’m not gonna be that long, but I am gonna tell a story. I had a dealing with ICE with a family last summer, and they came to me in tears. They contacted our federal delegation, our Senators -- our two Senators and our congress men and women, and they realized they couldn’t do anything, sent them to a sanctuary church. Onwar [phonetic] came to me -- that’s the husband -- and Semar [phonetic] was going to be sent back to Bangladesh. They came here 21 years ago, but they still -- because of our broken immigration system in Washington at the fault of both parties for 30 years now -- they’re not -- they’re not citizens. [Clearing throat]. So, I said, you know, there’s really not much I could do, but Rosa Delora’s [phonetic] office called me, and they said, well, you can send her to a church in New Haven. I said, they don’t want to do that. They want to stay in this country. Their oldest -- their son -- one son is going to be -- is 19. He’s going to go to Quinnipiac University. So, I got -- I got ICE’s phone number in Hartford. At first, they
wouldn’t talk to me. They said we don’t’ know who you are and we need to check your background, so they checked my background, they checked who I was. They called me back actually. We spoke for quite a long time. I gave them the case number. They said we’ll see what we can do. Give us a call in a couple of days. I called in a couple of days. They said you gotta wait. So, finally, they were good enough to give me Immigration’s number in Virginia, and we had a long discussion -- myself and the gentleman. I don’t remember his name from ICE -- and he told me what to do and what the family to do. They’re not out to throw them out of the country. They’re just following the laws that have been going on since 2002-2003, part of Homeland Security and then ICE.

So, with that, seven weeks went by. We went back and forth. There was a lot of protesting in the state last year. I didn’t go to any protest but what I did was every other day I’d speak to ICE, and the last day when they’re going to be sent back to Bangladesh, I said I knew there was a paperwork
glitch, I went through the whole file, and it’s not purview, it’s none of our purview. That’s our federal delegation’s purview, and they didn’t want to -- honestly, they didn’t think they could do anything. They didn’t get involved. No fault of their own. They just felt it wasn’t -- nothing was going to happen, and it was easier to send them to a church, and they didn’t want to do that because they wanted to live in this country. They want to be citizens, and I hope they do become citizens someday. They called me and they found -- they did found -- I was right. There was an error, and they gave them one year to stay in this country.

So, with that, they’re here now. They have until July 15, 2019, and I’m thankful. I was thankful with ICE. I know they have a job to do and I’m, you know -- my point is I went through their whole history and under president Obama in 2013, when we passed the Trust Act, he really applauded ICE and expanded ICE. They go after child -- child pedophile, human trafficking that we always support here. We support those laws. We try to protect
those men and women, especially children. They supported the Cyber Security Act. They go after terrorist. They’re here to protect our ports -- our airports, our ports, our harbors, our train stations. They are our neighbors. They live in all of our communities. They live in Connecticut. They live all through the whole country. We all want immigration. We all want to protect people, and I’m sympathetic. I talked to you about the housing bill last night. I’m a bleeding heart and I supported that. I support of housing and transitional housing, but also, I support people that try to protect us on a daily basis. They swear an oath. They go after drug traffickers. They -- as much as there’s angst right now, they’re more of our friends, and we should stick with the 2013 Trust Act. They’re not our enemies. They’re here to protect and serve us. They’ve done much more good than anybody could imagine. If you look -- we don’t even know most of the stuff they’ve done, but they’re here to serve and protect us just like our military, just like our state police, just like our
law enforcement here with Capitol Police. And, so I’m sympathetic. I want immigration reform. Shame on federal politicians on both republicans and democrats that we don’t do anything, but the fact is this agency is here for a reason. It started after 2011. They’ve caught many, many terrorist. I could go on and on, but the fact is we need to -- we need to protect our laws. People should be protected, and we want to have legal immigration. People that are here trying to make a living. We want to support that, but we also don’t want to take tools away from the men and women that serve and protect us from -- and I’m not going to bring up all the people that killed one another. That happens, unfortunately, on both sides, but the most -- the -- my point is they’re here to serve and protect us, and I think we have to remember that, so I appreciate the amendment. I cannot support it, and I know we’re in a land of immigration, but we also are a land of laws and respecting the laws and protecting one another, and I would fret if something every happened nationally. We need
Homeland Security. We need -- we need these agencies, and like I said, under president -- I saw it under President Bush and President Obama and now under President Trump, but President Obama really expanded a lot of the things that are happening today to protect us, not to hurt people, and he wants them -- he wanted people to stay here too, but the fact is they do serve and protect us, and I would hope you respect what they do. They’re not our enemies. There our friends, they’re our neighbors, and when we need them, we want them there like a police officer, our state police, or our military.

