The Senate was called to order at 3:00 o’clock p.m., the President in the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon. Would the Senate please come to order? Members and guest please rise, and as we are gathering may I just take the opportunity to wish Senator Duff a very Happy Birthday. It's Norwalk Day and it's Senator Duff's birthday. (Applause) And with that if you could please direct your attention to our Chaplain, Rabbi Lazowski.

DEPUTY CHAPLAIN RABBI PHILIP LAZOWSKI:

Thank you. Let us pray. Our thought for today is from Lamentations Chapter 3 verse 57: "You called near when I called you, and you said, "Do not fear."

O Blessed Creator, in the world you have created, you also give us protection from the violence and unruly nature of human kind. We rely on you to take away our fear. Grant us wisdom and courage to overcome all the evil that surrounds us. May this Senate be an influence for good, uniting all people in our State of Connecticut in peace and freedom, and keep us safe. Bless our Nation, our President, our Governor, our Lieutenant Governor, our state leaders and hold our defenders of freedom in your
care. O Lord hear us as we pray and let us all say, Amen.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Rabbi and if you would remain standing I would like to invite Senator Berthel up to lead us in the Pledge.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

(All) I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE CHAIR:

And at this time the Chair will entertain any points of personal privilege. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President and good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you for recognizing Norwalk Day and the other occasion as well. Last year we were here on May 8, it was Sine Die and we were here until after midnight so maybe we'll copy the same thing for my birthday. Maybe that's my birthday wish to stay
after midnight tonight; I'm not sure. With all my good friends and --

THE CHAIR:

You have a moment to rethink that. (Laughing)

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Does the Clerk have agendas on his desk?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 dated Wednesday, May 8, 2019.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President. I move all items on Senate Agendas No. 1, 2 and 3 dated Wednesday, May 8, 2019 be acted upon as indicated and that the agenda and that the agendas be incorporated by reference into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcripts.

THE CHAIR:
So noted.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President. Madam President, I have a number of referrals for other Committees.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Madam President. On Calendar page 3, Calendar 28, Senate Bill 560. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 3, Calendar 30, Senate Bill 562. I'd like to refer that Bill to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 3, Calendar 31, Senate Bill 563. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 3, Calendar 39, Senate Bill 805. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 3, Calendar 43, Senate Bill 802. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 5, Calendar 66, Senate Bill 96. I'd like to refer that item to the Judiciary Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 5, Calendar 68, Senate Bill 518. I'd like to defer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 6, Calendar 74, Senate Bill 898. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 9, Calendar 101, Senate Bill 781. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 9, Calendar 102, Senate Bill 801. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 9, Calendar 103, Senate Bill 950. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 11, Calendar 112, Senate Bill 453. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 12, Calendar 119, Senate Bill 598. I'd like to place that item on the foot of the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 12, Calendar 124, Senate Bill 808. I'd like to refer that item on to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 12, Calendar 134, Senate Bill 860. I'd like to refer that on to the Appropriations Committee.
THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 13, Calendar 137, Senate Bill 968. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 14, Calendar 144, Senate Bill 435. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar page 16, Calendar 159, Senate Bill 15. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
On Calendar page 36, Calendar 339, Senate Bill 1095. I'd like to refer that item to the GAE Committee.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
On Calendar page 28, Calendar 351, Senate Bill 928. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
On Calendar page 38, Calendar 354, Senate Bill 1071. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
On Calendar page 50, Calendar 432, Senate Bill 653. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 53, Calendar 447, Senate Bill 1113. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And on Calendar page 62, Calendar 168, Senate Bill 904. I'd like to remove that item from the foot of the Calendar and mark that as PR.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Oh sorry. A few more. Double sided. On Calendar page 16, Calendar 161, Senate Bill 33. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 16, Calendar 164, Senate Bill 317. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 17, Calendar 172, Senate Bill 978. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 18, Calendar 177, Senate Bill 1004. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 20, Calendar 187, Senate Bill 746. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 22, Calendar 204, Senate Bill 846. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.
THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 22, Calendar 206, Senate Bill 961. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 22, Calendar 212, Senate Bill 838. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 23, Calendar 219, Senate Bill 360. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
On Calendar page 24, Calendar 223, Senate Bill 989. I'd like to refer that item to the Judiciary Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 26, Calendar 239, Senate Bill 823. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 27, Calendar 246, Senate Bill 1051. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 27, Calendar 251, Senate Bill 660. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 28, Calendar 263, Senate Bill 2015. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 32, Calendar 291, Senate Bill 361. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 32, Calendar 292, Senate Bill 527. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 32, Calendar 294, Senate Bill 995. I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.
THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
And on page 32, Calendar 295, Senate Bill 1074. I'd like to place that item on the foot of the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
And if we could stand at ease for a moment Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
The Chamber will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to mark a few items go please.

THE CHAIR:
Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar page 1, Calendar 458, go. On Calendar page 2, Calendar 459, go. On Calendar 460, go. Calendar 461, go. Calendar 462, go. Calendar 463, go, all on Calendar
page 2. And if the Clerk can call those in that order, please.

THE CHAIR:

Will be so noted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 1, Calendar No. 458, Senate Drug Resolution No. 30. RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF REGINALD D. BETTS OF NEW HAVEN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark further?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is a non-paid position. The Commissioner makes appointments to and may remove State's Attorneys, Assistant State's Attorneys and Deputy State's Attorneys within the depart -- Division of Justice. Attorney Betts was voted unanimously in the Committee. He comes from
the University of Maryland with honors and has a JD from Yale Law School. He has a career in background defending juveniles and working on legislative reform and again was also appointed by President Obama to the Coordinating Council to assist the Offices of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. I urge a favorable vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you and good afternoon Madam President. I would concur my remarks with that of the Joint Minority Leader and urge the Chamber's adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much. Will you remark further? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just stand at ease for a moment, please.

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection might this item be placed on Consent Calendar.
THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Senator Duff. Oh, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2, Calendar No. 459. Senate Joint Resolution No. 31. RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF ROBERT M. BERKE OF WOODBRIDGE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, again this is a non-paid position. Same qualifications or same duties as I mentioned with the previous nominee. Attorney Berke's votes were unanimous in Committee. He attended Suny Albany for Criminal Justice, University of Bridgeport where he earned his JD and worked as a lecturer at the Connecticut Bar Association as an Assistant Public Defender.
And has been in private practice for more than 20 years. I believe Madam President; this is the first time we've had a Public Defender on the Commission and I would urge adoption. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would concur with the remarks of the Majority Leader and urge adoption of the nominee.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's -- if there's no objection, might this item be placed on the Consent Calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2, Calendar No. 460, Senate Joint Resolution No. 32. RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE LEANIE L. CRADLE OF DURHAM TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Again, this has the same duties as was previously mentioned. Judge Cradle's votes were -- was unanimous in Committee. She comes from Adelphi University with the majors in Anthropology and Sociology with honors and Singhal Law. She's been a professor, Senior State's Attorney and is currently a State of Connecticut Superior Court Judge and I urge favorable vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

You know, Madam President. It's really great when we have these highly qualified candidates that want to volunteer their services to the State of Connecticut and I support the comments by Majority Leader Duff and urge concurrence with the motion.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator Witkos. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection might this item be placed on the Consent Calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2, Calendar No. 461. Senate Joint Resolution No. 33. RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE ANDREW J. MCDONALD OF STAMFORD AS MEMBER AND CHAIRPERSON OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, again this comes with -- I'm sorry, I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark further?
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Again the qualifications are as I previously stated with other nominees. Justice McDonald served as a member and has been appointed Chairperson by Governor Lamont. He was voted unanimously in Committee. Many of us in the circle are familiar with Justice McDonald with his time as a State Senator and also a General Council to the former Governor in his work on the State Supreme Court. Madam President, I would urge favorable vote on this nominee. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Duff. Senator Witkos, will you remark?

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As the good Senator said, it received unanimous support by the Committee and I would urge its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection might this item be placed on the Consent Calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.
Page 2, Calendar No. 462. Senate Joint Resolution No. 34. RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF SCOTT J. MURPHY OF FARMINGTON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The question is adoption. Will you remark further? Will you remark, Senator Duff?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, again this is for the same Commission that we previously had debated here. Attorney Murphy was voted unanimously in Committee. He attended Alfred University and Suny Buffalo Law School. Attorney Murphy has been a prosecutor for 34 years in the Division of Criminal Justice and he also served as Executive Director of Judicial Review for two years. He's now retired and volunteers for AARP and I would urge a favorable vote.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you so much, Senator Duff. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Madam President, another highly qualified volunteer. I would urge the Chamber's adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection might this item be placed on the Consent Calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2, Calendar No. 463, Senate Joint Resolution No. 35. RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF MOY N. OGILVIE OF BLOOMFIELD TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.
THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Again, this is the same Commission as we have previously brought with other nominees. Attorney Ogilvie was voted in unanimously in Committee. He's Bowdoin College with a degree in Sociology and Boston University Law with his JD. He is currently the Managing Partner in McCarter and English in Hartford and is a member of a number of legal and business associations in the area, and I urge a favorable vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. We also support the Resolution of the Confirmation before us and ask for Chamber's adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection, might this item be placed on the Consent Calendar?
Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk. Ah, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Will the Chamber stand at ease for a moment, please?

THE CHAIR:

The Chamber will stand at ease. Chamber will come back to order and the Chair recognizes Senator Looney for a Point of Personal Privilege.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. For purposes of an introduction, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

I've been very fortunate this session, Madam President to have Audrey Rossignol as my intern. She has done a superb job. She's a graduating senior this spring from Eastern Connecticut. During her time at Eastern she's been active participating in campus activities and a variety of clubs including the Peace and Human Rights Club and sports activities and outdoors as well as being active with the Connecticut Young Democrats and the College Democrats. She had also previously interned for Congressman Joe Courtney working on constituent
services and event preparation. She's had some experience interning at DCF, a general practice law firm in the Hartford Juvenile Court. So she has gained a lot of experience in a variety of fields while attending college. She's also worked and volunteered on several campaigns at the State Municipal level and she also enjoys skiing and kayaking and attending local live music shows. She's somebody who leads a very active and vibrant life and I think has a wonderful career ahead of her, and she aspires to a career in politics and public policy, so I think she's one of the young people on which our state's future depends. I'd just like to have the Chamber give her our traditional warm welcome and congratulations on the good work she's done. (Applause)

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If the Chamber will stand at ease for a moment, please.

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will stand at ease. Good afternoon, Senator Duff. Would the Senate please come to order and I recognize Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I'd like to mark our first item as go as our order of the day.
Calendar page 61, Calendar 429, House Joint Resolution No. No. 161.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 61, Calendar No. 429, Substitute for House Joint Resolution No. 161. RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE STATE CONSTITUTION TO ALLOW FOR EARLY VOTING. As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" LCL 7493. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Resolution in concurrence with the House of Representative.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Resolution in front of us today is a critical step forward for easing the residents of Connecticut's ability to participate in our elections process. The Resolution before us would
make a needed change to our State Constitution to allow for early voting to be considered by future General Assemblies. Connecticut is one of less than ten states that does not allow for early voting and this General Assembly cannot debate the possibility of having early voting in Connecticut unless these provisions of our State Constitution are changed to allow the notion of early voting to be considered. The Resolution in front of us makes those changes to allow a future General Assembly to consider early voting to decide exactly how that process of early voting would be set up. All of those details would be considered at a later date but this important Resolution in front of us would start the process for allowing the Constitution to be changed if this body were to take action like the bipartisan action that was taken in the House of Representatives where 82 percent of our colleagues in the House voted for this Resolution. Then this measure would be on the ballot in November of 2020 and the voters of Connecticut would get to decide whether or not the Constitution should be amended to allow early voting to be considered in our state. I'm sure that many of my colleagues around this circle heard similar conversations in November of last year when so many of us watched in the over 40 states around the country where voters participated in early voting where people were allowed to exercise their right in a manner that eased the electoral process and wondered why we couldn't do that here in Connecticut. And the reason why we can't do that here in our state is because of the strict guidelines in our Constitution. I'm hopeful that my colleagues will look at the resolution that is in front of us, recognize that the General Assembly should be able to have a conversation about how to have early voting in our state and I'm hopeful that
we will enjoy the bipartisan support for this Resolution that was demonstrated by our great colleagues in the House of Representatives. Madam President, I urge support for this Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I want to thank the Chairwoman of the General Government Administration Elections Committee for her comments on the Constitutional Amendment that is before us. Clearly a Constitutional Amendment is serious business and something that we should not tread into lightly, and would require some thorough review before passage out of either Chamber. Unfortunately I think what happened is the House rushed the changes in language and as a result the action that was passed was not fully understood by every person in the House of Representatives. And I want to make sure that that mistake does not occur here in the Senate. So I do have a few questions Madam President, through you to the kind, gentlelady.

I think what I want to do first is ask about what this Amendment actually achieves. The title is a RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE STATE CONSTITUTION TO ALLOW FOR EARLY VOTING. Is that exactly what the language proposes to do? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Resolution that is before us reads that the General Assembly may further provide by law for voting in person prior to the day of the election and in the choice of any officer to be -- to be elected or upon any question to be voted on in an election by qualified voters of the state. So it is a Resolution that will allow the General Assembly in the future to consider allowing election voting to happen prior to election day AKA early voting.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President and I appreciate that answer. So I guess I just want to make a distinction because I heard quite a few people speaking about this Resolution after it was passed in the House, some even on the radio describing it as something that they refer to as in-person absentee voting. And looking at the section that is being changed in our State Constitution if this passes, it is the section that refers to absentee voting. But I would like to just make it explicit whether or not this change is intended to be a change in our absentee voting process or a more universal change to allow early voting in our state. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Government Administration Elections Committee considered several measures with regard to early voting and no excuse absentee ballot voting. The Resolution that is in front of us when it first reached the floor of the House did contemplate changes to our process for absentee ballot voting and making a change to the State Constitution with regard to that. Those changes were taken out of the Amendment that was adopted by the House and therefore the Resolution that is before this Chamber today is limited to the subject of early voting.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And again, thank you for the answer. So by saying that this Amendment that's before us is limited to early voting means that it makes no changes to the Constitution with regard to absentee voting and I'll just, rather than ask a lot of individual questions, I just want to confirm that the intent of the language is to allow for an expansion in essentially the -- essentially the keys for the General Assembly to make changes to our election laws to allow for pretty much unlimited early voting. Through you, Madam President. Is that correct?
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Through you, Madam President. The Resolution that is before us would allow a future General Assembly if it is passed by this body and by the voters of the State of Connecticut to consider allowing for voting in person prior to election day.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Through you, Madam President. Is there any limitation on the number of days that would be allowed for early voting if this were to pass and become our new Amended State Constitution? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Through you, Madam President. As the good ranking member of the Government Administration and Elections Committee may recall, the Resolution that is before us had originally prescribed a three-day period for early voting. That was something that was debated extensively in our conversations in that Committee. The House of Representatives chose to
change the language of the Resolution that is now before us here in the Senate so it does not limit the number of days. I would say that what is before us instead allows the General Assembly to provide for early voting but does not require that the General Assembly provide for early voting. The earlier version of this resolution did set that early voting had to happen and that it had to be for that three-day period. This would allow a General Assembly to set up a period of early voting or a future General Assembly could choose not to enact early voting if the people of Connecticut adopted this Amendment to the State Constitution. So I think that the Resolution that is before us gives future General Assemblies some latitude in the statutes and some room for debate. There are many people who have opinions about how early voting should happen in Connecticut. A lot of people who work directly with elections. And there are opinions of people who just want to have a say in how our voting process works and this Resolution allows for the widest opportunity for discussion by a future General Assembly as to how early voting would work in Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So I'm genuinely appreciative that the gentlelady's comments align with my own as far as the understanding of what is before us. I've heard all manner of description about what this language would do including affecting only the way we handle absentee voting in
the state and that it might require some sort of identification but it appears that this change will do nothing more than essentially give the General Assembly the power and authority to pass its own laws to allow for early voting of any number of days that it so chooses without restriction that exists currently in the Constitution.

I would just like to follow up maybe on the process just a little bit so that we're clear on that. My understanding is that this Resolution has already passed the House Chamber with a three-quarters plurality, and if it passes this Chamber with a three-quarters plurality it can go on the ballot as a question as early as next year; is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you Madam President. Madam President, the process for this Amendment to be made to the Constitution would be if this Chamber, if 27 of our colleagues around this circle were to vote for this Resolution today and move this Amendment forward for the voters of Connecticut to decide whether or not we should even be allowed to have a conversation in our state about allowing early voting, it would happen in November of 2020. If this Chamber fails to allow the people of Connecticut to have their say on the concept of early voting then it would have to be passed by a future General Assembly, by a simple majority and would be on the ballot then in November of 2022, not November of 2020.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and I appreciate the detailed answer. It saves me asking a few more questions. I guess I have only one more question in that area and that is, I would like to just know for the record the number of state Senators that would have to vote in the affirmative for this to meet the requisite three-quarters and ultimately be on the ballot for 2020 versus having to wait until another legislature -- excuse me, until another legislature has an opportunity to vote on it. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Through you, Madam President. As I previously mentioned, 27 state Senators would need to vote for this Resolution today to meet the required Constitutional 75 percent threshold for the voters of Connecticut to have their say as to whether or not we would have early voting in our state.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):
Madam President, thank you very much and thank you to the Chairman of the Chairman of the GAE Committee for those answers. Can I also ask what elections would be affected? Does this apply to just state elections or does it also apply to municipal elections in the future and also primary elections? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, this Resolution would allow the General Assembly to consider in the future how to have early voting at elections. How that was determined in terms of which elections it would apply to would decided by a future General Assembly if that future General Assembly decided to even move forward with a process of early voting. That would be something that would have to be debated by this body as they debate the thorough details of how a process of early voting would happen in our state.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just a final question and then I will have some comments on the proposal before us. And it's just simply, I see that the initiative has been taken to put this proposal
before both Chambers, potentially change our State Constitution; as I said, a significant and serious piece of business. And this I see is a fundamental change in the way we handle elections in the state and I will elaborate on that further. But I'd just like to know if there is any sort of plan in place for what will happen if this were to become our new Constitutional language. Is there a plan in place for adopting early voting? How would that work? Would it be through town clerks accepting early ballots? Is there a proposed timeframe? Is it three days, is it seven days, is it 30 days, is it 90 days of early voting? Where would that voting take place? Would we be requiring our local town officials to budget for polling locations and cost to the residents of those towns? Any insight I could have would be really appreciated. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Through you, Madam President. The Resolution that is before us again just would allow a future General Assembly to contemplate having early voting in our state. It does not prescribe that early voting has to be allowed in Connecticut and it certainly does not get into the details as to what period of time early voting would happen or how it would happen. All of those things would be determined by the next newly-elected General Assembly, not this current General Assembly. None of those conversations contemplated in the good Senator's question could even be discussed by this General Assembly until
this Amendment to the Constitution of our state is passed to allow that kind of debate and changes to our statutes to happen.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you again for those responses. I would just argue that we're here to make public policy decisions that affect our state and the mere fact that this is before us means that someone has an idea or a plan for implementing early voting, otherwise there would be no desire to put forward a Resolution to change our Constitution to allow it. So I find it interesting that there is no detail about what the plan might ultimately be, and that's my greatest concern about this legislation that is before us. I'm going to speak only for a few minutes but the main thrust of what I want to get across to people during this conversation is that there is the desire to increase access to voting. But I want to point out that is shared by everyone in this Chamber. No one wants to limit people's ability to cast a vote in our elections. But at the same time that you increase access you would also have to mindful of the process by which you do it to maintain the integrity, the sanctity if you will, of our elections. Because if we do not have elections that are honest and decent and the people who vote in those elections can rely on them, then the value of those elections and the value of our system of government is in danger and that is my greatest concern.
This proposal is extremely broad. The original proposal allowed for only three days of early voting. There are some people in this room that will vote no today when they might have considered voting for three days simply because this allows for an unlimited period of time. There is no specification here. I don't mean to be ridiculous, but there's nothing stopping it from being the day after the previous election. Two years in advance of another one, maybe four years in the case of gubernatorial election. Now I don't think that would even happen, but that is not the kind of language that we should be putting in our State Constitution in my mind.