So, I think that’s pretty much what I have to say, but if you look at the pedophile rings they’ve dismantled, the computer forensic program, the cyber-attacks, attack by Russia. They attacked that just as hardbacked against them, so for that, I just -- I had to say that. I’m thankful that Onwar [phonetic] and Semar [phonetic] were able to stay here, and -- and I’ll fight for them, and I’ll fight for anybody that legally wants to stay here, but the
fact is we can’t take the tools away from the men and women that protect and serve us every day. We don’t see what they do, but they’re protecting us every single day and they want to protect us, and like I said, they are our neighbors. So, I think that’s all I have to say. I want to thank you for my time, and think at least amendment makes it better, but would -- I don’t see why we’re going away from the 2013 Trust Act, and even at that time, President Obama applauded them and expanded the agency.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good evening.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Good evening, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Madam Speaker, a little while ago we heard the Chairman, the proponent of the bill, talk about that
we’re a nation of laws, and you know, I do recognize the U.S. Constitution, the Connecticut Constitutions, documents that we swore to take an oath to, and you know, quite frankly what I think what we’re doing here is in violation of the U.S. Constitution, but that’s perhaps something to be dealt with at a future time. With that, Madam Speaker, I do have some questions for the proponent; if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom, please prepare yourself. Representative Fishbein, please proceed, sir.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you. Taking a helicopter approach to what we’re doing here today, is there something that prevents -- are we preventing our law enforcement from doing something or are we also preventing federal law enforcement from doing something?

Through you, Madam Chair -- Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.
REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Let me break that down a little bit. We -- I want to be very clear as I’ve -- as I said to the good Ranking Member a couple times. We are not preventing federal law enforcement from doing anything under this bill. There is absolutely nothing under this bill that prevents the FBI or any other law enforcement agency from enforcing criminal laws that occur inside the United States by this bill in any way, shape, or form. What we are doing is placing certain restrictions on our state and local law enforcement’s cooperation with -- with federal immigration authorities.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I believe there’s a federal crime similar to what we have in Connecticut having to do with obstruction of justice, and I don’t know if the good Chairman is
aware of that federal crime?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Madam Speaker, I’m aware the crime exists.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

With all due respect, I did not hear the answer.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes. I’m aware of the crime of obstruction of justice exists as it’s been in the news quite a bit recently.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.
REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, if a somebody from ICE called local law enforcement and inquired as to whether or not they had a particular individual who they were looking for in their custody and local law enforcement didn’t answer or perhaps gave the wrong answer, would that not be obstruction of justice under the federal crime statutes?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I do not believe so, but again, I’m -- I’m not an expert in the federal obstruction of justice laws.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, am I to understand that if that communication is made under
this law what is local law enforcement to say to ICE when that call is made and they have that individual in custody?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

I believe I would answer that pursuant to state law I cannot answer that question.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, and let’s just say that did occur and that law enforcement official was arrested for the crime of obstruction of justice under the federal code. Is there some sort of indemnification here in this language?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you, Madam Speaker. It’s not in this particular section, nor does it need to be there as a general indemnification provision already ingrained in our state statutes, and certainly, that individual would be well-acting within the scope of -- of their authority, would be entitled to qualified immunity and indemnification through the Office of the Attorney General.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe that’s for a civil allegation. I don’t believe -- unless the good Chairman could correct me -- that that crime would be obviated by some state law -- the federal crime.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. As indicated, I
don’t believe that that -- it’s not my understanding that would be a federal criminal offense; however, if -- and I suppose an aggressive U.S. attorney or someone decided they were to prosecute that offense, then the Attorney General would have to determine whether the person is entitled to indemnification pursuant to the statute. I’m blanking on the section of the statute -- 2 dash something -- and would determine whether the AG is going to provide a defense to that action.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, just to get fundamentally and -- you know, I -- with all due respect, I haven’t been around for all of these discussions about civil detainers. I do sit on Judic and have a helicopter view, but if the good Chairman could just briefly tell me -- and I don’t even know if that’s possible -- what is a civil detainer?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I would refer the gentleman back to the underlying bill, Senate Bill 990, at lines 10 to 13.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since I don’t have that language readily available, I don’t want to delay the process; if the good Chairman could just read those? I believe it’s three lines.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yeah. through you, Madam Speaker, to summarize. It’s a request from a federal immigration authority, generally ICE, to hold an
individual for up to 48 hours beyond the time in which that individual would otherwise be eligible from release from detention by the state or local law enforcement agency.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, is that civil immigration detainer issued by an investigator or some sort of judge? Who issues that?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. It’s through ICE itself. It’s not signed by a judge. That’s in fact the crux of the issue here.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, as opposed to that detainer, what is an administrative warrant? How is that different from a detainer?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. An administrative warrant is more of a tool to request that somebody appear for a particular proceeding. It -- it’s more of a command to appear at an immigration proceeding as opposed to the detainer, which is when somebody is in custody.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISCHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, an administrative warrant, is that signed off by ICE or an investigator or a judge?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. It’s generally signed by either ICE or Customs and Border Protection.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I’m to understand under this language that should there be a civil immigration detainer or an administrative warrant that there would not be compliance, that’s what we would be having had happened under this language?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe it’s more -- the situation where it’s gonna occur much more prevalently is in the situation of a civil
immigration detainer than an administrative warrant because it’s the situation of where somebody is in custody of a state or local law enforcement agency, so it’d be the detainer that generally is where there is the request to hold someone.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I know Representative Rebimbas was talking a lot about the A and B felony. I don’t know if the good Chairman knows that possession of child pornography, I believe, was a class D felony?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I don’t have the - - I don’t have Chapter 52 of the general statutes in front of me.

Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe it to be a class D felony, and understanding that, why would we have someone who’s been convicted of possession of child pornography not be the subject of this process when we carve out A and B felonies?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Someone who was convicted of child pornography offense some number of years ago, perhaps it was 10, 15, 20 years ago has served their sentence, has not reoffended again, may or may not be subject to our state’s registry requirements. That can be handled through our state system, and that individual should not be subject to an enhanced deportation or detention simply based on that fact that they committed that act some number of years ago and may have paid their debt to
society.

         Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

         Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

         Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I appreciate the answer, but unless I am incorrect here -- maybe the Chairman could point out where the time period is in this language because I read it that the person could have been convicted two years ago of child pornography, not the many, many years that the Chairman is speaking of unless I can be shown differently?

         Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

         Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

         Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes. And, if that individual was convicted two years ago and that was classified as a crime of moral turpitude, which was subject to deportation under federal immigration laws and ICE received a civil immigration detainer
and backed that up with a warrant that gave -- that showed a judge probable cause on why that individual has committed a crime of moral turpitude subject to deportation, then they could be held.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just didn’t see any of those conditions present in the language, but moving on, the court order subject to 8 U.S.C. 1225. I don’t know if the good Chairman’s knowledgeable of that federal statute?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. My understanding from LCO is that’s the federal statute under which ICE would obtain these types of court orders based on their research and knowledge of this law.