And what is the plan? If we institute early voting in this state does that mean that we're going to require people to show up at a town hall location? And if we have happen in Connecticut what we've seen in other states where a great many people participate, I don't think that's going to work for very long. Our town clerks will be overwhelmed. How will the votes actually be processed? Will they be done through an absentee process using the applications and envelopes and all that that we use now or are they going to be done through a voting machine? And then you have the problem of the way our voting machines work in the state, which is that at the end of the day of voting you shut off the machine and you have a tally. If you're doing that on a day-to-day basis for two days, three days, seven days or 30 days, you're going to have numbers in someone's procession that are relevant and I think may affect the outcome of the election.

As I said, this is a fundamental change to the way we do things. I know that other states have passed
various forms of early voting and I think that the results of those states experience varies wildly. We had quite a bit of testimony in the Committee on this, but the most detailed testimony that we heard was from Dr. Gail Alberta who is an Assistant Professor of Politics and Public Administration at Fairfield University; somebody with some actual credibility who understands elections and has done a tremendous amount of research on the subject. And I've got her whole testimony in front of me. I'm certainly not going to go through the whole thing, but it was very interesting what she pointed out which is, what happens when you have different types of early voting and what the results are. And just to quote her. She said, "on the other hand, early voting laws depress voter turnouts, fail to increase representation and alter the nature of campaigns." And I think you can see why each of those things actually happens and certainly the last one. The nature of campaigns is that election day happens on a specific point and time and each of us that serve in this Chamber have all been involved in campaigns and we realize that we have a timeline that we are working on and we are running a campaign basically to lead up to that day, that final day where the people have the information necessary to cast a vote. As you go on to read her testimony I think what you find out is that the people that vote early are the people that are not waiting for that information. They're people that have already made a decision. They're people that are partisan Republicans or partisan Democrats and they simply want to get their vote cast and counted because they're anxious to do so. I don't think that increases quality participation in voting, which I think is even more important than the numbers. I think what we need to have is informed voters who
are able to make a legitimate choice based on the things that are before them. I'll just point out that over the last 10 years I cannot remember an election that went smoothly in this state. You had the first Malloy-Folley election that happened back in 2011 and there were plenty of irregularities that were pointed out, particularly in the City of Bridgeport and I don't remember the exact details but that's not what's important anyway. What's important is that there was confusion and there were people that felt like they were disenfranchised and felt that that election was not done in a way where they can rely on the results being accurate. That's the worst possible outcome for an election. This is not a third-world country. This is Connecticut inside the United States of America. Our elections have to be accurate; they have to have integrity and no one can doubt the results. Since then there have been countless other issues with polling places that did not close at the proper time, people standing in line after the time of voting, people being sworn in in mass. These are things that should not happen in our election process and in recent years we have expanded our election process dramatically. I don't actually believe that there's anyone out there that's being disenfranchised from being able to vote under our current law. Election day is 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. and we have a process where if someone is unable to vote during that period, they can cast an absentee ballot, which is readily available to anyone who is a citizen and eligible voter in the state and they can do that up to 45 days before election. So we already have a mechanism for early voting for those people that need it.
We also have something that was instituted in the last several years called election day registration and this, I think is the source of the latest batch of problems that we've had because we did not account as a state for how people would react to election day registration and voting and I think in many cases it was under estimated how many people would participate leading to problems where people were not able to vote prior to APM. Where the folks that were running those polling locations were overwhelmed and unable to provide the proper service. And people waiting in line. These are all significant problems that we should be addressing in this legislative session and yet those things are not being addressed. We are simply coming up with more ways to confuse the process.

What happens to that scenario I mentioned earlier when the end of the night the machine is shut off? Who's going to have that information about the days' tally? Or are we going to avoid that altogether and we're not going to feed the ballots through the machine that day; we're just going to put them in a bag and set them aside? Can you imagine what the news is going to say when you have towns all across our state holding bags of ballots waiting to be tallied on a later date? Again, the issue is not that anyone wants to limit access. The issue is that we have to maintain the integrity of the vote. There are ways to do that by the way. Continuing on with the testimony that Dr. Alberta put before us. She mentioned that there are better ways to provide for access. She mentioned that the biggest issue with people being able to vote is to actually know what they're voting for, who they're voting for, and where they are voting. And these are things we can do. In this General Assembly we can do some of
these things even this session if we work hard on it and they do not need to be made part of our state Constitution.

She recommended providing sample ballots to voters in advance of the election so that they know exactly what they're walking into without being confused by the ballot when they get there. She mentioned making sure that people are fully aware of where their polling location is so that they're not confused on election day. I think those are great ideas to provide access and I think that we should explore them.

I'll just finish up by saying that I don't know how this vote is going to turn out today but one thing I do know is that if we do early voting without a plan, it is only going to lead to more problems than we have now and potentially more disenfranchisement of voters. We need to get our house in order. We need to make sure that the problems that we have experienced over the last ten years I said; I don't think we've had an election without problems. We need to get that fixed first. If we cannot fix that process, if we cannot fix the absentee ballot process that makes the news even today, we should not be expanding the ways to vote in this state without the resources and the information necessary to do so. And one of the other things that I think we ought to be doing to maintain the sincerity and integrity of the vote and giving people the faith in our system of elections that it's actually working, is to require photo identification at the polling location when people vote in person. And seeing that Madam President, the Clerk has an Amendment. It's LCO 8194. Can you have him call it and I be allowed to summarize?
THE CHAIR:

Yes. Mr. Clerk please proceed.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8194, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Mr. Clerk for reading that. This is a very, very simple Amendment that we would make as a different change to our State Constitution and it would restore the integrity of elections in a lot of people's eyes, including my own. And it's simply language that would be added in Article 9 that says, "Any such elector who wishes to vote in person on the day of election day may do so only upon the presentation of current and valid photo identification containing the name and address of such elector." I move adoption, Madam President and I'd ask that when the vote is taken, it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The question is on adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark? Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would urge rejection of this Amendment for a number of reasons. The most simple reason perhaps is that this is not relevant to the Resolution that is before us. This Resolution is contemplating allowing the voters of Connecticut and a future General Assembly to debate early voting. It does not have to do with the sections that are outlined in this Amendment and I would also reject the premise of the need for the Amendment. We know that voter ID laws actually end up suppressing turnout in our state and in our country. Voter ID would potentially affect thousands of voters in Connecticut and across the country. More than 10 percent of people -- 10 percent of active voters I should say, do not have a valid ID and voter ID laws have largely been attributed to decreased turnout in many states where they have moved forward with provisions similar to the Amendment before us. It's a tactic that scares voters away from voting. Our system right now in order to register to vote, people's identities are carefully checked with their IDs and most people when they do vote in Connecticut do use an ID or they have to swear on an affidavit as you know well, Madam President, that they are who they say they are when they go to vote. And I would just lastly say that I have a strong personal objection to this Amendment. In the time I've been privileged to serve in this circle, I have several times mentioned with great love and admiration my parents. And my mother as many in the circle know, is an Irish-American immigrant and I often say that despite the fact that my father is a proud Vietnam Veteran and Marine, there's no one more patriotic than my mother. And there's no one who enjoys voting more than my mother does. But my mother doesn't have an active voter ID and she was once turned away at our
polling place in Killingly and I can't tell you how hurtful that was to her and how difficult it was for her despite the fact that our law would allow someone like my mother to have voted. And luckily she was able to talk with me about it and we were able to solve that problem, but that was a moment that made a woman like my mother almost throw her hands up in the air and give up on our electoral process. This Amendment would require that kind of experience for thousands of people in Connecticut like my mother who do not drive and may not have access to the kind of photo ID that's contemplated in this Amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote against this Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If I may, a few questions to the proponent of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President and through you to Senator Sampson. This Bill contemplates requirement to show photo identification when you go to vote. Is that not already the requirement? Through you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The State of Connecticut does require identification before you can vote, yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):


THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos. Thank you. Through you, Madam President. So if we're -- we're looking at the sanctity of the ballot box and you're not required to show a photo ID, what kind of ID does the State of Connecticut accept for identification purposes to know the specific voter? Through you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As was pointed out by the Chairman of the GAE Committee, you can sign an affidavit rather than providing identification or you can provide identification in the form of something as simple as a utility bill, partly something that I would consider to be a true valid form of identification. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So in the case of, I'll use myself as an example, I bring a utility bill that's made out to Kevin Witkos to the polling location, would I be able to vote just showing that utility bill? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, absolutely under our law you would be able to vote.
SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And my son happens to have the same name as I do, his first name is Kevin. If my son were able to take the utility bill and go to the voting location and say that this is Kevin Witkos, who he is; would he be able to vote? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I appreciate my colleague pointing out one of the flaws in the current law, which is that it does not to the legs necessary to validate someone's identity in a thorough way. This exact thing could play out over and over again all across our state. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. Is the good Senator aware, do you have to show a photo identification to board an airplane? Through you?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Sampson.
SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, absolutely you must show photo identification to board an aircraft, certainly in this state and probably across the whole country.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

If you, if the good Senator knows, do you know if you're required to show any type of photo identification when you're opening up a bank account at a financial institution? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm not fully familiar with this law but in my experience, yes, they require photo identification before you can open a bank account.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):
Thank you, Madam President. And is the good Senator aware that if you don't have -- if you're not a driver, can you obtain a photo ID only through the Connecticut Department of Motor Vehicles? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Yes, Madam President. That is correct. You can certainly obtain a photo identification in lieu of a driver's license at our Motor Vehicle Department. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Members of the Armed Forces have an Armed Forces card with their picture and signature and their rank structure on their card. Is that an acceptable form of identification to use at a polling location? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes.
SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I -- I'm all set with my questions of Senator Sampson. You know I stand in support of the Amendment before us as we've just learned that there is no lack of the ability to obtain a photo identification card here in the state of Connecticut. And more often than not they are required for positive identification purposes. I also provided the example of if two people have the first and last name, my son and I, that they can just take a piece of paper that looks official, made out -- could be a bank statement, could be an electric bill, utility bill and present that as identification. If one of the two of us doesn't show up, our names would be crossed off the voter's list so to me that's a problem. I think if my vote doesn't count because somebody else committed fraud potentially, they've weakened my vote or eliminated my vote if we weren't voting the same direction. And I think this action also provides and I'll address it after the Amendment is voted on on the underlying bill, the issue of folks that are here on a temporary basis that they really don't live here fulltime but yet are voting on the policies of the State of Connecticut and those policies have long-lasting and immediate effects on all those residents that do live here today. And I think by providing and improving the sanctity of the ballot box is the upmost concern to each and every one of us because that is the bedrock of democracy, to make sure that that ballot box is safe and secure and can be trusted. Thank you, Madam President. Urge adoption on the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Witkos. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just a final word on this Amendment before we have the opportunity to vote on it. I want to just dispel a couple of the myths that were put forward a few minutes ago and point out that even as recently as May 7, which was -- was that yesterday; the Wall Street Journal had an article on the subject of elections and voter ID and even the word suppression. But I'll point out that in the article, it says that there is a reference to a 2016 Gallop Poll that says that voter ID laws were supported by four out of five respondents, including 95 percent of Republicans, 63 percent of Democrats, 81 percent of whites and 77 percent of non-whites. So it's certainly not something that's unpopular. It's something that is overwhelmingly popular. The people in our country see the need for making sure that the integrity of our elections is maintained.

I also just want to point out that we're not referring to a voter ID. We're referring to a photo identification, that's all. And as was pointed out by my colleague, Senator Witkos; that can come in many, many forms. But I'll also point out that this particular Constitutional Amendment has been tested in other states and what the conclusion is, is that states are allowed to make this requirement for photo ID as long as they provide for in their statutes, a mechanism to provide for a free temporary photo ID to those that need one and I'm all in favor of that policy and hope that it passes.
after we pass the Amendment that I just offered before us. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, there's been a request for a roll call vote so Mr. Clerk, if you would announce the vote and the machine would be open.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8194. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8194.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8194, Senate Amendment A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Voting Yea</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Voting Nay</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

And the motion fails. Senator Kissel.
SENATOR KISSELL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Great to see you this afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR KISSELL (7TH):

I'm standing simply to stand on the underlying resolution. I have no questions for the proponent. One of -- one of my underlying -- one of the underlying degrees that I have is Bachelor of Science in Education and back in the day I pursued both secondary English and Social Studies and did my student teaching at Coventry High School. And I recall back in those years, decades ago that in teaching Social Studies, one of the things that I would tell the students was that there are two great pillars that hold up this great democracy that we know as the United States of America. One of those pillars is the right to a jury of your peers. But the other great pillar is the right to vote. And regarding one's right to vote is not only one's right but is indeed their privilege. So many men and women serve in our military forces both now and over the last centuries protecting those sacred rights that we have as well as so many others. In a few weeks we will be going to Memorial Day celebrations throughout our great state and we will hear that it was the men and women that died abroad and in battles here in America to make sure that we still had those rights.
So when this notion of early voting came up this year I spoke to my constituents as to how they regarded it. And indeed, they felt that a rush into this area was misguided. There's no need to rush. There was already a -- essentially a statewide referenda on this issue in the last, approximately six years where by over 30,000 votes the people of the State of Connecticut said no. So we've already had within the last decade, a statewide vote on this issue and the people of the State of Connecticut said no.

Secondly, the characterization that we are limited regarding this to early voting to my mind is misleading. I'm not ascribing anyone's attention to do that but early voting is a broad term that encompasses almost anything. And as Senator Sampson said, it could mean voting the day after a previous election. He had said that it's highly unlikely, it is highly unlikely; but there's nothing that says that early voting would encompass three days, five days, 60 days, 100 days. I view this as what's before us as a blank check for the next legislature to do whatever they want. And I am concerned about that. And my constituents are concerned about that. They want to know exactly what does "early voting entail." How many days, what's the procedure, where are the locations going to be? Because right now it's highly proscribed because we are protecting something that is sacrosanct to our democracy and that is one's ability to vote. And I agree with those that say if someone fraudulently votes, they have thereby diluted my vote. If the person next to me on my left is not allowed to vote and somehow gets to vote, then my vote is now half and multiply that out. So there is a real danger and threat. It may not be as widespread as some people report it to
be, but certainly it is not unusual about errors taking place and people voting or perhaps mistakenly thinking they're going to vote at one place and voting somewhere else. There is a tendency to abuse the system if it doesn't have safeguards. We need to have those safeguards.

And I can't possibly stand up and vote on a Resolution that writes a blank check as to what we're going to go regarding this very sacred right that we have, this privilege that we have so that it can immediately be on the ballot. We're going to have the right to a Constitutional Convention in just a few years. Some people don't favor a Constitutional Convention, but if we're going to really seriously think about changing our Constitution, let's incorporate it into that. Let's all bring people from around the state of Connecticut to that Constitutional Convention and we can talk about changing the voting rules and we can talk about initiative and referendum and we can talk about other ways to change our Constitution. If we don't have the appropriate 75 percent or more in our circle here this evening it simply means that it's not going to be fast-tracked.

And I agree with the statements that were made by folks in the House on both sides of the aisle. People can disagree on the underlying notion regarding what we should do regarding voting. And I do believe that what many members of the House they were voting on, we have the advantage here in the Senator to have more days to sit back and look at this and research this, talk to our Staff Council, talk to researchers and figure out exactly what this might be. And to my mind, it's a Pandora's box. It is a blank check regarding reform. I don't even
know whether the rules would be changed for primary voting as opposed to general elections. To my mind I think whatever rules we prescribe around voting, should be exactly the same for a primary as opposed to a general election because my concern about the sanctity of voting is the same. I can't go back to North Central Connecticut and my constituents in the seven towns I serve and say I signed that blank check for reform and I don't know what it's going to be. That would be a disservice to them. They elected me to protect their Constitutional guarded rights and they believe in the sanctity of voting and they believe in jury by your peers and all the other rights that we hold so dear. I'm not intending to filibuster this what-so-ever, and there could be some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle, even though there's no aisle here in the Senate, that are going to be voting in favor of this and that's okay. But I just wanted it on the record that I don't view a vote against this resolution as somehow proscribing a person's ability to vote. It's maintaining the status quo until we get more information as to what the reforms are exactly going to be. And then we can have that informed conversation as to whether we want to go there, not go there, do this, not do that. But to race to put this on the ballot so that some future legislature can then do whatever it pleases, I don't feel very well grounded in pursuing that. I think that would be a disservice again to my constituents. There may be reforms that should be enacted here in the State of Connecticut but right now as Senator Sampson so eloquently pointed out, we do have early voting. You have to get an absentee ballot up to 45 days and you have to put down a reason. And the reasons are very broad. I mean how many of us have folks that go away on vacation or homes down in Florida or
somewhere down south or maybe it's a family
gathering in a different part of the country and
they're just not going to be around on election day?
Or how many of us know folks that maybe have college
age students that are away in a different part of
the country and at that part of November they're
just not around, but they want to be able to vote
here in Connecticut. They can get an absentee
ballot if this is their residence. Or what if
someone is on call and has to be at their job for
that entire cycle from 8:00 a.m. or 6:00 a.m. to
8:00 a.m. -- 8:00 p.m. rather, the entire day. They
just can't be there. They're just not able to go to
their polling place. They can easily get that
absentee ballot and vote. I don't get a lot of
calls or emails from my constituents saying, I
wasn't able to vote.