Thank you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I did pull up this section, and particularly B, which is carved out here, has to do with inquiries by the immigration officer, and issuing an order. Am I to understand that if that is the case that the order is issued under this particular part of the federal code by the immigration officer that it would not be a reason to detain the individual?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Again, I’m not overly familiar with this statute, so I don’t want to interfere with the plain language of the legislation here, so I will leave it for the intent as if the immigration authority has complied with whatever requirements are set forth in that federal statute, then they could conduct the interview.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I’m just a little puzzled what we’re voting on, and that’s the reason why I asked the question. So, am I to understand that -- ‘cause I don’t see court order in 4b? So, if the good Chairman can explain what exactly that exception is?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. With the capable assistance of the Vice-Chairman, we’ve been able to pull up the statute, and my read of the statute now is that any United State District Court, which of course, we have three here in the state of Connecticut -- one in Bridgeport, one in Hartford, and one in New Haven -- and any of the judges sitting in those courts could issue an order
requiring a person to appear before an immigration officer, and where one of our federal judges in the state has so ordered, then our state and local law enforcement would comply with that order.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I’m looking at -- and this is I believe line 60 -- where there’s a request for notification. It indicates that prior to responding the request has to be forwarded to the law enforcement agency for review of the -- if the Chairman can just explain what -- what the procedure is in parens, [sic]?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. This is clarifying language in this amendment that was requested by our state judicial branch in order to clean up the
process by which notification of release would be communicated to the individual suspected of violating a federal immigration law.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don’t see the judicial branch being any part of this quite frankly. It appears to be a request for notification of the release date and time from custody of a law enforcement agency, so that would be local law enforcement, perhaps the state, and that before that can be responded to, it has to go to the head of that agency for review. I’m just trying to figure out based upon the prior answer where the judicial department gets in there.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. As indicated, I
think this was an internal process by which the judicial branch who would be the recipient of many of these type of requests would -- between the Marshall service -- wanted to follow in order to have these reviews -- these requests reviewed.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Am I to understand -- because the Marshal services -- are we talking about the Federal Marshal Service?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

No, Madam Speaker. We’re talking about our State Marshals who man our courthouses, provide prisoner transport, and monitor the lockups.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.
REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, am I to understand that law enforcement agency is the judicial branch?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. Certain, judicial branch employees qualify under the definition of law enforcement.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I -- I mean it clearly talks about the release date and time from custody of a law enforcement agency, which I’ve never seen that defined as the judicial branch, but I’ll take the good Chairman at his word. Am I to understand that upon that request being made of the judicial branch that it cannot be responded upon
until the head of -- well, you’re saying the judicial branch -- reviews that?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. I point the gentleman back to lines 87 and 88 of the underlying bill, Senate Bill 992, where Judicial Marshals, State Marshals, Bail Commission, and Adult Probation Officer are outlined, and I believe the head of that agency would not be the head of the branch itself necessarily but would be the head of the Judicial Marshals or would be head of the State Marshals or the Adult Probation Office.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, where am I to find the direction to that head as to how to deal with that request?
Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That there would be a training. As indicated earlier, there is a training requirement in the bill, and I believe that would be an internal communication between the branch on how to properly evaluate these requests to determine whether they fit under the criteria enumerated.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Is there particular language in here that directs that to occur -- what the good Representative was just speaking about?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):
Through you, Madam Speaker. I think there’s various places in the bill where that is either expressly stated or -- or can be read into the language of the statute.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, Madam Speaker, we out here try to stay out of trouble, and it appears more and more that we are trying to do things for people that either purposefully -- or mostly purposefully, get themselves into trouble, and our law enforcement is there for a reason. Federal law enforcement is supposed to work hand and glove with local law enforcement. These statutes do not help that situation. I haven’t had one member of law enforcement contact me and say this is a good idea. I deal with law enforcement quite frequently. I don’t know any of them that think this is a good idea. This will make a bad problem even worse, and it’s unfortunate because we’re trying to make the
state better, and this will not do it. So, thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this amendment, and before I state my reasons for supporting this amendment, I just want to make sure that this bill provides protections and addresses some concerns that many of our members have in regards to those individuals that will be arrested. So, madam, through you, a question to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Madam Speaker, through you. Does this bill ensure that anyone that is on the terrorist screening database that are local police can intervene in those instances and retain those individuals until a federal authority comes and
arrives and takes them away?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. It ensures that they can be interviewed, and they can be held pursuant to a civil immigration detainer for up to 48 hours.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