I will say this. As an aside, I am actually to the
best of my knowledge, the only person in the State
of Connecticut, in the history of the State of
Connecticut that was ever elected on a Sunday
because after my predecessor, former Senator Con
O'Leary, now my constituent decided not to take the
oath of office one day before going into a new
session. Then Governor Lowell Weicker who was very
creative and wanted to try different things said,
hum, all right. I'm going to call a special
election and I'm going to call it for a Sunday.
Well, it's difficult doing a special election in the
dead of winter but it's even more difficult when you
actually get a hold of the people that are going to
vote and they tell you, I would vote for you John,
but I'm very religious and because you're election
is on a Sunday I can't vote that day. That was
crazy. And so the reason I can tell you I'm the
only one to have ever been elected on a Sunday was
when Governor Weicker did that he proclaimed, this has never been done in the history of the State of Connecticut and when I won that special election I worked across the aisle to help pass a law to make sure there would never be a Sunday election ever going forward because of all the people that for whatever reason, especially religious reasons said they couldn't even go out to vote.

So sometimes being too creative can diminish the votes. Remember when we debated expanding package store hours, liquor outlets and the whole question came down; this is very recent, the last six - eight years about Sunday sales and the Mom and Pop's and the package stores said, listen if you open -- if you say we have to be open or we can be open permissive, from 10:00 to 5:00 on a Sunday, a) we're going to feel compelled because of competition to open our store, but all you're going to do is dilute the six-day amount of sales into seven. And as much as it's convenient for a lot of folks, in talking to the folks that run these stores since that time they have said, what we predicted is essentially true. Sales didn't skyrocket, it just sort of flattened them out.

And speaking to Senator Sampson, the good ranking Senator on Government Administration and Elections, we talked about that issue amongst many of us and in states that have gone in this direction with "early voting," however it was actually described, it didn't really boost a huge amount of voting. It just sort of leveled it out. As Senator Sampson again so applied put it, those that were really into one side or the other or one candidate or the other, and it doesn't even have to be partisan but they just were really zoomed in on a particular
candidate, they wanted to jump in there early. But did the total amount of voting go up? Historically no. It just got flattened out over a longer period of time.

So I see no reason to rush into this this afternoon. I see every reason to take a step back. We've got a lot of GAE Bills coming down the road that we can discuss different aspects of voting, what we like, what we don't like. And I appreciate the folks that are pushing forward for this. I know that our Secretary of State, Denise Merrill has been in the building and has been a champion of this and I appreciate everything that Chairman Flexer has done in championing this, but I've given it a lot of thought and certainly there may be things that we can all embrace but a blank check as to what we're going to do in the future in fast tracking something that I have no idea what it is, to change our Constitution this afternoon to do that; I just absolutely cannot support that. So for those reasons, and I'm not urging anyone to vote one way or another but I really do sincerely hope that we're the brakes on this and that we can take our time in moving forward and we don't have to race to put this on the next 2020 ballot and that we don't change the Connecticut State Constitution at this time in this way. Like I say, we have a potential Constitutional Convention in a few years and that might be the best mechanism to move forward. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Cassano to be followed by Senator Bizzarro.
SENATOR CASSANO (4TH): It's for all of us an honor to sit in a circle of 36 and represent all of the people of Connecticut who in fact elected us to office. There are a lot of people that I know personally that did not vote in this last election simply because of work changes and family illness and another one, a couple of reasons if they could have voted on a Monday or even on a Sunday or by mail at that time, because if they didn't have an absentee ballot they couldn't vote. But that's not what I'm standing to talk about. We are of course the land of steady habits. We -- we know that. Making change in Connecticut is extremely difficult. Some of the issues that Senator Sampson talked about were horrendous situations on election night. Most of that attributed to too many people trying to vote in too short a period of time.

One of the reasons that I support this Bill is that it spreads it out over a few days, whatever those days are going to be so that we don't have those 8:00 rushes at the polls that we see so commonly, particularly when we have national elections or major elections. We don't seem to have that rush with our local elections but the fact is, it's a real situation. And that's why other states have made the change to prevent that kind of, almost invasion on the polls because you can't do it all in one day.

When you look at the size of some of our cities, it's difficult. Think about it. The numbers of people that have to get out to vote or want to get out to vote, it's difficult. You've stood in the long lines. Every one of us has been in the polls, around the polls at election time and we see people turn around and go home because the lines are too
long. You've been out there with a sign and you've seen this happen. And so this is an attempt to try to rectify that.

I find it unique that when they determined the rules of the Senate, whoever did and when they did years ago, they set this up so that a Senate and a House in one year can create legislation that a following legislative party will be able to carry out, and that's exactly what's taking place here. What they're saying is very simple. The people that elect us to office are the same people that will elect the next legislative body. We are the people's choice. And whoever is sitting around this circle and sitting down in the House at that time if this Bill passes will have that opportunity to do what it is asked. And what are we asking? Very simply for the people -- the people of Connecticut to come out on election day and say, I would like to expand this and I have trust in the legislature to do this right in two years because they won't make their decision until 2020. So there's a process here that makes sense and the reasons -- the negative reasons that we've talked about that happen on election day, this is one of the answers to eliminating those problems; a couple of more days to vote.

This by the way is not the same as an absentee ballot. There's a major difference in the absentee ballot and major requirements that have been established by legislature for how you use an absentee ballot. You can't just use it because you don't think you're going to be there Tuesday. You've got to fill out a little affidavit that says I will be out of the state or illness or whatever it might be. If that was the case, everybody would be
voting by absentee ballot. So it provides an alternative. It's an alternative that the legislature will have to do and it requires the approval of the people of Connecticut. That's a pretty thorough combination and it helps eliminate a real problem that we do have. We do have poll overcrowding. There's no question about it, on national elections particularly, and we need to address the problem. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark? Senate -- Senator Bizzarro.

SENATOR BIZZARRO (6TH):

Thank you, Madam. Good afternoon. Madam President, I rise this afternoon in opposition to this Bill. Madam President, as a relatively new member of this body I have had to bring myself up to speed rather quickly and for the most part I think I have adapted fairly well. One of the things however that I find incredibly frustrating about our legislative process is the sheer number of times that we are called upon to vote on something before we are permitted to see the final form of that legislation. Now I found that to be the case much to my chagrin early on in my career here as a legislator in the -- during the Committee process when I learned that it is not uncommon to be called upon to vote on Bills for the sake of moving them out of Committee with the expectation that the final language would be negotiated behind the scenes and then proceeded to us once again for another vote.
I also learned that sometimes we legislatures are permitted to vote on legislation which essentially delegates our responsibility to make important decisions that affect the residents of the state, and delegate that task to various state agencies. So that those very important decisions might be made by some unelected bureaucrats who have no accountability to the constituents and the residents and the voters of this state like we do.

And Madam President, my chief concern with this proposed Bill is that it essentially does the same thing. I understand that the mechanism is different. I understand that we are talking about amending the Constitution and therefore it's different than saying, well you know the Bill is going to be -- is going to be flushed out in further detail. We can't possibly as a proponent of the Bill, advance and articulate it so eloquently. We can't possibly account for everything in the way of this Constitution -- proposed ballot language. But details are very important. As my colleague, Senator Sampson talked about earlier; we don't know how long before election day people might be permitted to vote. We don't know how that process is going to be played out. We don't know what's going to happen to ballots that are cast prior to election day. We don't know what the cost is going to be municipalities. Now I would imagine that the many municipalities around the state that are already struggling because they lack adequate resources to handle the election process as it is are probably going to have significant concerns about how they're going to staff this sort of thing depending on how long before election day people are permitted to vote.
And all of these details Madam President, are very important. And these are going to be difficult decisions that I would imagine will call for significant debate in this circle. But the -- the constituents -- the residents of the Sixth District, the voters of the Sixth District elected me to make those types of hard decisions. They did not elect me so that I might empower our successors or somebody else to make those decisions on my behalf. And as has already been stated, the way this is drafted is so overly broad and open-ended, there are no meaningful restrictions at all. And Senator Sampson, we all understand was just trying to make a point by suggesting that a future legislature could in fact allow for voting the day after an election but I think that example drives my point home.

Madam President, I just feel that I would abdicating my responsibility to my constituents if I were to vote in favor of this Bill. And in fact, we already have early voting and that early voting is absentee voting. And I understand my good colleague, the Senator from the Fourth's point that it's not exactly the same but I would suggest that it shouldn't be. I don't see that the absentee voting process is overly burdensome. I think it's sufficiently weighty. I think, yeah, it's not the same as just walking up and saying well, I just want to vote now but it shouldn't be. There's a reason why that process is memorialized in our Constitution. And I think it affords people the right to vote in the event that they are unable to make it to the polls on election day. So for those reasons I will be opposing this and I urge -- I'll be voting no and I urge all of my colleagues to think long and hard about some of the things that I've mentioned today. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Bizzarro. Will you remark further on the Resolution before us? Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and I want to thank all of my colleagues from both sides of the proverbial aisle for weighing in today. I'm grateful for their insights and grateful for the many hours that have been poured into this legislation and the work on our Government Administrations and Elections Committee. You know many of my colleagues probably remember election day, that rainy Tuesday in November. One thing that I remember very clearly is standing outside the polling locations in every one of the seven towns that I represent and being asked by constituents as they rushed into the polling booths, why is it that they have this one Tuesday in November? Why is this their only opportunity to make their voice heard? They told me about their relatives in Texas, in West Virginia and in fact Madam President, 39 other states who had already cast their ballot in a manner that they found convenient and yet Connecticut set this high bar. And what I've come to realize over the -- what I came to realize over the course of that day and also in my ensuing work in the Government Administration and Elections Committee is that Madam President, the right to vote is rendered meaningless without the opportunity to vote. There's been a lot of conversation about the final form of early voting in Connecticut. Well the final form of this legislation can't be drafted,
finalized, debated until the restrictive and outdated language in our Constitution is finally changed. I hope to be here Madam President, at the time when we make those important decisions. I think the registrar of voters, the town clerks, democrats, republicans, non-voters and voters elect should be engaged in a conversation about how we can perfect a system of accessible and accountable democracy in Connecticut. But unfortunately as the Secretary of State has emphatically made clear in her testimony before our Committee, that conversation is simply not possible until we modernize our construct -- on Constitution and pass this Amendment.

You know, one of the things I really enjoy about being an elected official is participating in forums with the League of Women Voters. This is a non-partisan organization that regularly invites citizens and officer holders to talk about the issues, to find out what's important to our community. And something I absolutely love about the League of Women Voters is that they open every single debate and every single forum, at least in my District, at least the ones I participated in with a question about early voting. This is a group of concerned citizens who don't have any particular agenda. I don't believe the League of Women Voters care who -- particularly cares who you vote for but they care tremendously that you vote and that you have an opportunity to vote and I hope to have an answer for them at the next debate. I hope to have an answer for them at the next forum when I know this question will come up. And I hope to tell them that we acted bravely and boldly. We thought about tomorrow's voters. We thought about how we can improve our democracy. We thought about the details
but only once we've reformed the Constitution, only once we've passed this Amendment with what I hope will be bipartisan support.

You know, I'll just close Madam President by saying this Bill isn't a capital D, Democratic Bill. It's not about the Democratic party. I view this as a lower case d Democratic Bill. It's a Bill about democracy, about the fundamental question of whether you think we're better off when more people participate or when fewer people participate. It's about the promise, the fundamental promise of democracy that everybody have a seat of the table, whether you're a single working parent or commuter. Or someone who simply doesn't have time to make it to the polling booth on that one Tuesday in November. I think that the voters in my District here, gave me the tremendous honor of having a seat at this time, not so that I could make democracy smaller but instead so that I could increase and improve our Democratic process so that I could bolster the accountability that happens every Tuesday in November by expanding it and making sure that they have multiple opportunities to weigh in. So thank you Madam President, and I urge my -- I'll be voting yes and urge my colleagues to do the same.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I rise to discuss this Amendment to our State Constitution and I listen to Senator Haskell's comments with regards there to, as well the rest of the members who have
already spoken and it is clear that the one thing we want to make sure happens is that every one who wants to vote has the opportunity to vote. And it's not just about access but it's actually having the ability to not only have access but to have their vote count. Unfortunately in the town of Stratford, not only my home town but my District, at last election there was an error that occurred at the Bunnell polling place that resulted in 75 of my constituents who were disenfranchised that day. They showed up to vote on election day. They thought they cast their vote on election day only to find out they were handed the wrong ballot and as a result, not only did they have access but their vote didn't count. The election was won by less than 20 votes. So the election itself was in doubt and then candidate James Pheon took his case to the Connecticut court system. He went through the entire system and was told by the Connecticut Supreme Court that while he had serious claims the exclusive jurisdiction of elections when it comes to the General Assembly is the House of Representatives. We have statutes for every other office but not for the Connecticut State Senate, not for the Connecticut House of Representatives. That goes to the House. Since November the people of the 120th State Representative District, so it's not only the 76 people who didn't have the right to vote that day on -- last fall, but also every other person that lives in that State Senate District does not have a representative that they elected to have serve in this General Assembly.

The Supreme Court kicked the case back to the House of Representatives saying they did not have jurisdiction because the Constitution of our great state gave that to the House of Representatives, not
to the judicial system. The reason being, back when we had Kings when we came up with the Constitution, the Kings got to a point, the legislators, so it made sense that the people didn't -- the King appointed judges. The people elected Representatives. So they didn't want the King's people to be deciding the people's business. But the fact remains today, May 8 when the session started in January that we haven't seated a proper state Representative shows that the current system doesn't work and that something needs to change with the State Constitution to make sure that people get the right to vote.

To that end Madam President, the Clerk has in his procession LCO No. 8155. Can he -- can he call the Amendment and have a vote by roll call?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, if you would please call the Amendment and it is so noted that when there is a vote on this Amendment it will be by roll. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8155, Senate Schedule B.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. This is pretty simple. What it would do is it would amend the Resolution -- oh, thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of
the Amendment and waive the reading and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. So the question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Please proceed. Will you remark?

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. The Amendment is fairly simple. What this will do is it will amend the Connecticut General Assembly so that in the event there is an issue and a contested election that with regards to Senate and House elections, that the Connecticut Court System can handle that and make sure that the people's right to be heard, to be represented in this General Assembly happens expeditiously because that's not what's happening currently, and I urge adoption. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Fasano, please remark on the Amendment.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I stand to support, excuse me, the Amendment -- the Amendment to the Resolution. Madam President, a few issues. First, let's be clear. That election took place in November of 2018. We are now in May of 2019 without a Resolution in the House relative to a seat in this General Assembly. It is clear as Senator Kelly said, that the claims are serious and
unexpectedly we have to kick the wall to the General Assembly. That's what our Constitution provides. And as we sit here today it's not resolved. When you talk about disenfranchising people who went to the polls, over 5,000 people believe they were not heard. Over 5,000 people believe their vote did not matter because of a clerical error that denied them the right for their vote to count. How could you not see given where we are that this Amendment would say we don't play politics with people's votes. And so you say, Senator Fasano, why do you say politics? Why do you say that's the issue? So let's say why we say that's the issue. This is what was said in the House of Representatives when the issue came up of the House determining whether or not 5,000 people's votes matter and whether or not we take serious the elections that we all stand up and support. The courts legally trained, and I would suggest probably far more disciplined as a result, they are not in part, they are not political, they're impartial and they're distance from the decisions that we are making. None of those things apply to us. We are a body that valued for being passionate and sometimes parochial. We are a political body elected every two year cycles. We organize ourselves by a political party. That is an admission that in reviewing this very case before this body downstairs it was, we're not going to make this decision this passionate. We're not going to make this decision based upon impartiality. We're going to make this decision based upon politics. So everyone who voted in that machine, your vote is subject to our political will.

Are you kidding me? That's what our Constitution is standing for? That we're going to make decisions in
political will, not facts before you? 76 people got the wrong ballot. Not a question of fact. Not a question that those votes could have turned the election. The 5,000 people who went out to vote, their votes don't count because those 76 could have converted a lower to a winner in an election. The answer is do a re-election in that area. There's no Resolution in the House. Now maybe it's because if they lose that seat they lose the three-fifths and that's a bit number to lose. You lose a lot of rights you dip below that number. Maybe that's the reason for the foot drag; I don't know. But what I do know is that those who speak about protecting votes, those who speak about not disenfranchising the voters, those who speak and say every vote counts and we need people to vote, now is the time and stand we really mean it. It's not about politics. Now is the time to take this Amendment and say, let's change the law. Let's put it in parcel. Maybe some folks will remember there was a time that this Chamber was even. And there was a time that this Chamber was Republican. And you were -- and you were subject to the whims of the majority. Because it is the whims of the majority and the will of the majority in the House that will say, we aren't going to touch this election until sometimes in the future if ever. By the way, there is nothing you can do about it because Supreme Court says it's in your court. You can't bring an injunction. You can't bring a Mandamus. You can do nothing. That's justice? That's protecting the right to vote. That's a clear example of disenfranchise. So Madam President, if we want to protect, if we want to protect the vote and we want to make sure it's done impartial I would argue this is the time, this is the place, this is the
Amendment. Madam President, it's good to see you up there and thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would urge my colleagues to reject the Amendment before us. I think I can speak for most of the members of the Government Administration Elections Committee that we would be happy to debate some of the issues that have come up with regard to the Amendment before us in our Committee and try to build consensus on the issues that arise when you look at this Amendment. But I would encourage my colleagues to reject this Amendment because acceptance of this Amendment would threaten our ability to focus on the underlying Resolution to allow for early voting and getting a pass of the threshold that would allow for the people of Connecticut to vote on this in 2020; and so for that reason I urge my colleagues to reject Senate Amendment B. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further -- oh, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):
Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this Amendment because of a former ranking member and JE in the House we've heard so much about voter integrity. We hear about it the rest of this debate I'm sure. But the reality was, voters weren't respected in Stratford during the 2018 election. There were voters that were disenfranchised; we've heard that quite often as well. Real voters disenfranchised because they weren't allowed to vote for the right people that they wanted to. Where is the justice for people in Stratford?

And I think we got caught up in the House in addressing that it is not part of the Constitutional change but this Amendment drafts it to accommodate that there will be justice served in the judicial court system and that we will maintain the integrity of the vote. So I rise in very strong support of this, and remember, in not supporting this I would ask that you think twice the next time you use the word voter integrity, disenfranchisement. Because what you in doing so will disenfranchise the voters of Stratford.

In saying that, I also wanted to address the fact that indeed as the proponent of this Bill raised earlier, that this issue was not raised in the GAE Committee. Again, having served in the GAE Committee and having great respect for the jurisdictions of that Committee, I believe it was indeed raised in the GAE Committee this year by House Representative Vincent Candelora in addressing this exact concern. But again, we have a way of convenience. We talk again using the word voter integrity, disenfranchisement, but we have not offered a solution for those people that were denied
an opportunity to vote. It is clearly stated as a fact and we have to this day not resolved that. This Amendment would move this forward because every single vote that's impacted by Representative that sits in that seat because voters were disenfranchised, because the voter integrity was sacrificed gets to the core of what we're talking about in regards to the early voting and issues related to election law. So again, I urge support of this Amendment because at the end of the day, it is about the sanctity of the vote. The one person, one vote that we so value in this circle and in Stratford, that was not served. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the Amendment because first, I don't think that one controversial case should result in a fundamental change in our process that would I think upset the balance of powers between executive -- well, in this case between the legislative and judicial branches of government. This really is a serious separation of powers issue. I think it would be a dangerous thing with unforeseen consequences to give the judicial system of this state authority to seat or not seat members of the General Assembly. I think that would be far reaching in ways that we could not even predict today, very dangerous departure from what has been our long tradition and I think that that respect for
our own branch of government should dictate to all of us to vote down this Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, Mr. Clerk if you would please announce the tally and the machine will be open. Sorry, the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. LCO 8155, Senate Amendment B. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? If so, the machine will be closed and the clerk will now announce the tally.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8155, Senate Amendment B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number Voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Voting Yea</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Voting Nay</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:
THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) Amendment fails. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I'm so disappointed that the disenfranchisement of 76 voters didn't carry the day. This Bill or this Resolution is reportedly about trying to make the electoral process more available to more people. But when it comes to my town and my constituents, well there's not only no early voting, there's no day of voting, there's no voting for seven or eight months and that just range hallow. The -- it didn't carry the day. I heard that this should have gone through GAE. It did. It was referred to GAE. It didn't even get a public hearing. People lost their vote and it didn't even get a public hearing. I heard somebody else talk about, oh confusion. I'll tell you what's been confusion and what I heard on election day about the lock box. That the lock box can be intercepted. People thought they were voting on a lock box that the minute it was going to be imposed was at the pocket and it would go right to the -- to the lock box and be used for transportation purposes but then they find out, oh wait a minute it wasn't drafted that way and it can be intercepted by the General Assembly, which raises my concern on the underlying Resolution that it's not properly drafted. We want to change the Constitution which is the document, the people's will and we aren't even going to say what we're going to do.

Now reasonable minds can fall down on different sides of this issue and I recognize that because
making voters -- making the ability to vote more accessible, I see that and I want that. But representing 76 people who lost their opportunity to vote and now 20-25,000 of my constituents don't have a dually and properly-elected State Representative to represent them in the House of Representatives is a problem from my perspective. I don't care how you slice it or dice it, separation of powers aside. It's not working. And the people have a right to fix that. But that's not going to be put to the people. That's not the Constitutional change that we're going to do. As a matter of fact, it doesn't even get a hearing in this building and I have a problem with that. And then what we're going to do is put an Amendment on the Constitution that's going to bring it back to politicians as if we're getting this one right -- now getting it right, and we're not.

This is just so sad. So sad that we talk about giving people the right to vote, we talk about democracy in a small d but the question I beg is, do we really mean it? Because if we really meant that then our conduct would match our language. Our conduct would have said, let's protect those 76 Stratford voters. They would have done something about it in January. Didn't happen. Didn't happen then, hasn't happened now. The conduct is what I find troubling. The conduct is what's disturbing. And now you're asking me as the Senator for these individuals to say, oh that's okay. We're going to trust you on the conduct of early voting. Well there are problems with early voting. We see that time and time again in the area of absentee ballots. We see it all the time. I could get my head around a situation where you give people with an ID to show up and to vote and to give them a
bigger and better opportunity to exercise that vote as long as the integrity of the vote is protected, the integrity. But where's the conduct on the integrity of the 120th state Representative election? Not here. Not under this dome. So I find it very hard while I want to give more people the opportunity to exercise the vote, I'm troubled by the lack of clarity in the Resolution, the lack of detail and the conduct, the conduct of the General Assembly now in dealing with a problem that my constituents face. For those reasons, Madam President I urge this Resolution be rejected.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the Resolution? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

I would like to just make a few remarks on the underlying Bill. And I think it's important in this circle that we can all agree that we want to do everything that we can to encourage -- that we have civil participation and ease of participation in our democratic process. I think that all of us can agree to that. I think it's also important and I think we can all agree that we would all also to preserve and protect our Constitution and that our citizens have confidence in our election process. I'm just going to share with you, I have not gotten one call from my District or even outside of my District from anyone who indicated that they did not have access or the ability to vote in various
elections that we've had, not one. We have same-day registration in the State of Connecticut. You can register and you can vote by absentee 45 days in advance of our election. But one of my issues that I've had in reviewing the language is that it's not concrete, it doesn't seem to have a solid plan. Everything is sort of left up to the future. Legislation which really in essence leaves it up to whoever is in the majority at that point. And for years, the state has fallen short in protecting our election process I feel. We've had -- we've just heard from Senator Kelly. We've had absentee voter fraud. We've had people voting multiple times. We've had obviously issues in counting votes.

Something that I would like to share with you is that two weeks ago, and I can get this to everybody; the Census Bureau released a report on voter turnout in 2018, so a year ago. And guess what? It climbed 11 points from the last midterm in 2014. And it surpassed 50 percent for the first time since 1982. So decades. And the increase was driven by minorities. African Americans turned out 27 percent higher than they had, and Hispanic and Latino voters turned out 50 percent higher so that tells us that voters are not feeling suppressed. I've heard a lot of language like suppressed or disenfranchised and I started to think you know, have people in Connecticut felt that way since we had our first election in 1788? I don't think so. I have heard from my town clerks and my register of voters that they don't want early voting. They are concerned about how they're going to handle it. About the cost to the municipalities and the unfunded mandates. And right now we don't have a problem. Anyone who wants to vote, you have same-day registration. You have an availability to vote 45
days if you're not going to be in town, early by absentee votes. And we had this conversation in 2013. There was an Amendment on the ballot that allowed the citizens of Connecticut to vote on whether they wanted to change the Connecticut Constitution to have early voting and they said no. They said no just a few years ago.

When we talked in our caucus about the conversation that the Secretary of State had it was clear that the Bill would in essence -- you know, in essence allow the majority party, again whoever that is at the time, to have total authority over how this would be implemented. They would be able to decide what elections have early voting; what elections don't have early voting. Are we going to have legitimate polling places or are we not going to use our current polling places? They could decide to put a polling location in a library. They could decide to put it at a nursing home, at a college, at a union hall. We have no say in that what-so-ever. Whoever is in the majority would have that distinction.

We were also told that the Secretary of State does not actually want to use our solid polling places because of the requirements for handicap accessibility, security and the things that go along with a secure election. That gives me great pause. What it is going to look like? How's it going to be implemented? How's it going to be secured? Are our voting booths going to be secured? Is the ballot going to be sequestered? We don't have any of those answers and I understand that this is the beginning but it's hard for us to want to vote on something that's not complete. That seems to be a current theme in this particular session; incomplete.
documents that we are asked to vote on. So my question is, should we really be changing the Connecticut Constitution for early voting when we really do have it right now? Same-day registration. If you look at the data, which is probably counterintuitive than everyone is thinking here, early voting has not proven to expand or encourage an increase in voting. All it has done or shown in the states that have it, is that people vote in a different way. What really changes the amount of people that come out is same-day registration and we have that here in the State of Connecticut. So I would urge people to think long and hard about the change here and what it means for the vote. We've had issues as I've said in the past with us as a state running elections that have run smoothly. I would really like us to consider having a decade of smooth and -- elections that can prove confident for our citizens before we move to yet another change in the way that we vote and also think about -- your ability to vote is your right as a citizen. There's nothing in here that says that we have to hand it to you on a silver platter. Voting for me is something that we -- there's not one person in here that doesn't know when election day is. All I here from constituents and people in town is, oh my God I can't wait 'till it's over. Stop with your flyers and this and that. Everybody knows when election day and I encourage everyone to register and vote on that day or vote early by absentee ballot. Or if you're not registered register to vote on same-day registration and you can vote. There is no suppression. There is no disenfranchised voters. You have every opportunity in this state to vote. It's up to you. So I want to have people really consider this before they make their vote here today. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further? Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to comment on the underlying Bill. The State of Connecticut's Constitution is a well thought out special document. This proposed Resolution looks to change that by making a broad change to our state Constitution. This Resolution will give lawmakers the ability to use political power to meddle with the current Constitutional protections that we have. This Resolution could open up our voting system to more potential fraud and disenfranchise the current system. In addition we already have early voting. If someone cannot make it to the polls on election day, they can still vote via absentee ballot. I do not believe that expanding early voting beyond our current system is necessary. It is easier now, easier than ever before to vote here in Connecticut. I do not believe that expanding early voting beyond our current system will improve voter turnout. I do not believe it will improve voter turnout in any significant way. I've looked. I've tried to find data in other parts of the country, it just doesn't seem to be there. So for these reasons, I will be voting no on House Joint Resolution 161. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Logan. Will you remark further on the Resolution? Will you remark further on the Resolution? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I recall back in 2013 there was a similar proposal, Resolution before this body to consider changes to our voting laws and I was supportive of the measure at that time. I always believe that direct democracy to our citizens would provide the best course of action and direction as where we should be and in 2014 that ballot was -- the question was placed on the ballot and was rejected by the majority of the citizens in the State of Connecticut. They believe that we should continue with the provisions in our Constitution as it pertains to voting and not allow the General Assembly to seek leave from that to make accommodations that we felt by simple majority would be the direction and way that we should go. And so today -- and I also supported that back in 2013 because we had just had -- missed the opportunity of having a Constitutional Convention in our state because the citizens in the State of Connecticut also rejected the idea of allowing electors to come together and contemplate changes to our Constitution so I felt it would be another seven years before that question was before us again, so why not put this directly out to the citizens. But in this case, next year on the ballot will be the question, shall Connecticut have the Constitutional Convention and I believe that is the appropriate time where electors could participate in democracy and have discussion and debate whether or not we change our Constitution to do a variety of things. Whether they want election reform, whether they want direct
referendum, do they want recall? All those initiatives that we constantly hear about on a yearly basis while we're in session. About why can't you do this, why can't you do that or why can't we do that? All those questions could be answered in a Constitutional Convention. So folks will have the opportunity in 2020 to answer that.

But this year I'm a little concerned and I base it on all the issues that many of my colleagues before have expressed and those are issues at the ballot box or at the polling locations. Whether they are running out of ballots, whether a court injunction is ceased at the last minute to maintain the opening of a ballot in a specific town for two hours but no other location, whether the registrar doesn't have the checkoff list prepared in the morning; and it seems every single election something is happening that causes the question, what is happening? Why are we not prepared? In every single session after something happens we pass a law that says well, we just passed a law that will make sure that this doesn't happen again but then something else happens. And it seems to be moving along to different locations where there are issues.

I actually asked the staff today, over the past couple of days to do an analysis for me because we talk about voter suppression and our young people wanted to get engaged in voting. And we always think that the local level has the most impact for young people because that is the level where taxes are levied upon you and serviced provided by your local municipality. And so I happened to pick out of two cities if you will, or two locations where our higher education places are located and these are issues that -- the reason why I picked these two
to be honest with you are because it seems that I saw in the news on election night, buses transported students that hadn't registered to vote; that multiple pizzas were ready for them when they arrived. And this is an hour before the polls were due to close so they could get in line to vote and that disturbed me, Madam President. That somebody that was so concerned about voting in our statewide elections didn't have enough knowledge or forethought to make sure that they had to get to a polling location one hour before closure. But yet it seems to be coordinated when there was over a dozen pizzas ready for them waiting in line. So I chose the communities of New Haven and Mansfield and in 2018 for out state government election 32 percent of the citizens age 17 to 25 voted. But the year before in the municipal election, 4.7 percent. And then in Mansfield 39.65 percent voted in the Gubernatorial election. But the year before that in the municipal election, 4.69. And some folks may say well, you know it does drop off at the municipal election but let's compare the Gubernatorial election of 2018 to the Gubernatorial election of 2014. In New Haven it was a 32 percent as I said, turnout for ages 17 to 25. But in 2014 it was 10.2 percent turnout. They didn't make the news that year in 2014 with bus loads of students arriving at the polls an hour before they were set to close. In fact I don't believe there was an issue in New Haven in 2014. And in Mansfield in 2018 to remind everyone, ages 17 to 25 showed up with a 39.65 percent voting rate. But in Gubernatorial year 2014 that number dropped to 4.33 percent. To me that draws concern. If the young people of our state are that interested in voting, how do you have that much of a range from 4.33 percent to 39.65 percent? Something is going on there. I'm glad to see our
numbers of participation in our elections but it concerns me that it's done at the very last minute and it's always done, there's problems abound. And what further concerns me, are there several other Bills being contemplated by this legislature specifically to voting. We talked about absentee voting. Well here's one -- currently you have to go to your town clerk's office to pick up an absentee ballot. This one says you can apply on line to the Secretary of State's office and have one mailed to you and then you mail it back to the Secretary of State's office and the Secretary of State will mail it to your municipality. Every time you're adding more bureaucracy, it allows more opportunity for mistakes and fraud.

Another example that's being debated before this body will be the requirement that the -- the checker in the polling location has to shout as loud as they can so the unofficial checker can hear the voter ID. Can you imagine if you have multiple checkers in one polling location? The acoustics are bad enough in that room. The confusion that would be created by multiple people yelling out voter ID numbers so somebody on the opposite side of the room can hear what they have to say?

A requirement that makes your employer give you at least, at least four hours off from work to go vote. These are some of the Bills that are being contemplated before this body. A Bill that requires a polling location, if it includes a higher education institution to be located within 500 feet of that institution. So now we want to tell municipalities where you're going to have your polling location. Automatic registration. Now if you enroll in a higher education institution in the
State of Connecticut you will automatically be registered unless you opt out. So imagine a student from out of state or out of this country, a foreign student coming into the University of Connecticut or to Quinnipiac or University of New Haven, one of our fine institutions of higher education; unless they opt out they are automatically put in to vote. And the Bill analysis says that they're not sure that they have to verify their eligibility before they're admitted into the voting process. That is fraud right there. We're not even going to be putting in the requirement that you're verified before you get to vote. You're automatically put in and maybe we'll verify afterwards.

So many of my colleagues spoke about the sanctity and the integrity of the ballot box. Just a few examples that I've given today should bring grave concern. I think what we have in our Constitution at this time is sufficient. I have not heard from one individual that says they haven't had the ability to vote in the State of Connecticut because we hold election day on one day. In fact, I heard the Secretary of State on the radio this morning when she was asked about absentee balloting, the answer was well, we don't have an absentee ballot police so people can really go down there and say that they're out of town and not able to vote for the four excuses that we give and get an absentee ballot. And I spoke to my town clerk, one of my towns, and she said every single year it's the same people that come forward and request an absentee ballot. And then they ask me, well when is election day again? So they're saying they're not even available but they don't even know when election day is. I'm not so sure that the town clerks all know what's contained within the provision of this Bill
or this Resolution because it requires now the individual to go to the town clerk, not the registrar of voters, and they must vote there in person. Many of the Town Halls that I represent have a little counter or a little slide-through window to pass something through. How can there be integrity and privacy to vote if you have to vote in front of your town clerk with somebody standing right next to you with the ability to vote -- but you don't have any other place to go because it's often some of the small communities that I represent, are very small Town Halls. They just don't have the room. And you can't let somebody walk away, that has to be done in front of the town clerk. So there's many, many issues. I think what we have works and I would urge rejection of the Resolution before us today. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would like to mark this Bill as PT and if we could stand at ease for a moment, please?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. We -- the Chamber will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I have a number of items to mark go.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar page 56, Calendar 70, Senate Bill 811, go. On Calendar page 10, Calendar 106, Senate Bill 1028, go. On Calendar page 14, Calendar 142, Senate Bill 854, go. On Calendar page 15, Calendar 150, Senate Bill 935, go. On Calendar page 19, Calendar 185, Senate Bill 1020, go. On Calendar page 33, Calendar 307, Senate Bill 1063, go. On Calendar page 36, Calendar 335, Senate Bill 1038, go. On Calendar page 27, Calendar 247, Senate Bill 1052, go. On Calendar page 17, Calendar 171, Senate Bill 974, go. On Calendar page 56, Calendar 104, Senate Bill 951, go. On Calendar page 60, Calendar 132, Senate Joint Resolution 3, go. On Calendar page 44, Senate Bill -- I'm sorry, on Calendar page 44, Calendar 395, Senate Bill 1088, go. On Calendar page 4, Calendar 52, Senate Bill 807, go. On Calendar page 4, Calendar 53, Senate Bill 815, go. On Calendar page 15, Senate Bill 156 -- I'm sorry, Calendar 156, Senate Bill 607, go. On Calendar page 57, Calendar 176, Senate Bill 356, go. Calendar page 23, Calendar 220, Senate Bill 549, go.

Thank you, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. So ordered. Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call the business?
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of this Bill.

Will you remark? The question is on passage.

Thank you, Madam President. This is a Bill to reduce computer crimes against financial institutions and their customers. The rise of computer crimes is -- has been noted by the industry and poses a severe threat to the privacy and the finances of many people in the state. This is a Bill that would increase the penalty for such crimes which would safeguard consumers and financial institutions.
Thank you, Senator Bergstein. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further? Senator Bergstein.

SENATOR BERGSTEIN (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move to move this Bill to the Consent Calendar please.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR BERGSTEIN (6TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk would you please call the next item of business?

CLERK:

Page 10, Calendar No. 107, Senate Bill No. 1028, AN ACT CONCERNING CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS INCORPORATED AND PRIVATE EQUITY INVESTMENT.

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease for a moment.

Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Mr. President. Good to see you up there today.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Mr. President, we're going to PT the next two Commerce Bills, Calendar page 10, Calendar 1077, Senate Bill 1028 and Calendar page 14, Calendar 142, Senate Bill 854. If we can go -- if the Clerk can please call the next two Education Committee Bills? Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 15, Calendar 150, Substitute for Senate Bill 935, AN ACT REQUIRING THE OFFICE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD TO DEVELOP A PROPOSED EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATOR COMPENSATION SCHEDULE. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory, the distinguished Chair of the Education Committee.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Well thank you there, young man. Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark?

SENATOR MCCORORY (2ND):

Yes. Mr. President, this Bill requires the Office of Early Childhood to develop an early childhood compensation schedule and for early childhood -- childhood program providers to implement such a compensation schedule. Mr. President, I have -- I'm sorry, there's an Amendment attached to this Bill also. I'm sorry, the Amendment is L -- Amendment LCO 7783.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7783, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCORORY (2ND):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, in line 40 strikes --

THE CHAIR:

If you would just move the Amendment first?
SENATOR MCCRARY (2ND):

Yes.

THE CHAIR:

So moved now, would you remark?

SENATOR MCCRARY (2ND):

Yes, thank you Mr. President. In President, line 40 we're wanting to change the date -- the start date of this comprehensive schedule from 2020 and insert the date of 2021.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, all in favor please indicate by saying Aye.

ALL:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRARY (2ND):

Yes, Mr. President. If there's no objection I would ask that this Bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. There has been a motion to place the Bill on the Consent Calendar. Is there objection? Is there objection? Hearing none, it's so ordered.