And, through you, Madam Speaker. Anyone who has an A and B felony, would those individuals be detained?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Pursuant to a civil immigration detainer, they could be.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And, I thank the gentleman for those answers. Madam Speaker, you know, I’ve heard the argument back and forth, and I think one of the biggest issues that we have in this country is a broken immigration system. A broken immigration system that really does not address the needs of all the residents of this great nation. I’m not talking about U.S. citizens but all the residents. If we address the immigration reform, we won’t have the issue, and we won’t be debating this bill here today. I heard a lot of Hispanic names being mentioned in this Chamber about the crimes they have committed because those individuals have crossed the border illegally. Let me remind people that there’s more heinous crimes happening in this country not committed by Latinos. When I look at Virginia Tech, 32 victims; Sandy Hook, 26 victims; Majority Stoneman, 17 victims; Santa Fe High, 10
victims, and I could go on and on. And, that’s another issue, but when I look at those faces, they don’t look like Latinos to me. When we look at these families that have crossed the border, they crossed the border for a better life. Other communities have been granted the opportunity to come into this country and find a path to citizenship, but unfortunately, that has not been the case for Latinos. And, yeah, because we border with Mexico, the immigration issue has turned around and addressed and targeted specifically Latinos, but this affects many individuals from many countries -- Poland, Germany, Japan, China; but yet, we don’t have conversations about those individuals. The issue is specifically targeting Latinos, and let me tell you something, these individuals contribute to the national economy of a trillion dollars. These individuals pay taxes. These individuals work in our restaurants. They work in our households, are domestic workers.

So, the bill before us, Madam Speaker, ensures that our local law enforcement focuses their energy
on more important issues within our communities. We do not receive any federal funding to ensure that our local police enforces the immigration laws. We’re not looking at the terrorists or the murders. I think I’m in agreement those who have committed a felony A or B, are in the terrorist watchlist, they shouldn’t be in this country. I stand for that 100 percent, but the bigger discussion and issue is that we need to work on the federal level and come into an agreement where we have immigration reform. Until that happens, we’re still gonna continue to have this debate.

So, at the end of the day a family that’s here in the state looking for a better living, have children in our schools who are our neighbors, they may get stopped by a police officer because they took a wrong turn or ran a red light. Those individuals in many instances are detained and are deported, breaking families, we are separating families. I don’t think the state of Connecticut want to be in the business of separating families. I think the state of Connecticut wants to reunite
families, and I think what this bill does it ensures that we get the bad people out of the state, those that have broken our laws, A and B felonies, those that are on the terrorist watchlist, that they are detained, and they are deported. That’s what this does, but doesn’t give the authorities just to come in and profile an individual because they happen to be Latinos and say, you know what, where’s your papers? You gotta get -- we have to detain you, and go through that process.

You have people that have been to courts for -- for -- for a specific issue. Let’s talk about -- because they -- they had an accident for example. They go through our legal process. The court genders judgement. They’re set free to go, and then you have people within our court system picking up the phone and calling ICE and detaining these individuals. Well, we have more pressing issues.

We talk about the courts need more police officers because they don’t have enough in the courts to control it, more Marshals; but yet, we’re using those resources to ensure that we take time to
call ICE to separate families. I think I’m in agreement with all of my colleagues who are against illegals who are here committing heinous crimes. I’m there with you, but those are not the peoples that we want to protect. We want to protect those individuals who are contributing citizens to our state and to our country, those that respect our laws. Those are the individuals that we are going to protect, and I think this bill ensures that, Madam Speaker. So, for those reasons, I stand in strong support of this amendment, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. And, just a reminder when the vote is taken, the vote will be taken by roll. Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom, please prepare
yourself. Representative Dubitsky, the Chairman is ready. Please proceed.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you. Madam Speaker, I’m looking at this amendment LCO 10226, and in lines 3 through 7, it talks about subdivisions 9 and 10 of subsection a of a specific statute as amended by section 1 of substitute Senate Bill 992, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedules “A” and “K”. That’s what’s been repealed. I defy anybody to figure out what that means. Now, I admit I am not the smartest guy in the world, but I’ve been an attorney for 20 years, and I’ve been in this legislature for five years, and I’ve read an awful lot of bills. I can’t figure this one out. I defy anybody in this Chamber to do so.