SENATOR MCCORY (2ND):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 19, Calendar No. 185, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1020, AN ACT CONCERNING THE INCLUSION OF INSTRUCTION IN CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE PEDAGOGY AND PRACTICE IN THE PRESERVICE TRAINING, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROVIDED TO TEACHERS.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRY (2ND):

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

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator. The Bill has been moved. Will you remark? Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Yes, Mr. President. This Bill changes the term cultural competency to cultural responsive pedagogy and practice and is asked cultural responsive pedagogy and practice teacher development and in-service training. This is -- this is not anticipated to result in any fiscal impact on our budget and it's very important that we move and change the language of what we're doing with our pre-service teachers and be more in tune to what we are doing in our classrooms in regards to providing a cultural responsive pedagogy in our educational system. Mr. President, if -- at this point Mr. President, I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The Bill has been moved and discussed. Is there additional comment on the Bill? Will you remark further? Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of the Bill and I think it's an important in language for us to be undertaking at this point and I urge support. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, Senator McCrory.
SENATOR MCCORY (2ND):

Yes, Mr. President. If there's no objection I would ask that this Bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The Bill has been moved for placement on the Consent Calendar. Is there objection to placing the item on the Consent Calendar? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

SENATOR MCCORY (2ND):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. If the Senate could stand at ease for a moment, please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, the Clerk can go back to the call of the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Duff. If the Clerk will please return to the call of the Calendar?

CLERK:

Page 33, Calendar No. 307, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1063, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO IMPROVE FARMLAND AVAILABILITY FOR BEGINNING FARMERS.

THE CHAIR:

The Chair recognizes the distinguished Chair of the Environment Committee, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. This Bill would establish a task force to study issues related to the access of farmland not only for new and beginning farmers but for those in non-traditional farm areas. Recent report told us that 92 percent of Connecticut farmers and they say elder farmers, which I was -- I'm pleased to report is under the age of 45 (laughing) -- or I'm sorry, over the age of 45. Right, right. Are not working with a younger farmer on staff. So there is a great
concern that our farmers are going to go by the wayside and we want to address this issue and certainly bring farmland access to those areas that are again non-traditional farming areas such as more urban and suburban -- other suburban areas of the state.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further on the Bill. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I too rise in support of the Bill. We heard from a number of individuals, young and old that had expressed a concern that while they had taken in some cases extraordinary time to become educated in agriculture they had in some cases found agriculture as a second opportunity for employment. It wasn't their primary. They may have taken a job in an office somewhere and found out it just wasn't -- wasn't their cup of tea. But none the less they've developed a vocation and really were having some difficulties taking it to the next step. We heard from people that spoke about being enthusiastically supportive of agriculture, not necessarily in a grandiose way. There certainly were opportunities that we heard about where people could make a living, make a good living, yet trying to pay for capital, whether it's equipment or land was a problem.

And so Mr. President, one of the benefits I think of having a task force look at all of these issues is that they can come back and help us try and address things like capital. How is it possible to get a
loan? They can address -- help us address issues like land. What kind of arrangements can be made to secure property for the long haul, some of the investments that need to be made when we talk to people that are in the beer industry and want to raise hops. Those are not short-term investments. Vineyards are not short-term investments. Making maple syrup is not a short-term investment. And so in all those cases, Mr. President we heard that there were impediments and so I think the value of this task force is that it will help people interested in farming. Not traditional farmers where is a piece of property is passed down amongst generations, make it possible for them to enter into agriculture. So I again am very supportive of the Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in strong support of the Bill before us. You know when I saw the title I researched and the first thing that came to my mind was FFA. And if you've ever had the opportunity or you haven't had the opportunity to speak to some students that are involved with me through the FFA Program, I'd urge you to do so. These kids take farming to heart, to mind and to soul. They are so into their craft and the CSAs that they perform. They are so well spoken. They are so knowledgeable. They could run circles around probably every single person around this circle with the things that they are involved in in that
program. And I think this is one way that we can look at making sure that those avenues remain existing for them and provide maybe new avenues to them and opportunities that may not be available to them now, so I'd urge the Chamber's adoption as well. And I want to thank all the -- the members of the Environment Committee for bringing the Bill forward. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further? Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Good evening, Mr. President. I first want to say thank you to the Chairs of the Environment for supporting this Bill and bringing it to the vote today to the floor and I'm in full support of this Bill. For the last 15-20 years I've looking -- been looking at access to food in Connecticut and it's brought me to many farmers who have been involved on a small scale working in community gardens with young people that have grown into wanting to have their own farmland. I've traveled all of the New England states talking to farmers and been a part of a lot of the activities and heard the barriers that young people have that want to do farming, have acc -- don't have the access to the land, but also don't have access to resources or finances to start a farm or to do any type of farming so I think this is an opportunity for us to identify places like farm -- farm -- farm businesses but also to encourage young people that this is another avenue that they can take. There are places like Farmland Credit who
will support some of these initiatives that come up but I think it's -- what's really important here is we have the opportunity to do this -- look deep to see what's available and how we can support them. So I support this and I say thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further? Yes, Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in support of the Bill as well. I think it's just important to call out a couple of good economic numbers with respect to farming in Connecticut. You know, in 2017 the University of Connecticut found that the agricultural industry in Connecticut had an output of $4.0 billion, $4 billion and dollars and created 21,696 jobs. So when we look at farming in Connecticut, this is a huge part of our economy. It's actually -- it generates more jobs per million dollars of sales than nearly any other sector in the rest of the state economy. We have an obligation I think to ensure through the legislature that we are supporting young farmers as the good Chair spoke to. The average age of farmers is 58 in Connecticut with most of them, a large majority of them retiring in the next two decades. So you know, there's a sticker that many of us have in our offices and we've seen throughout the building that says, no farms, no food and it's very true. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further? If not, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to thank my good colleagues for standing in support of the Bill and also say special thanks to Senator Moore for really championing this effort, particularly for our more urban communities. So Mr. President, if there's no objection I move to place this item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. The matter has been moved for placement on the Consent Calendar. Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing none, it is so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 36, Calendar No. 335, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1038, AN ACT CONCERNING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DUE TO AN EMPLOYER OTHER THAN THE STATE UNDER THE STATE CODE OF ETHICS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer, the distinguished Chair of the Government Administration and Elections Committee.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good evening, Mr. President.
THE CHAIR:

Good evening.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, the Bill before us today would apply our current ethics law or current ethics code concerning substantial conflicts of interest to the outside employment of public officials and state employees and their spouses. A Bill like this has passed the State Senate twice unanimously in the last two years and I would hope that my colleagues would support this Bill this evening. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I just want to get up briefly and speak in favor of the legislation before us. This Bill comes to us from the Office of
State Ethics. I think it is a good update to our public policy in this area and I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If I could, just a question to the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please propose your question, Senator and Senator Flexer be prepared for the question. Thank you.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Often times things that come to our attention are a geneses of something that actually happened out there and we're trying to correct a wrong. Was there a perceived wrong doing that our -- our current statutes don't prevent and that's why this is before us or should we give an example because there's a lot of stuff in there and I just want to make sure I'm very aware of what is taking place in the Bill. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Senator Flexer, do you care to respond?
SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Through you, Mr. President, I am responding. The Bill that is before us has been proposed by the Office of State Ethics for the last several years. The Office of State Ethics is always looking at our statutes and trying to see how we can improve upon and strengthen our laws with regard to ethics, particularly in the area of public officials and state employees who have to abide by our existing code of ethics. I believe that this idea has come to us from the Office of State Ethics in an effort to strengthen the provisions that are currently in our statutes to ensure that if there are any conflicts of interest that may arise with a public official and a state -- state employee who has to abide by our existing state code of ethics that they -- that that conflict that may arise due to their outside employment, their non-state employment or the employment of their spouse would have to be disclosed. I believe this is a good measure to make sure that we can have confidence in the decision making and the ethics of these state employees and public officials who are affected by this. I'm grateful to the Office of State Ethics for their continued work looking at our statutes to make sure we have the strongest and most ethical laws that we can and I'm hopeful again that my colleagues will support this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Senator Witkos you have the floor.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):
Thank you, Mr. President. I -- I'm not opposed to the Bill. I just didn't know if during the public hearing they gave an example to the Government Administrative and Elections Committee about why the need for the Bill. I understand they are constantly reviewing our statutes and offering changes but that's all I was looking for. I -- I'll go on the website and look for public hearing testimony to see if there's anything in there. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, Senator Flexer. Oh, Senator Daugherty-Abrams. No? All right. Anyone else? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, Senator Flexer. I guess we may need -- okay, we will proceed to a roll call vote on this Bill. Mr. Clerk, I think we should -- if we might -- Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm not objecting to moving it to the Consent Calendar. I was just asking for a question for my own cognoscente about the Bill. I have no objections if that's why the good gentleman was asking for a roll call, but I have -- I have no objection to putting it on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Flexer.
SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. After that clarification I wanted to make sure the good Senator had the opportunity to read the public hearing testimony so he could make his decision, but since he's made those comments I would suggest that we place this Bill on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The Bill has been moved for placement on the Consent Calendar. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 27, Calendar No. 247, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1052. AN ACT EXPANDING MEDICAID COVERAGE OF TELEHEALTH SERVICES. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease for a moment. Senate will come back to order. Senate will come back to order. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

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

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator. The Bill has been moved. Will you remark? Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Yes. Mr. President, the Clerk is in possession of a strike-all Amendment, LCO. 7555. Please call -- I ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7555, Senate Schedule A.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you. I move adoption of the Amendment, waive its reading and seek leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. The Amendment has been moved. Will you remark?

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you. The Amendment gives the Commissioner of DSS authority to implement procedures necessary to carry out the provisions of the Bill while adopting the policies and procedures as regulations, provided notice of intent to adopt the regulations published in accordance with the provisions in Section 17b-a. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. Will you remark further on the -- yes, Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of the Amendment. I think it's important for us as a state to do what we can to utilize technology to improve the healthcare service that we can provide to our citizens here in the State of Connecticut and I urge my colleagues to approve the Amendment as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Logan. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Lesser. (Laughing) Okay, all right. Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, I will try your minds on the Amendment. All in favor please indicate by saying Aye.

ALL:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. President. This Bill requires the Department of Social Service Commission to expand
Medicaid coverage of telehealth services and provide statewide coverage by July 2020 with a phase in for certain types of coverage beginning 2019. And the Bill repeals and replaces the current Medicaid telehealth provisions, which among other things requires DSS to provide telehealth coverage within available state and federal resources.

I ask that my colleagues support this, both the Amendment and the passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank Senator Moore and Senator Logan for bringing the Bill before us. I've always been a strong proponent of telehealth and not only do I believe that this provides more accessibility but at a cheaper rate and a more convenience factor, but the department has to report back to us on how much actual savings was done and what area the states have utilized the telehealth services. And it's only from factual data that we can make these decisions and I think it's going to prove out that this is a good policy for the State of Connecticut so I would urge the Chamber's adoption as well. And again, thank you to Senator Moore and Senator Logan for their work on this Bill.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further? Senator Moore?

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Mr. President, if there's no objection I ask that this be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. A motion has been made to place this item on the Consent Calendar. Is there objection to that motion? Hearing none it is so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 17, Calendar No. 171, Senate Bill No. 974, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY METHODS OF DEVELOPING, EXPANDING AND IMPROVING THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY WORKFORCE IN THIS STATE.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Chair recognizes Senator Lesser, the distinguished Chair of the Insurance and Real Estate Committee.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Good evening, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator. The Bill has been moved. Will you remark? Senator Lesser?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you Mr. President. Mr. President, this Bill is designed to set up a tax force to develop and study strategies, to develop, expand and improve the insurance industries workforce in Connecticut. It is a robust task force that includes a variety of stakeholders and I particularly wanted to note the presence of our state's higher education institutions is a key component of that. There has been some work to date. There's some important colleges in greater Hartford that are working with the industry right now to strengthen the insurance workforce needs, but there -- we think there is more work that can be done. And specifically we're looking here at the impact of student debt and potential models such as sharing agreements that could allow students to graduate and take jobs in the insurance industry without accruing debt. Mr. President, I urge all my colleagues to support this and I do want to give a special shout out to some of our bipartisan partners who have worked with us in support of this worthwhile goal.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you very much, Mr. President and I also rise in support of this Bill. As Senator Lesser said this is a -- a very important component to growing
jobs that we know exist in one of our flagship industries here in the State of Connecticut. These are very good paying jobs, they're skilled jobs. It's a request that came from the industry itself because they know that going forward into the future that this is an industry that is place that -- Connecticut can grow jobs. So I thank Chairman Lesser for bringing this Bill forward from the Insurance Committee and I urge the body's support. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. If I may, just a question to the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed with your question, Senator.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I quickly scanned the Bill and I see that we're looking at all the appointments and I only saw one appointment that deals with insurance and that's the Insurance Commission, and for just -- for legislative intent, I notice that all the leaders have appointments, again for legislative intent; would the -- would it be anticipated that the leaders of the General Assembly would appoint people from the industry --
the private industry that we're -- the Bill's looking to work with? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser, will you respond?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, and thank you and through you, Mr. President. Absolutely although we did receive a request not to designate specific participants in the tax force. It's my expectation and my hope that the leaders specified here would designate leaders from the insurance industry to serve on the task force because they have the expertise in the industry and then they would be able to make it work. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Witkos, you have the floor.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank Senator Lesser and Senator Kelly and all those on the Insurance Committee. I think this is a worthwhile goal to begin to look at ways that we can improve our industry and also free students of their student debt and I would urge the Chamber's adoption. Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you Mr. President. Mr. President I do want to just speak briefly. I want to thank Senator Kelly in particular for his passion for developing the Insurance Workforce needs in the state. I know that this is something that he's been interested in now for several years and if there is no objection, I'd like to ask that this item be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The Senator has moved to place this item on the Consent Calendar. Is there objection to that motion? Seeing none, it is so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 56, Calendar No. 104, Senate Bill No. 951. AN ACT CONCERNING VETERAN ENROLLMENT IN CERTAIN ALTERNATE ROUTE TO CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):
Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The Bill has moved. Will you remark?

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Mr. President, the Clerk is in procession of LCO Amendment No. 7891. I move the Amendment and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Amendment has been moved. Will you proceed with summarization, Senator? Oh yes, Mr. Clerk if you would call the Amendment, Senate Amendment Schedule A.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7891, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. This Amendment in line 26 changes --

THE CHAIR:
For procedurally, you should move the Amendment again since the Clerk has now officially called it.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Oh okay, I'm sorry. I move the Amendment and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

The Amendment has been moved and please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. This Amendment in line 26 strikes 15 and inserts 10 so what this Bill -- the underlying Bill is aimed to help us promote the Troops to Teachers Program. In May of 2018 the State Department of Education received a $1.1 million grant from the US Department of Education to help promote the Troops to Teachers and help Veterans get serving again in -- in our public school. And the underlying Bill had asked for 15 percent of the slots in the alternate root to certification, which helps to certify teachers to be reserved for Veterans. If they're not utilized by Veterans, they revert to the general public. This Amendment changes that from 15 percent to 10 percent based on discussions during the Committee process.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, I will try your minds. Yes, Senator Logan.
SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in favor of the Amendment and the underlying Bill. This -- the Amendment and the underlying Bill will help to make our Veterans more available to teaching our students and it actually helps in terms of thanking them, giving them a leg up in terms of getting out there and back into the workforce so I urge all my colleagues to support the Amendment and the underlying Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, senator Logan. Will you remark further on the Amendment? On Senator Amendment Schedule A? If not, I will try your minds. All in favor please indicate by saying, Aye.

ALL:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed Nay. Hearing none, the Ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Yes, thank you very much, Mr. President. I want to thank my Ranking Member, Senator Logan for all his cooperation and work during the Committee process and going forward on the Bills. If there is no objection I would move that we place this item on the Consent Calendar.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The item has been moved for placement on our Consent Calendar. Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing none, it is so ordered. Thank you, Senator Maroney. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 60, Calendar No. 132, Substitute for Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO RECOGNIZE WOMEN IN THE CADET NURSE CORPS DURING WORLD WAR II AS VETERANS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The Bill has been moved. Please proceed.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. This Bill is a Resolution asking Congress to recognize women who served in the Cadet Nurse Corps as Veterans. The Cadet Nurse Corps was founded in 1943 and the women served often alongside the Veterans but sometimes stateside
sometimes -- sometimes abroad during the war providing service to our country. There were 3,000 women from the State of Connecticut who served and what we are doing, because this was organized under the Department of Public Health, or United States Public Health Service, they were not recognized as Veterans so we are asking Congress to give them the recognition that they've earned and recognize them as Veterans.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Maroney. The distinguished Chairman of the Veterans Committee has moved and discussed the item. Is there further comment? Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in support of the Bill. Women have served admirably and heroically during World War II and behooves us to take this opportunity to help to show our support of our women and in this particular case, I urge all of my colleagues to stand in favor of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Logan. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Yes, Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President and good evening. I rise in support of the Resolution. I believe that this has been a long time coming and I hope and
commend the Committee and the Committee Chair and Ranking Member for bringing this forward and I hope that this last nudge finally gets this done down there so that we can get this Resolution passed. So I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Is there additional comment on Senate Joint Resolution No. 3? Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I just want to thank everyone for their bipartisan support on this. I also just wanted to thank Senator Austin for her hard work on this as well and appreciate this effort to recognize this very important group of people who -- who really did contribute mightily during time of need. So again, I wanted to thank Senator Austin for her hard work on this because we know that -- and as a Veteran herself, she's somebody who certainly holds this near and dear to her heart and consistently fights for Veterans and Veterans issues in our circle. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader. Is there additional comment on the Resolution, on Senate Joint Resolution No. 3? Hearing none? Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. President and I also thank Senator Duff for recognizing Senator Austin's work on this.
I know she's been putting this forward for several years. If there are no objections, I move to place this item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The item has been moved for placement on our Consent Calendar. Is there objection? Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered. Thank you, Senator. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 44, Calendar No. 395, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1088, AN ACT CONCERNING PARTICIPATION BY A RESIDENT OF A NURSING HOME FACILITY OR RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME IN A RECEIVERSHIP PROCEEDING.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Winfield, distinguished Chair of the Judiciary Committee.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good evening, Mr. President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The Bill has been oved. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):
Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. This is a Bill that comes to us through the Judiciary Committee on a unanimous vote. It comes to us thanks to the work of Senator Kissel but he had an issue in his district where there was an abrupt closing of a nursing home and the results of that were something I don’t think we’d ever want to see. It actually had something to do with the death of one of his constituents. The Bill -- the JFS language of the Bill took the Bill to a single section and moved away from a problem that was in the original Bill and what the single section does is, it allows for the resident of the nursing home or their legally liable relative, conservator or guardian to be a part of the proceeding for the receivership without having to file an appearance. It's a good Bill. We should pass this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSELL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Great to see you up there this evening.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR KISSELL (7TH):

At the outset I'd like to thank Chairman Winfield, Chairman Stafstrom, and my fellow Ranking Member Rosa Rebimbas as well as all the members of the
Judiciary Committee for being very supporting -- supportive regarding this particular Bill. As Chairman Winfield indicated, this Bill did arise out of a tragic circumstance for those of you from North Central Connecticut or maybe towns close by. In the last couple of years a nursing home called Blair Manor was thrown into financial receivership and at that time both the employees, the nurses, caregivers as well as the loved ones of those who are in this facility were very concerned because this particular facility had a very high number of frail elderly. And there was some confusion as the facility was owned a group that had others and some of the folks wanted to see if this facility could be kept financially viable and the nursing home ombudsperson at the time seemed to indicate to either the loved ones of the individuals there or the conservators or the individuals themselves, don't worry; as this proceeds you will have an opportunity to be heard. Low and behold when that day came and the nurses and the loved ones were at the hearing, in particular George Stephens and Carol Conlon, George Stephens being one of my constituents and probably a surprise to the ombudsperson, the Judge at that hearing disallowed anybody other than the individual appointed as the receiver from offering any testimony what-so-ever. So what we found was we had a packed courtroom where all the people that were very concerned for their loved ones or the people that they were caring for; indeed the town attorney for the town of Enfield was foreclosed from saying anything.

We know as Senators that in public hearings nobody ever gets everything they want. But the public hearing process is so important to the workings of the legislature. It gives people not only an
opportunity to express themselves but to inform us, and it's not just a venting process, but it's the free flow of ideas. And only so many Bills are going to cross the finish line and be signed into law, but that public hearing process is so important to so many. And when these folks were foreclosed from being able to talk about their concerns, when it was all said and done; they came to me and they said, John, this just isn't fair. They were concerned especially with these frail elderly population with what's called Transfer Trauma, and indeed just a few months after the facility was ultimately closed over 15 of the individuals, around 90 to 100 passed away because of the closure of that facility including George Stephens' wife.

So what this Bill does, and again I can't thank the leadership of the Committee enough, is it makes a simple change that says unlike the way the law is right now where you would actually have to file an appearance in the receivership proceeding to actually have an ability to speak at the hearing. It just makes it very clear that you have a right to at least speak at the hearing. The judge will have to listen. It may not change the ultimate outcome but it will afford individuals an ability to be -- express themselves, express their concerns and to be heard. And if you lost, as Carol lost her mom or if you lost your wife as George did; and I want to thank Carol Conlon and George Stephens for coming to the public hearing; you want to be able to at least know that you did everything you could to stop that transfer that might have ultimately resulted in your loved ones demise. And so I believe this makes that small change. It was worked out with folks from a nursing home industry, current ombudsperson. It's agreed upon, but again I just can't thank Chairman
Winfield, Chairman Stafstrom and my fellow Ranking Member Rosa Rebimbas enough for helping to move this Bill forward as well as the entire Judiciary Committee and I urge my colleague's support. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further? If not, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you again, Mr. President. I just want to thank Senator Kissel again for his work on this important Bill, particularly to his constituents and if there's no further conversation or objection, I'd ask that Senate Bill 1088 be moved to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The item has been moved for placement on the Consent Calendar. Is there objection to that placement? Hearing none, it is so ordered. Thank you, Senator. Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. The next item if we can PT that, which is Calendar page 4, Calendar 52, Senate Bill 807 and move on to the next Bill after that?

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader. Mr. Clerk, if you would call the next item.

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar No. 53, Senate Bill No 815, AN ACT ALLOWING INSURANCE POLICIES IN LIEU OF SURETY BONDS.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Haskell, distinguished Chair of the Committee on Higher Education and Advancement.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Please comment.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes, thank you Mr. President. This Bill comes from -- comes to us from the Connecticut Health and Education Facilities Authority as well as the Connecticut's Higher Education and Supplemental Loan Authority. It's largely technical in nature. Its current statute requires that both CHEFA and CHESLA execute surety bonds to cover the faithful performance of duties by their boards, officers and staff however the term surety bond is really not applicable to important and valuable work that both CHEFA and CHESLA do. The fact of the matter is that
insurance policies that they already do enter into is a far better tool for risk litigation and amending the statute will reduce the costly and duplicative processes that they currently undergo.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on Senate Bill 815? Yes, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. It's good to see you up there. I rise in support of this Bill and I want to compliment the good work of the Committee leadership and its members throughout. But for legislative intent and clarification I do have some questions to the proponent of this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Please propose your first question.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Can you explain why we need to have the surety bond or insurance in this case for those board members? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):
I thank the good Senator from Fairfield for his question and through you, Mr. President. As the Senator is likely aware, CHEFA invests in Connecticut nonprofits by helping access low cost debt capital from tax exempt public and private debt markets and provide equity capital in the form of grants, however in order to do that they need certain risk mitigation tools to protect both the state and those who do business with CHEFA and CHESLA in the case that those duties are not faithfully performed. The issue is that surety bonds is really a term more applicable to something like a construction project where there's an expected profit afterwards and an insurance policy is by far a more appropriate term. Now the -- both CHEFA CHESLA staff already are using insurance policies. The problem is current statute requires them to purchase that duplicative bond in the form of a surety bond. This is a tool -- this legislation I believe will not only save the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut but also further empower CHEFA and CHESLA to revitalize Connecticut's economy, invest in students, help nonprofits operate and improve the lives of those who live in our communities. So I do believe it's an important Bill.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

I want to thank my colleague for the answer and thank you. And do other quasi-public agencies require this kind of insurance or surety bond for them to --

THE CHAIR:

Through the Chair, Senator.
SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, through you, Mr. President. Do other quasi-public agencies require these kind of surety or insurance bonds -- insurances to fulfill their obligations or is this organization unique. Through you, Mr. President. Sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Haskell, do you care to respond?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes, thank you Mr. Chair and thank my colleague from Fairfield for his question. To be honest, I don't have the practices and procedures of every quasi-public agency in front of me. I do know that within the cognoscente of the Higher Education and Employment Advancement Committee that I have the honor of chairing, this is the only quasi-public agency that we heard from that does undergo this -- this costly procedure -- this costly process I should say. So while I don't have a more precise answer to the -- the Ranking Members question, I do believe that there are other quasi-public agencies that are entering into duplicative and costly processes we should take a look at that, perhaps in the Committee of Cognoscente. However, as it pertains to this Bill and as it pertains to our Committee, we are only looking at both CHEFA and CHESLA. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President. Do other states of this similar type organization, quasi-public have the same requirement of Assurity Insurance for them to fulfill their jobs? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell, do you care to respond?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

I do. Thank you, Mr. President and thank you to my colleague from Fairfield for the question. It's not apparent to me that both CHEFA and CHESLA have exact corollaries in other states. I certainly know that it was only a few years ago before I reached the General Assembly but I -- many of my colleagues here voted to create the Connecticut Higher Educational Supplemental Loan Authority, an absolutely crucial quasi-public agency that helps provide low cost or no cost loans, or no interest loans to students so that they can pursue higher educational opportunities. The Connecticut strategic plan on higher education that the -- that was reported to the Higher Education and Employment Advancement Committee only a few years ago said that we need to drastically increase the number of students who earn their bachelor's and associate degree in order to meet the workforce needs of Connecticut and yet we're falling short of that goal constantly.
As I've heard in my work on the Committee, Mr. Chair and I'm sure the Ranking Member could attest as well, the cost of higher education in Connecticut is exceptionally high and CHEFA -- I'm sorry, CHESLA does an exceptional job of trying to bring that cost down. As far as what other states are doing and the practices and procedures that they follow in order to mitigate the risk of their employees, boards and officers, I can't speak to that.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President I did offer in the beginning that I am in support of this Bill and I appreciate the clarification for legislative intent to explain the fact that this indeed could be a possible cost saving with no additional fiscal note to this state, but at the same time be able to provide the same level of insurance and protection. So I thank the good Chair for his answers and I urge support of this Bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator -- Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to thank my colleague from Fairfield for his work on the Bill and every member of our Higher Education Committee. I will note that this Bill was bipartisan and unanimous
coming out of our Committee and hopefully following along that same pattern Mr. President, if there's no objection I would move that the -- that this Bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The Committee Chair has moved to place this item on the Consent Calendar. Is there objection to so placing it? Hearing none, it is so ordered. Thank you, Senator Haskell. Clerk will please return to the call.

CLERK:

Page 15, Calendar No. 156, Senate Bill No. 607, AN ACT CONCERNING APPRENTICESHIP PATHWAYS TO EARNING A BACHELOR'S DEGREE. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The Bill has been moved. Will you remark? Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):
Yes, thank you Mr. President. This Bill -- first of all I want to thank Senator Maroney who has been a really valuable member of our Higher Education Employment Advancement Committee, for bringing this Bill to our attention and for championing this cause. You know, not every student who receives a bachelor's degree or an associate's degree in the State of Connecticut needs to go through the traditional practice of going on to a college campus and sitting in a classroom. In order to make higher education more affordable and accessible in Connecticut, Mr. Chair we need to make sure that there are non-traditional pathways available for folks who perhaps have to work at the same time that they're attending school, for folks who want to gain valuable skills training in the -- in the ever-increasing industry of advanced manufacturing in Connecticut while at the same -- while at the same time earning credits toward their degree. I think this Bill is an important step in asking the Department of Labor to create a plan to create those non-traditional pathways towards earning a degree through apprenticeships.

Also Mr. President, the Clerk is in procession of an Amendment, LCO No. 7542.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7542, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Mr. President, I move adoption of the bipartisan Amendment and ask that its reading be waived and seek leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. This Amendment which we -- which I co-introduced with the Chair and my Co-Chair in the House as well as the Ranking Members of the Higher Education Employment Advancement Committee is largely technical in nature, slightly amending the definition of apprenticeship so that it conforms with our other statutes.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? Seeing none, we'll try your minds. All in favor of Senate Amendment Schedule A, please indicate by saying Aye.

ALL:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:
Opposed? Hearing none, the Amendment is adopted.
Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. If there is no objection I would ask that the Bill be placed on the Consent Calendar. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. And again, I rise again as I reiterated the collaborated work that we've demonstrated in the Higher Education Committee, I rise in support of this Bill but again for legislative intent, this is something that's unique. We are looking to create non-traditional pathways for apprenticeships to get a bachelor's degree and I believe this is requiring our Department of Labor along with the Department of Education to design a collaborative program to give these kinds of credits that would have college credits. Through you, could I ask some questions of the proponent of the Bill or through the Chair? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. I think the first part of it is when we were debating the dialogue, the idea of being able to take apprenticeship roles and transition that into a college credit -- curriculum credit basis was something that evolved. Could the proponent of this Bill, Senator Maroney, be able to address the -- the
-- the rationale for this plan to proceed and for it to be realized? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

I believe the question is asked of Senator Haskell?

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, through Senator Haskell or through the proponent of this Bill, Senator Maroney.

THE CHAIR:

Would either -- either pro -- either -- either person may respond. Senator Haskell as the Chair?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm sure Senator Maroney can speak more eloquently to this Bill than I can but I will briefly remark about one portion of the testimony that stuck out to me. Mr. President, specifically the testimony that I'm about to read comes to us from the Connecticut Association of Human Services and as many members of this Chamber may be aware, there has been a State Statute in place for some time in Connecticut with a timeline requiring all early childhood educators to have a bachelor's degree by a certain date. Now centers have struggled to hire and retain staff with these credentials. As a result the legislature has been forced to push the deadline back repeatedly. A structured apprenticeship program could provide a means for Associate degree teachers to work towards their bachelor's degree while also working in the classroom resulting in a pipeline for strong, early
childhood workforce. Now Mr. President, I believe this is only one example of so many industries that could benefit from non-traditional pathways towards earning a degree. We know that students across the state are participating in apprenticeships, that those apprenticeships are contributing meaningfully to their education. I believe the logical next step is to create a pathway whereby those students might earn credits so that they can earn their degree and become participating, contributing tax-paying members of the workforce. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. And Senator Haskell, if I might ask you to yield to Senator Maroney who I believe will have additional comment on Senator Hwang's question.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I do yield to -- to Senator Maroney.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Through you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Haskell for your leadership and your commitment to helping students get a debt-free education and I see this as one part of your overall mission and I think the overall mission of the Committee this year as well as I believe, Senator Hwang. Senator Hwang, there are several apprenticeships in the country now
that actually lead to bachelor's degrees and that was the genesis for this Bill. In Fairview Hospital System in Minnesota they offer an apprenticeship that leads to a Bachelor's in Nursing. Newport News Shipbuilding in Virginia offers a bachelor's that leads to an apprenticeship that leads to a Bachelor's in Engineering. You may have read recently in the news of Mphasis, a company that's come to Hartford and in the last five months hired 287 computer programmers and they're starting a program to help students with associate degrees get bachelor's degrees. That is something that could be done as an apprenticeship as well. And as Senator Haskell mentioned, there already is a registered apprenticeship program with the state in Childcare Development Specialists so that's another method of helping, and in that case people who really may not be able to get the education otherwise to get the degree necessary to achieve the profession of their -- you know, their intended profession.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Maroney. Senator Hwang, the floor is still yours.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, thank you. Through you, Mr. President. I want to compliment the proponent of this Bill because he emphasized some great examples of this program because when we normally think of the word apprenticeship we think of the trades and the crafts and it is an important part of this Bill, but I believe the drafting of this Bill addresses the issue of profession and it allows us to explore the
different areas, not simply the traditional trade, but also in the areas of coding, STEM and various other sciences. So I think it's important for us to recognize the importance of being able to focus on many of the areas that we're talking about through this Bill to help individuals to seek apprenticeships in those various areas, and not just simply the craft, which is important but in STEM and coding as well as an education and various other components. So I want to applaud Senator Maroney for his good work in the proponent of this but I also want to compliment the circle and its emphasis this year I hope, that as we look to revive our state's economy that apprenticeships is a way to job creation. So I urge support of this Bill and I want to thank Senator Maroney for his good work on this. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to comment that I think this is the exact type of policy that we should be promoting here in the state of Connecticut. A few years ago Senator Duff and I cosponsored some legislation regarding apprenticeships and licensures and because of that bipartisan effort, Connecticut was one of ten states chosen nationally to participate in a pilot program where we seek to remove barriers and enhance the ability for folks to enter into apprenticeships and I think this Bill further compliments that
initiative and would move Connecticut to the top ten -- to the top of the top ten in the country for innovative ways to -- to find apprenticeships, find pathways to work, reduce the debt of those through -- in the educational field, all good things. And these are the types of things as was mentioned before that will help to grow our economy, help put more skilled people into the workforce and certainly I support and ask my fellow colleagues to do the same thing. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further? Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Senator Hwang for his leadership in the Higher Education Employment Advancement Committee and his support of this Bill in Committee as well as here on the floor today and also Senator Witkos. Madam President, if there is no objection I would be asked that the Bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 57, Calendar No. 176, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 356. AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT APPRENTICESHIP AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Madam President, I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This Bill modifies the Education Commissioner's Committee to coordinate education for public school students on manufacturing careers by renaming the Committee the Connecticut Apprenticeship and Education Committee, broadening the Committee's scope to include additional fields including insurance, healthcare, financial technology, biotechnology, STEM which is science, technology, engineering and math, construction trades, hospitality industries and other appropriate industries. It also modifies the Committee's membership in modifying the information included in the Committee's required annual report and extending the first reporting date to July 1, 2020. This Bill makes corresponding changes to statutes requiring Education Commissioner to introduce students to careers and manufacturing and State Department of Education to produce a best practices guide for school districts. So this is a
very important Bill given our future and our desire to create more pathways to good jobs.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill?

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Madam President, if -- I move the adoption -- if there's no objection, I move to place this item on the Consent -- sorry. Oh, I should say something too about Senator Formica and the fact that he has been very helpful in developing this Bill and we appreciate your concern about apprenticeship programs.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kushner. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President, good evening. Thank you, Senator Kushner. I appreciate the kind words. It was a team effort. Senator Martin and Senator Somers and all of you on the Committee worked very hard to kind of move this forward. I have no questions for you. I'm just going to make a few comments and thank you for your leadership on this. But this is a -- this is a very good Bill, Madam President and it does precisely what we need to do and move into the next generation of job creation in terms of developing an apprenticeship program that is expanded beyond manufacturing. And I think that's the key portion of this particular Bill and
that other industries will now be able to get involved in the opportunity into and develop a strong apprenticeship program. Apprenticeship programs around the country and around the world, North Carolina and Virginia are specific less than 500 miles apart where they have wonderful apprenticeship programs that we can learn from and this Bill looks to that area to try to study from as well as the European model that has been very successful over in Sweden and Germany. So this is the next level here at Eastern Connecticut. We have Eastern Workforce Investment Board, which has pioneered the manufacturing pipeline and moved people from learning about and understanding what the job is about into good high-paying jobs in and around large manufacturers in Southeastern Connecticut as well as the support vendors that do that. And that WIB Program is being replicated in the WIBs throughout the state. So this is the next step. It's not quite an MTB -- I'm sorry, an MBA but it is the opportunity to move forward for those folks who need to get into this type of program and I think this is really going to keep people in Connecticut. It's going to draw people in Connecticut and it's going to expand the workforce, which is what we so need to do. So I commend the leadership of the Labor Committee for their hard work and for the other Senators who I expect you'll hear from in a minute who also worked hard on putting this Bill together. So thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Formica. Will you remark further? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):
Thank you, Madam -- Madam President. Good evening.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Madam President, I rise to support this Bill. I want to thank first of all the Chairs of the Labor Committee, Senator Kushner as well as Representative Porter for your help in this and moving this along. And as well I'd like to thank Senator Formia and Senator Somers for their comments and developing this Bill. Also someone that needs to be thanked is the Committee, the Connecticut Manufacturing Committee that we assembled a couple of years back. They -- they -- the framework that they were charged with by this body here, they did plow the field for us here. We didn't have to reinvent the wheel in order to make this a successful piece of legislation. They've done their work which was -- they were basically charged with a -- let's identify the workforce needs that were out there, particularly in the manufacturing sector. They came back and they gave us a great report in the Commerce Committee and the idea came from that report saying, gee, why should we have to reinvent the wheel when we've got the boiler plate right here. You know we all know the workforce needs are great, 20-something thousand to 27,000 in the manufacturing sector but this Bill expands it to the same group of individuals. We're going to expand that Committee a little bit and that will provide the additional sectors that we're trying to address, which is the business sector, the insurance sector, the trade
sector, as well as the healthcare sector as well and to identify the workforce needs that exist out there, tie them to the Education Department through the middle school, let them know what's going on as well as the high schools. So great path. I think this is a great Bill for -- for us as a future and I think we're going to be addressing some great needs that the business sector is in great need of; identifying those students that they can tap into. So thank you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Martin. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this Bill, but I also want to take a few moments to acknowledge the tremendously hard work and successful work I hope of the Labor Committee's leadership and also my colleagues, Senator Martin, Senator Somers, Senator Formia. But also I want to commend the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor collaborated and offered their insights in understanding the compliment of the apprenticeship program to the objective of increasing our labor force successes. But I also want to add the compliment of my Higher Education Committee members because technical skills and apprenticeship is higher education as well. The ability to be able to develop a skill that is in demand and can create well-funded career paths is something that is part of the component of higher education. This Bill, through its apprentice is also a higher education
Bill as well. So I want to applaud the proponents of this Bill and say, kudos to them because the work that went through to make this right took endless hours and endless ink and they deserve tremendous credit. So I urge support of this. So, thank you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Hwang. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Kushner. Oh, I'm sorry. Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this Bill. I echo the sentiments of Senator Hwang in that this is something that was a collaborate effort on so many folks' parts. It shows how when we all are in agreement on what's best for our young people in the State of Connecticut we can work together to really give them a great opportunity and I'm excited to work with the different industries to see what we can collaborate on in the future to make sure that our young people have opportunities and that's what, you know our job here is in the Senate to make sure that young people in the State of Connecticut have an opportunity to develop a career that suits them, that gives them a great opportunity for a career going forward and I think the focus on manufacturing has been terrific. It's time for us to look at other industries and we have some public health Bills coming up that there will be an opportunity for internships going forward and education and I couldn't agree more that education is not just through books, but through apprenticeship, mentoring, and experience so I fully
support this Bill and I want to thank everyone on the Labor Committee, also Higher Ed and my good colleagues that worked together on this wonderful project that we hope will go forward. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Somers. Will you remark further? Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection I move to place this item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objections, so ordered.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 23, Calendar No. 220, Senate Bill No. 549. AN ACT CONCERNING FIREFIGHTER WORK WEEKS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is a Bill that would clarify that firefighter work week is something that is subject to collective bargaining where there is a collective bargaining agent and it would add to the existing statute that where there's a collective bargaining agent it is a mandatory subject that would be bargained for. So you know it's pretty clear-cut that it will address the issue so that there wouldn't be any kind of confusion about the application of any ordinance or referendum.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kushner. Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If I might, just a couple of clarifying questions.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, please proceed Senator Miner.
SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, so it's my understanding or my recollection at least that this would affect communities that may develop a career firefighter scenario that would be represented by a bargaining group and in those cases this would be a subject of collective bargaining as a matter of right once we pass this Bill? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, that is correct that where there is a collective bargaining agent going forward effective January 1, 2020 it would be a subjective to collect -- a mandatory subject of collective bargaining to establish the average workweek.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kushner. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And so at the end of the Bill it talks about agreements that are negotiated or entered into, renewed or extended after January 1st. I wasn't aware of any testimony where a municipality currently had a negotiated agreement where this wasn't part of that agreement
already. If the gentlelady could remind me whether in fact that was the case or not? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, Senator Miner you're correct that we're not aware of any collective bargaining agreement currently in the State of Connecticut where there is a 56 hour workweek. In fact they are mostly 42 hours.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kushner. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Based on those responses and my recollection of the public hearing I -- my concern back when the Bill was in Committee that there may be communities where this may actually affect a current contract and I take the gentlelady at her description of what exists here in Connecticut now. It's my understanding that with the passage of this law if the town of Litchfield should decide that they want to go to a career fire department and that that career fire department would be paid and that they would be subject to collective bargaining; in this case they would not have to collectively bargain to make the hours a matter of subject matter bargaining. And so if that's what this does then I -- I join the gentlelady in her support of the Bill. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