So, I’m going to ask the proponent of the bill to help me figure it out because it seems to me you gotta look at five different pieces of paper to figure out what we’re voting on. So, a couple of quick questions. Through you, Madam Speaker. Is it the case that this amendment to Senate Bill 1115 is
amending the language to Senate Bill -- Substitute Senate Bill 992 that was previously passed?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Madam Speaker. That’s correct. Senate Bill 9992 has been passed in concurrence of both Chambers and is headed to the governor’s desk, and assuming he signs it, will become the law of the State of Connecticut. The bill before us was a negotiation between the various caucuses to certain changes to that law that all parties were amenable to. We’d like to have this incorporated into the final statute when it’s codified into law, so we are passing this bill in order to make sure these get codified into law as well as along with 9992 that’s already on its way to the governor’s desk.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. I’m looking at 992, and I would -- I would just correct the good Chairman. It’s 992, not 9992. It’s Substitute Senate Bill 992. So, looking at Substitute Senate Bill 992 section -- I can’t even tell what section it is -- but lines 145 through 158. And, I would ask the good Chairman that after Substitute Senate Bill 992 was amended by Senate “A” and then amended again by Senate “K”, and then after it would be amended a third time by this amendment to Senate Bill 1115; is that -- are those lines, 145 through 158 -- are they still in this bill?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Madam Speaker. They’re still on this bill as amended. The operative language would be that that is in LCO No. 10226 at lines 60 through 65.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):
Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, do I interpret that to mean that lines 145 through 158 are no longer part of the bill, but they have been -- they will be amended by this current amendment that we are debating, which is LCO 10226?

And, through you.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I would leave it at my previous answer, which is the operative language as of lines 60 through 65 of the amendment we are currently debating.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, I -- I’ll be a little bit more specific. Is line -- line 156 and 157 of Senate -- Substitute Senate Bill 992, after this -- if this amendment passes, would those lines still be in this bill?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Parts of them.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

I -- I’m sorry, Mr. Speaker. I didn’t understand that answer.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom, do you care to respond?

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

I’ll simply repeat it. I said, parts of those lines will survive.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Line 158 of Senate Bill -- of Substitute Senate Bill 992, if this
amendment LCO 10226 were passed, would line 158 of Senate Bill 992, would that survive?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky, I know we’re -- we’re merging kind of two bills and this is what we worked out, and I’m going to afford you the leniency to bounce back and forth on bills -- just to be clear -- if the transcripts need to show it, so please proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My -- my -- the reason why I need to do this is because there’re actually four different pieces of paper -- four different documents that need to be put together, and frankly, it’s nearly impossible to figure out what’s in and what’s out, so I’m -- I’m just asking some specific questions so I can -- for my own edification understand what we’re voting on.
So, through you, Mr. Speaker. If -- so line 158 of Senate Bill 992 will remain after this amendment, and that line indicates that confidential information can be disclosed to a federal immigration authority if otherwise required by law. And, I would ask the good Chairman if otherwise required by law means both state law and federal law?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, we have the -- we have a bill that 992 has already passed with which includes a provision that requires this information be disclosed when required by law. Does confidential information under this amendment include information about immigration status?
Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect, I believe I’ve answered this several times.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not with regard to the amendment that we’re talking about now. We discussed that earlier with regard to a different bill, and my question is, is it the same or is it changed by this amendment?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Stafstrom, do you care to respond?