I agree with most of what you said, Senator Miner. The only thing is you left out the step where they would have to first organize a union before they would be subject to collective bargaining rights but yes, that's what would happen in the future.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Madam President, if there's no objection I move this place this item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Will the Senate stand at ease for a moment?

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to go back to two Bills that I had previously marked PT and mark them as go. Calendar page 10, Calendar 107, Senate Bill 1028. Calendar page 14, Calendar 142, Senate Bill 854.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Mr. Clerk if you would just call the first item, please.

CLERK:

Page 10, Calendar No. 107, Senate Bill No. 1028. AN ACT CONCERNING CONNECTICUT INNOVATIONS, INCORPORATED AND PRIVATE EQUITY INVESTMENT. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hartley. Will you remark?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes indeed. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, there is an Amendment that is LCO 7971 and I ask that the Clerk please call and I be granted leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Certainly. Mr. Clerk would you call that Amendment?

CLERK:

LCO No. 7971, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Madam President, I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hartley. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, thank you, thank you Madam President. Madam President, the first part of this Bill essentially dissolves the vestiges of the former Connecticut
Development Authority, which goes back some years, perhaps even a decade ago and it was a subsidiary of CDA known as the Connecticut Brownfields Redevelopment Authority, the CBRA. Essentially the duties of the CBRA have been subsumed by the Brownfields division within the department of DECD and so this is just really a defuncted part of the statutes, which we are looking to -- to clean up.

And the -- Section 5 is worthy of noting and in Section 5 what we are essentially doing there is providing CI the ability in their investing in funds and funds of funds to first of all require that any such fund, fund manager have a location, domicile in the state of Connecticut. And that furthermore that they make good faith and diligent efforts to invest the equal amount that CI has invested in the fund in Connecticut companies and we have always identified certain sectors. Those are the area of technology, bioscience, and precision manufacturing. And so we once again keep those concentrations but allow CI after — if such a fund is making good faith effort that they would have the latitude in making other investments. And so Madam President, this is an opportunity once again to grow the economy of the state of Connecticut by optimizing every opportunity that this state has and to do that also by leveraging private funds. I thank you and move adoption, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Hartley. Will you remark further? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):
Thank you, Madam President. I just rise to support the Bill and I think it's a great shot in the arm and a great opportunity for us to stimulate our economy here in Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Martin. Will you remark further? Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. If there is no objection I would ask that this be put on the Consent Calendar, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

So Senator Hartley, I believe we have, and I think there's a little bit of a snafu because this item was PT'd but we do have the Amendment before the body so would you like to have a voice vote on the Amendment?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Indeed I -- indeed, thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. So with that, all in favor of the Amendment let me try your minds. Please signify if you would like the Amendment to be adopted; please signify by saying Aye.

ALL:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And having adopted the Amendment I would ask if -- if there is no objection that it be put on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So with that, seeing no objection so ordered, Senator Hartley. Mr. Clerk would you please call the next item?

CLERK:

Page 14, Calendar No. 142, Substitute for Senate Bill for Senate Bill No. 854. AN ACT PROMOTING CAREERS IN MANUFACTURING TO PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS AND ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY THE DEMAND FOR CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Madam President, there is an Amendment and that is LCO 7973 and I ask that the Clerk please call and I'd be granted leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, Mr. Clerk kindly call the Amendment please.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7973, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Hartley. Will you remark further on the Amendment?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes indeed. Thank you, Madam. This is a strike all Amendment and it essentially was a product of the manufacturing caucus with regard to our ongoing conversation about supporting the manufacturing sector in the State of Connecticut very robust employer and major pillar in the State of Connecticut amongst all of the family, small manufacturers as well as the very large entities which represent the defense industry. And what the underlining Amendment does is to ensure that in the career counseling and working with students beginning in middle schools that manufacturing is also equally part of those discussions in sharing with students and their families about their future careers.

And we worked -- this actually is a product from the Commissioner of Education who was very supportive of this and actually worked with us in making sure that it worked under their requirements for their -- their accountability indexes with the federal government. And so it was the Commissioner's suggestion that the -- we would be able to add to the annual student success plans the emphasis to be sure to include manufacturing careers for each student's success plan. And so in doing -- there will be no fiscal note and it will be easily adopted and folded into local boards of education and regional school boards. So with that, Madam I ask for a voice vote and urge support. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you so much, Senator Hartley. Senator Martin, will you remark?

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. As you can see a lot of us here in the circle and probably in the House as well have identified the need about talking to our students about the manufacturing sector and I know that this last, the previous Bill and the one before that we talked about expanding what the manufacturing sector has done with its Committee and expanding it to the healthcare industry as well as the business community and finance and so forth. And though this is only addressing the manufacturing sector, I'm pretty sure we're going to be back here next year to start talking to our students at an early age about the healthcare industry as well as the business sector as well. But this Bill does exactly what the good Senator said. You know, we want to introduce manufacturing, that sector to the students who are in middle school as well as hey, let's have the guidance counselors pass out some information to the students to let them know, hey this is something you want to pay attention to. It's a great career opportunity. And I think it's going to filter out to the parents as well. When they see that information I think it will be an eye opener to the parents and to grandparents as well because they all have this image of what the manufacturing sector is about. And this Bill also talks about talking to the students and their success plans about, hey think about this -- this as a future and lay out something other than the -- the higher education or secondary education. So I'm excited about these last few Bills that we've done
and I look forward to seeing the results. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Martin. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? And Senator Hartley, did you request a voice vote on this or a vote by roll?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Voice vote, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. With that clarification, all in favor of the Amendment as presented please signify by saying Aye.

ALL:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Amendment is adopted. Will you remark on the Bill as amended? Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Having adopted the Amendment I would ask if there is no objection that this be added to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:
Seeing no objection, the item is added to the Consent Calendar. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Senate stand at ease for a moment?

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will indeed stand at ease. The Senate will come back to order. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I need to change a marking from earlier.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Earlier this afternoon I marked Calendar page 36, Calendar 339, Senate Bill 1095. That Bill needs to be referred to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if the Clerk can now call Calendar page 18, Calendar 173, Senate Bill 979.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 18, Calendar No. 173, Senate Bill No. 979. AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY THE IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON THIS STATE AND INSURANCE IN THIS STATE.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you Madam President. Madam President, this Bill is intended to look at the impact of climate change on the state and also on the insurance workforce in the state and also on insurability of the state. It involves a number of
stakeholders from industry and government to look specifically at a variety of issues, to look at future impact of climate change on the resident of municipalities and I urge my colleagues to support it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I just have a few questions through you to the good Chairman of the Insurance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you very much. So we're going to -- this Bill will create a task force that's going to study both the current and anticipated future impact of climate change in the state. Could you explain specifically how this would occur? Who's going to be appointed and what is their specific change? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):
Yes, thank you Madam President. Madam President, there are a number of experts who are on here. We've got Representatives who are appointed who have expertise in the insurance industry, one of whom has expertise in environmental science. We also have the Commissioner of Energy Environmental Protection. We've got the Insurance Commissioner and the hope is that we're going to use the best available science while also taking full advantage of stakeholder and industry employment as we look at this important issue.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. But is the charge going to be grounded more towards environmental study as you have environmental, I'm going to say stakeholders? Or is it going to be more a nexus to insurance and insurance products offered in the state? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Thank you. I actually think that the -- through you Madam President. I think the focus of this watch will be mostly -- mostly centered around insurance and the potential impact on the cost and availability of insurance as well as on the role of
insurance underwriting in -- in climate change and the nexus there. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Maybe that's where my question lies. What would insurance rating in the insurance industry -- what impact does that have on climate change? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Well thank you, Madam President. That's a good question. I think that's what we're going to find out but certainly to the extent to which one of the things that I know the National Association of Insurance Commissioners is looking at, for example our investments that insurers have made in the carbon economy and they have pushed for disclosures of that. I don't think that's within, necessarily within the scope of the task force but that could be. But obviously the other -- the other part of this as well is the impact on insurability of rising sea levels and other effects that could certainly affect some of our coastal communities. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. So just to be clear. The task force isn't so much looking at climate change itself as it is looking at the impact of climate change on our state and the, I'm going to say impact or results upon insurance and insurability of property and persons. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I think that is a good summary. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. So then we're only going to be looking at the insurance components of this. Are we also going to look at, I'm going to say zoning and development issues and looking at that and its impact as to insurance, but when somebody develops in an area that might be impacted by climate change, is that going to be part of the task force? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. That's actually a great question. I think that's beyond the direct scope of this although you know, when you set up a task force sometimes you have only limited control as to the direction the members go and -- but that is -- that is a great question. I don't think that is directly within the scope although certainly there are important other considerations about land use in coastal zones that the legislature has looked at in the past and should probably look at again. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. But in the Bill itself, while you have, I'm going to say the Commissioner of Insurance, the Commissioner of DEEP, and one appointment made by the Speaker of an individual has expertise in insurance and one that has expertise in environmental science, the rest of the appointments could have no nexus to either the environment or insurance. Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.
SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you. Although those aren't the specific qualifications, aren't specified in the Bill and that's something I think we've been moving towards as General Assembly, as removing the specific designations in task forces to allow flexibility, certainly we might open and hope the good Senator from Stratford shares this concern that the people who are appointed have expertise on the subject matter because that would be helpful to getting a quality result. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. While I do share those concerns, I'm also concerned that because there's no direction on the appointment there could be appointments made that don't -- that don't have experience in this specific area or that the task force could become more dominated by, let's say environmental individuals as opposed to insurance and I'm not going to say defeat the purpose of the task force but it may change the direction of the task force, particularly coming from a -- I'm going to say a coastal community where we have not only Long Island Sound but the Housatonic River that unites all the communities that I represent. It -- it's really important from my perspective that that's something that's focused on, and that's not necessarily in the Bill.
With regards to the task force the report back is due in January. Is there a -- an intent that with the report there would be legislation proposed next session to address issues with regards to this? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, that's a good question. I think -- my understanding is that the majority of the work that's happened by Departments of Insurance around the country have been done through -- without legislation through intergovernmental work through the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. So while it would be interesting to hear any recommendations that this task force might have with regard to possible future legislation, I think we're agnostic as to whether or not the best course is through unilateral action legislation in Connecticut as opposed to tasking our Insurance Commissioner to work with other Insurance Commissioners and with the industry across the country to tackle this global crisis. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. At this time I have no further questions. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President through you to Senator Lesser. In following up on Senator Kelly's question in looking at the insurance impact relative to climate, do you believe that one of the things that may looking -- be looking at is insurance rates, repetitive loss, things of that nature? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you. And through you, one of the things that would come about would be therefore the impact of those rates to either -- well to businesses who perhaps are in flood zones or wave action zones and the impact of this task force may or may not but -- have an affect upon those very businesses based upon where they sit. Through you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. Although the task force may not have a direct impact, I'm sure the recommendations certainly could. I think that that's reasonable and it's our hope that we can provide some level of planning and guidance to businesses and residents affected by this issue. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Fair enough. And then through you, Madam President. That would also be true for residential structures that border Long Island Sound or a river or any area where there could be flooding that's prone throughout the years. Their findings could result in legislation that could affect those homeowners. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator -- Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):
And it -- sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Jumped on that one. And therefore the actual effect of this is to understand climate change, the insurance impact relative to the things I talked about, predative loss, insurance rates, perhaps even where it would be prohibitive to build as a result of rates being at such a point that it would stop building in those particular areas. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. Absolutely.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I'm wondering -- I understand we have the Insurance Commissioner or designate DEEP or designee House of Representatives getting two experts on insurance. But when the Committee looked at this, I see no representation
for those folks who live along the shoreline to express their views on this task force. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. The majority of the appointments to this task force were not stated in it so while -- while the President Pro Tem for example has two appointments it doesn't say who the President has to appoint and likewise there's flexibility throughout the Bill about appointing authorities. And so while I think we did not include a resident of a coastal community on the task force explicitly we give the leaders of this body the authority to make sure that their voices are heard. And I think you raise an important point that it might -- might behoove us to listen to homeowners and business owners who are directly affected. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

So I'm wondering if the good Senator and I apologize, because normally I would ask you sort of behind the bar over here the question but would you be willing to PT this Bill to allow an Amendment perhaps we can both join and run tomorrow morning that would at least keep open some of those, but put
someone either from the coastal community or business within the coastal community so that that impact can be heard by their voices on this Commission? Would the good Senator be so willing to do that? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano, thank you. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes, I would be open to that and I don't know -- I would defer on the process as to whether or not that would be in order now or whether or not you would like to do that at some future point.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

May we stand at ease for one moment?

THE CHAIR:

We can stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would like to mark this item PT and if the Senate will stand at ease, please?

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will mark that item PT and we will stand at ease. Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President if we can -- we had marked item, House Joint Resolution No. 161 as a PT. If we can call that Bill again. It's Calendar page 61, Calendar 429.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Mr. Clerk, kindly call that item.

CLERK:

Page 61, Calendar No. 429, Substitute for Joint Resolution No. 161. RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE STATE CONSTITUTION TO ALLOW FOR EARLY VOTING. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I think we're just going to stand at ease for a moment while the Chair comes back in and she can move the Bill again.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The Senate Chamber will stand at ease until the Chair returns. Senator Flexer, good evening.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):
Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, once again I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Resolution in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes, thank you Madam President. Madam President, now that we have restarted debate on the Resolution before us I understand that the comments from my colleagues are just about finished and I want to first of all take a moment to thank the many people who have worked hard, not just on this Resolution this year but on advancing the ease of voting in our state and this concept of early voting for many years. I first of all want to thank my great Co-Chair Representative Dan Fox who has lead the fight for this initiative for several years in the House of Representatives and was able to achieve support of his colleagues in the House with 82 percent of the members of the House of Representatives voting for that measure. In a very bipartisan fashion the majority of both the democrats and republicans in the House of Representatives supported that Resolution and I want to thank Representative Fox for his leadership.