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I would simply remark that the amendment before us does not change
any of the answers I gave to the previous colloquy on this questioning.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’ll -- I’ll just move to a couple of comments. Federal law specifically 8 U.S.C. 1373 requires that state -- that state law enforcement and any state -- any governmental entity provide information about a person in custody when asked, specifically section (a), not withstanding any provision of federal and state law, no local government entity or official may prohibit or in any way restrict any government entity or official from sending to receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status lawful or unlawful of any individual. That’s federal law. That’s what the law says. And, what this bill does and the underlying bill that we apparently just passed is it says, we don’t care, that we’re just going to ignore
federal law that specifically prohibits us from doing exactly what we’re doing now. It would also specifically prohibit a law enforcement officer from abiding by the law that we are about to pass, so I’m wondering -- let’s say one of my local law enforcement officers -- let’s say the Lebanon Police Department gets a request from ICE for information. Under federal law, they are absolutely mandated to respond. While under the law we’re about to pass, they’re prohibited from responding. Which one are they supposed to handle? Which one are they supposed to abide by? Who are they supposed to listen to? The state or the federal government? We’re putting them in a completely untenable situation.

I also wanted to make a quick comment about procedure. Now, I have recently been approached by a number of people in my district, in this building, outside this building indicating that they spend their time -- God bless them -- watching CTN, watching these debates. And, for people at home watching these debates, I can tell you there isn’t
any way in the world they would be able to figure out what we’re voting for because I can almost guarantee there isn’t anybody in this Chamber that understands what we’re voting on right now. We already passed a bill with two amendments on it. Now, we’re passing an amendment to another bill, which amends that bill, and all of these things have to be reconciled in some way, and I tell ya, I sat down with all of this stuff and tried to figure out what’s in, what’s out, what we’re voting on. It would literally take hours. I can virtually guarantee that there isn’t anybody in this room that’s seeing what we’re voting on right now, but yet, we’re gonna vote. That does an amazing disservice to the people of this state, the people of this Chamber, the people in my district and in every other district. It does a disservice to the people watching CTN, and it completely disrespects the procedures that this Chamber and this legislature should be following. I frankly think it’s a disgrace. Nobody knows what we’re voting on, but we’re all gonna push a button one way or the
other. To pass a bill in this legislature, we should have a piece of paper that lays out what we’re voting on, what language is changing, what law is gonna change, and what it means. We don’t have that. We have four different pieces of paper that you have to try to put together that amends another statute. That, in my view, is a travesty, and I don’t think we should be passing laws in that way.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

All right. What are we doing? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well -- [Interruption]. Will you remark further on the bill as amended before us? If not, I try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying, aye. (All) Aye. All opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. (Gavel).

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

CLERK:

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1115 as Amended by Senate “A” in concurrence with the Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Applause] [Cheering]
DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The bill -- no, no, no, no, no. Excuse me.

(Gavel) (Gavel) (Gavel) Ladies and gentlemen in the
gallery, there is no cheering, please. The bill as
amended is passed. (Gavel).

Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pursuant to the
House rules, I’m moving immediate transmittal of all
business requiring further action in this Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

If there is no objection, so ordered. (Gavel).

Representative O’Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I just
rise for announcement, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative, please proceed, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Republicans are gonna have a caucus tomorrow morning
at 10. Please bring a change of clothes and your
toiletries for tomorrow.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Representative, thank you for the notification.

[Laughter]. Representative Santiago.

REP. SANTIAGO (84TH):

Thank you -- thank you Miss -- thank you, Madam Speaker. For purposes of Journal notations:

Business in the district, Representative Dillon, Baker, Phipps, and Gibson. Business outside of the Chamber, Serra, Genga, D’Agastino, Michel, and Palm. Personal business, Butler, Simmons, McGee, Walker, Exum, Horn. And, purposes of illness was Orange, Garibay, Rose, Reyes, and Sanchez.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. For Journal notation, Representative Zupkus was at a funeral wake, Representative Labriola was back in district
on family business, and Representative Green was out of the Chamber on legislative business.

Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Madam Speaker, I move there be no further business on the clerk’s desk, and we adjourn subject to the Call of the Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COOK (65TH):

The motion is adjournment subject to the Call of the Chair. Is there objection? I’m hearing none. The House is adjourned subject to the Call of the Chair. (Gavel).

(On motion of Representative Currey of the 11th District, the House adjourned at 10:10 o'clock p.m., to meet again at the Call of the Chair.)
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