I also want to thank all of the members of the Government Administration and Elections Committee who have worked on this measure. We have a great Committee and I want to thank Representative France for his leadership on this as the Ranking Member in
the House as well. And I'd like to thank the leaders here in the Senate, Senator Looney and Senator Duff for their leadership on this issue and their commitment to making sure that our voting process here in Connecticut is as easy an accessible as possible to the voters in Connecticut. And I want to lastly thank our great Secretary of State, Denise Merrell who has been working on this issue for several years and has you know, made it a point to go all around the state and talk with voters in every corner of our state about this initiative, talk with all of the stakeholders and try to move forward with a process to allow for early voting in our state and we're very grateful to her and the great leadership that she provides us on this issue and so many issues as our Secretary of State. And lastly --

THE CHAIR:

Senator, I apologize for interrupting but we do want to make sure that some of our visitors understand that there is a Senate rule that prohibits videotaping, so thank you so much. Sorry to interrupt and Senator, I'm also going to ask Senator Duff, just because we want to be sure that this Bill has been properly moved before the body. So Senator Duff, just want to ask you about that before we go any further. Yes, the Senator did. Thank you, Senator Flexer. Please proceed now that we have various clarifications. (Laughing)

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Okay. Thank you, Madam President. I forgot what I was saying, but that's okay. I guess I was -- I was just commenting there are so many organizations
throughout our state who have been working to advocate for this legislation -- or this Resolution and I would just implore my colleagues here in the circle one more time to please look at the -- the good example that we had from our colleagues in the House just less than two weeks ago on this measure where there was broad bipartisan support to let the people of Connecticut have what so many voters all throughout this country have the right to enjoy right now, which is deciding whether or not Connecticut will have early voting. Right now we do not have early voting. The laws regarding our absentee ballot process are very restrictive. There are very narrow reasons why someone can request an absentee ballot and unfortunately during this debate I think it's been reflected otherwise. And I wish that we were more permissive perhaps with allowing absentee ballots to be used and we could certainly have that conversation in this circle as well, but right now Connecticut has some of the strictest laws in the country with regard to early voting and the use of absentee ballots. And so this measure is of critical importance. If we want another election cycle to pass us by when -- when we're all campaigning and talking with voters in every region of the state and they're watching across the country in the next Presidential election when people are voting early and wondering why we can't do that here in Connecticut, it is because we have not changed this provision in the Constitution. And so I would implore my colleagues to support this Resolution, allow a future General Assembly to at least have a debate about early voting. This is simply just to allow the people of Connecticut to decide whether or not we should have a debate on early voting and then let the next General Assembly decide whether or not we should have early voting. We need to recognize
that voting is a right. It is not a privilege. It is not like some of the other examples that were brought up during this debate today. This is an inherent right that we all have as United States citizens and so many groups of people in our country had to fight long and hard to finally be enfranchised. We need to recognize that it is our responsibility to make it easy for people in Connecticut to exercise this fundamental right and voting for this Resolution to amend our Constitution and allow the people of Connecticut to vote for this Amendment to our Constitution is the right thing to do, to enfranchise everyone and allow everyone to exercise their voting rights. And with that, Madam President I would like to yield to our Majority Leader, Senator Duff.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President and I accept the yield. This evening I want to also just take a moment to thank Senator Flexer and the GAE Committee and those will vote for this Resolution because it really sets Connecticut on a path towards expanding voting rights here in the State of Connecticut. We have worked hard over the last few years to expand voting rights in the State of Connecticut when really many other states have gone in the opposite direction to make it more difficult for residents of their state to vote; whether it's closing polling places, whether it's other means in which to discourage people from exercising their Constitutional duties and rights as citizens of this country. And here in
Connecticut we've really taken the opposite view, which is to make it as easy as possible for people to vote, whether that's election day registration, whether that's ensuring that the polls are open from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., whether it is to have an enough -- the integrity of our voting system where we have the paper ballot so we can check to make sure that our machines aren't infiltrated by other sources. So we've done all these things over the years but the one thing we hear around election time is why can't I vote early? Why can't I do this in case -- so that I can -- I can just vote, get it out of the way and I don't have to worry about that day where I might be tied up doing something else. So we want to make sure that we are hearing and listening to the citizens of the State of Connecticut. And so I just -- I'm glad that we are at this point today where we can have this issue on the ballot where we can ask the citizens of the state for their thoughts, which I think if I -- when I hear people on election day, this -- this is something that they're very interested in and that they will very much want to support and that we can then come back as a legislature and then codify that in the future. So, my hope is that we -- we pass this by the records that number in order to get this on the ballot by 2020 and if not, it will have to wait I guess until 2024, but this really should be an issue that all of us as elected officials look at to say, how can we encourage more people to vote? How can we make sure that we're getting more participation in our election process?

So with that, Madam President again I just want to thank the folks in the Senate who have gotten us to this -- to this point today. Certainly thank our Senate President Senator Looney, our Secretary of
State Denise Merrell, Senator Flexer as the Chair of GAE and the leadership of that Committee and our counterparts in the House of Representatives as well they've worked on it. And I know, Madam President for you as a former Secretary of State this has been an issue that you've cared about quite a bit and you've championed over the years as well and that's -- you know this is -- this is one of those issues that we bring to -- to our electorate that I think they will overwhelmingly support because we've heard it year after year after year after year; we hear it again and again. And this is our opportunity to say we've heard you; we want to bring this to the people and then we can codify it because this is an issue that while we know we want to make change; we can't do it unless the voters give us the permission to do that. This is etched in our Constitution. Let's give them the opportunity to have that vote as soon as possible so we can expand the ability for folks to vote and then move forward and again, codify this here in the legislature. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further ON THE BILL? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I think this Bill or this Amendment to the Constitution is well intended. And I think like many of us, all of us around this circle, support the very notion of opening up voting access to as many people as you can. But I think there's a balance test that comes with that which is to ensure
that every vote that's a legal vote is not countered by a potential vote that is illegal. So when you look at what you have before us, I think the first thing you have to look at is what has been the history of voting in the State of Connecticut? Let's look back. Now I went back just to 2009. I decided just to go back ten years and see what the history of voting has been in Connecticut. You may ask, why is that important? I think what's important is that people know when they go to the voting booth that their vote counts and when you disenfranchise voters, you disenfranchise voters by the notion that perhaps their vote is not as meaningful as they believe it to be. So when you go back and you look in 2009 forward, you see that we had challenges with respect to voter fraud on absentees in 2009. We had bags of ballots in 2010 in a city that were left unattended and because an issue with respect to ballots, we had -- there was a court order to hold polling open for another two hours. And during the course of that people were removed from the voting area from one side of the aisle while the other side of the aisle had total control over that voting area.

There were in other cities in 2012, there were findings by agencies and law that absentees were done incorrectly; that they were fraudulently made out, not by the right people. That candidates and people who had been assigned to do ballots and watch the monitoring ballots had not done their job. That people were waiting in line for hours to vote. Now maybe they were bused there at 7:30, whether that's a plan or not I don't know; but they were there for hours trying to vote. There is not a time from 2009 to 2018 where the State of Connecticut has run an election without a problem, without either polls not
having the right ballots as we saw in a race here in the circle, and one we talked about downstairs. Not even correct people on the ballots I might add, for years with respect to the one in this circle, for years undetectable. We ran out of ballots at least three years of the last ten years in certain places and we've have history of fraud after fraud after fraud after fraud on absentees across the state. That's how voters feel -- look we were out there. We know that when there was a problem -- there was one just this last election I think in Hartford. And everyone said, oh here we go. It's like the other one that we had four years before that. Is this something that's going wrong in this election? Well I don't like to hear that no matter who wins the election; I don't like to hear that. And even though that -- that did not perhaps influence the election at the end of the day by vote count, it leaves a bad taste with the people we say we want you to know your vote counts.

So when you add that up, I say how about this? How about if we show the competency that we as a legislature are going to plug the holes, do the oversight and manage the elections in a manner that we should so at least we have a track record of clean, forthright elections that don't end up either in litigation in our courts because of a ballot mess up or bags of ballots being left unattended or lines out the door. Why don't we show the competency that we can do it right before we take a Constitutional Amendment that will open the door to anything. What do I mean by anything? This Constitutional Amendment says there shall be early voting in person. Now where? Not is it going to be a polling station or not a polling station? Was this a defined term of art? As a polling station it's got
to have access to handicap, it's got to have 600 square feet, ample parking. It's got to be secured. Now you say let's -- that goes by statutes. But then that leaves the dominant party with a hand that is too controlling. That's why it's in the Constitution. Because if you want to change it, it takes a lot to make that change. And what one party may think is good for all, may not be good for all and that vote is simply by a majority. That's the problem I have with this. There is no parameter. I'd much rather have seen an Amendment that shortens the days or talks about procedures to some extent or uses the magic term, polling station. There's no reason -- not no reason buy hypothetically someone could take this change and say for primaries we're going to vote here and for general elections we're going to vote all out there. It is the whim of the party that controls the legislature and I would argue whether it's republican or democrat, it's irrelevancy because the ruling party could change the rules at any time once you open that door up without going back to the public who said, wait a minute. My idea of early voting was three days. Your idea of early voting was 30 days. And my idea of early voting was three days in a Town Hall, secured ballots, not counted until the day of the election. Not 30 days at some office where there's a lot of people who happen to live there and one moderator appointed by the town clerk. That's not what I think people are thinking on early voting.

So if some parameters were put in this, perhaps some of us may have an appetite. But to have it open-ended and be at the whim every year of one dominant party; I'm not saying democrat, republican or democrat, to change the rules as they see fit, to match what they want to match, that is a dangerous
and fast slope. That's my fear. That's my fear.
So Madam President, upon reviewing, and because we
sort of had a time-out when we got back to this Bill
I'm not going to go through the voluminous articles
that I have found with respect to elections every
single year that we had statewide elections, every
single year. And not just one, but three or four
given those election years that we had problems,
serious in nature. I can't support something until
we show we have the competency that we're going to
do it right. A lot of us in this circle would not
give DMV a lot more authority because we all know
from our constituents they're probably not getting
that all that right. I see the same type of issue
here. We need to bring confidence to our election
system before we decide we're going to expand it to
a world we don't even know what those parameters or
limitations are. I think we should get it right
first, show the public that we have taken the
respect and duty you've given us to make sure our
elections are above reproach and until we do that, I
certainly can't support a notion that's put before
us today. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank You, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further,
Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good evening. And
Madam President, I rise in support of the proposed
Constitutional Amendment because I think this is an
important policy area for the State of Connecticut,
and area in which we once had the lead have fallen
behind. I think we have -- we have been a leader in
access to voter registration but not in access to actual voting because of our absence of early voting mechanism that so many other states have adopted and I think it's time for us to move forward on that, to give the people an opportunity to vote on that question and to give us a chance then if the -- the people so approve it, to legislate in this area. Again, this is asking for the opportunity to have a debate and to potentially legislate in this area. It is not creating policy in the Constitutional Amendment itself. We would only be doing what most other states do and then Connecticut is prevented from doing is to have control of these areas of election law by statute rather than Constitutional Amendment. We are definitely an outlier in that area because the Constitution in our state controls areas that in most other states are handled by the decisions of their General Assemblies through statutes. And I think we should be empowered to have that choice, to have that debate, to decide to what to extent of early voting if any we should have. And how many polling places any given town should be -- should be kept open and I think the critique that was offered by Senator Fasano and others that the proposal lacks details, in many ways I think that's the point of a Constitutional Amendment in that it is more of a general statement of principle, general allocation of power than one which is going to lay out the kind of details that would be provided in the statute if one were to be eventually adopted.

And it really is an area where the power to legislate in this area, something that other states entrust in their General Assembly; in that we believe the people of Connecticut should have an
opportunity to choose whether to entrust it to our General Assembly.

Again Madam President, 14 hours when the polls are open from 6:00 in the morning until 8:00 in the evening may seem like a fairly lengthy period of time for people to vote but most people don't have discretion to vote any time during that 14-hour period. For some people it matters, they either have to get to work in that first hour the polls are open on their way to work, or maybe in the last half hour when they're getting home in the evening. So maybe an hour or hour and a half out of 14 hours are actually available to a person on a given day. So I think we have to recognize that. In our busy society people want to vote and often there is a very narrow window for them to be able to vote. So offering early voting, offering polling places open sometime in advance of the election is critical.

And what I think is important and responsible and protective of the process in this proposal is that early voting provides for the essential protection of the secret ballot, the privacy of the voting booth. Now we all -- one of the reason why I think that this proposed Constitutional Amendment should be broadly acceptable, and I would hope that it would get the kind of vote that it receives in the House of Representatives where it passed with 125 votes, 11 more than the 75 percent threshold needed of 114 is that a provision that many regarded as problematic was removed before the House took up the issue; and that is opening the process potentially to universalization of absentee balloting. And I think that was -- that is legitimately controversial. Because in reality we never really know for sure who is casting an absentee ballot. We
hope it's the person to whom it was sent. We believe in most cases it is, but we don't actually know. And so that is an issue. If we open up absentee balloting for the convenience of those who are ill or disabled or out of state on a given day but obviously the number of absentee ballot cases of fraud that we've had over the years well documents the flaws in that system. So that's why I'm among those who were very pleased that the scope of the proposed Constitutional Amendment was limited by what the House of Representatives did. By limiting it to the issue of early voting which will provide for a specific site, a specific protections of someone going into a voting booth and casting a vote some period in advance of that limited, designated 14 hours of availability on election day. I think it will enhance turnout. It will make it more -- make it more flexible for people to get to vote. It will avoid some of the -- the crush and confusion, perhaps along the lines that we now see on election day and will, I think serve a salutary purpose for Connecticut just as it has in the other states that have adopted and report success and greater efficiency by having done so.

So I wanted to -- to thank our Committee Chair in this area, Senator Flexer who has worked so hard on this and so many other education reform issues over the years. And also our Secretary of State, Denise Merrell and yourself, Madam President for all the leadership you've shown in these election issues during your tenor as Secretary of State and now in your current office. So I think there is every reason to believe that this will give us an opportunity to do something that will be responsive to what we hear from the public all the time. In otherward, no legislation at all is guaranteed by
the passage of this Amendment to our Constitution. All it would do is give us an opportunity to have a debate as to whether some of these changes should be made in Connecticut as they have been made in other states who found it to be the right thing to do, the responsible thing to do, and something that has proved popular with the people of those states. So I believe that the people of Connecticut should -- should they give us that opportunity, will then have the opportunity then to weigh in on anything that is proposed in the General Assembly in this policy area where currently we are unable to move at all because this area is controlled as I said, by the Constitution and that is definitely an outlier position in terms of the way states handle these issues. So again, I would urge a very strong vote and I would hope that we would get to 27 votes on this so that it would then be able to be on the ballot in November of next year. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Looney. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk we will open the machines. Please announce the voting.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:
Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? Seeing that all the votes have been cast we will close the machine and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Joint Resolution 161.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Voting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Adoption</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Voting Yea</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Voting Nay</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent not Voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) Resolution passes. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I have two items for the -- to mark go please.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar page 1, Calendar 377, Senate Joint Resolution No. 29 as go followed by on Senate Agenda No. 3, House Joint Resolution No. 164. And Madam President for that I move that we suspend the rules.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The Clerk will so note.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you and if the Clerk can call those two items, please?

CLERK:

Page 1, Calendar No. 377, Senate Joint Resolution No. 29. RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF CARLETON J. GILES OF MIDDLETOWN TO BE A MEMBER AND THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you. Good evening, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark?
SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you Madam President. Before I say, Mr. Giles who came and sat before the Judiciary Committee and he was unanimously voted out of the Committee. He has served on the Board of Pardon and Paroles. He served as a police officer in the City of Norwalk. He's been a pastor. He had a unanimous nomination because he has been doing a great job and I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSELL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I wish to be associated with remarks of Chairman Winfield and I would like to speak in favor of Chairman Giles. He's been really accessible to the Judiciary Committee as we've had other individuals rise up to be nominated to the Board of Pardons and Paroles. He's been extraordinarily open and supportive. And for what it's worth, the Board of Pardons and Paroles is an entity that only is successful if we don't read about it in the paper. They have to assess risk and make difficult decisions whenever they review any individual that comes before them. And I think we would all be in agreement if we said to ourselves, Board of Pardons and Paroles hasn't been in the news lately, not for many years. So whatever they're doing, they're doing right and Mr. Giles has been a terrific leader of that organization and again, great to work with him as a
member of the Judiciary Committee so I highly support his nomination as well. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you Madam President. Madam President, I also want to rise in support of this Resolution. Madam President, as you know in addition to serving as the current Chairperson of the Board of Pardons and Paroles, Chairman Giles is also a retired police officer and a pastor who serves our community and is an active member of the community and the City of Middletown. I've gotten to know him in a variety of capacities over many years and have confidence in his leadership of this organization so urge all my colleagues to support.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I also rise to support Carlton Giles. Anybody knows him knows that he really is a wonderful person, a pastor as others had said and a former police officer and now the Chair of the Board of Pardons and Paroles. Really a wonderful person, a standup guy and someone the entire Chamber should support. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on this Resolution? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. If there's no objection I'd ask this be moved to Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Senate Agenda No. 3, House Joint Resolution No. 164. RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF MICHAEL E. POHL OF MANCHESTER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you again, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark further?
SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes. Michael Pohl came before the Committee. I don't think there's a member of the Committee that he did not impress and actually at one point remarked and I said I might have to ask people to stop saying positive things about Mr. Pohl. So he came before the Committee, he impressed the Committee thoroughly and I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSELL (7TH):

Thank you very much. I again would like to be associated with the remarks of Chairman Winfield. Mr. Pohl was extraordinarily impressive. He has been several decades sober and what he's about is going out and helping to sustain other individuals that want to turn their lives around if they have either alcohol issues or drug issues. There was numerous amounts of -- or a tremendous amount of testimony and statements from individuals indicating that at the drop of a hat he would go out, whether it's morning, noon or night to be by the side of an individual if they were facing difficulties and they wanted to turn their lives around.

He also serves as a -- as a teacher, I believe it's eighth grade, a difficult age group to deal with. A tremendous amount of patience and he brings to bear as someone that's involved with these issues a different perspective to the Board of Pardons and Paroles that could help give it depth and a
different observation. I asked him if he had any experience regarding risk assessment and he indicated to me that under the previous nominee of Chairman Giles that they are trained in that but he can also bring to bear all the information that he's gleamed over those decades of service to the members of the general public that again want to turn their lives around and in trying to apply for a pardon or to be granted parole, there has to be some indicia that these individuals do want to turn their lives around and become productive citizens so I'm happy to be supportive of this nominee. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further? Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise to offer my support and congratulations to Mike Pohl. I've known him probably more than 40 years. I don't know of anybody that's worked harder in our community, particularly for the underdog. That's what Mike does. He started programs like Pathfinders and these other kinds of things and that's exactly what they've done. People have been able to find a way to get out of some of the issues they're in. He does it every day. He does it for no glory. He does it because he believes it and I think he'll be a great appointment and I want to yield to my colleague, Dr. Anwar.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you so much. Doctor -- Senator and Doctor Anwar.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this nomination as well. I've known Michael Pohl for many years and one of the situations I see him, if I'm going to the emergency room to take care of somebody he would actually at times be in the emergency room with somebody who is going through a crisis in their lives. Individuals who have gone through substance abuse related challenges, Mike would actually go and take them physically and be with them in the emergency room, wait for hours and make sure that they're taken care of. And I asked him, how do you know these people? He said, well these are just individuals that I want to help in the community. So we don't find individuals like that as easily and he's a perfect fit for this important responsibility and I whole-heartedly support his nomination and would urge everyone else to support him as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you Madam President. If there is no further conversation or objection I ask this be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:
Seeing no objection, so ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It's kind of quiet in here. Madam President, that concludes I believe our Bills for this evening so if the Clerk would please now call the Bills on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Oh, Senator Osten I apologize.

THE CHAIR:

Would you like to be recognized? Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and thank you Senator Duff. I was absent during the timeframe when we talked about the Nurse Cadet Corps on Senate General -- the Resolution No. 3 and I would just like to stand and thank everybody who supported putting that Resolution on the Consent Calendar. These women and women often who served in the military who were nurses were often thought not to be -- were not considered to be part of the military and these women did work both in country and out of country healing our men who were grievously injured and I think it's important. This is the last group that has not been recognized as Veterans from World War II. The only group of women from World War II
in the Vietnam timeframe and Vietnam era women who served as nurses in Vietnam were not given the due respect. This is the same thing. It's time for us to respect these women. I've met many of them. They gave of themselves. They wore a uniform. They were trained appropriately and they served our country and I'm so pleased and proud of everybody here who is supporting women in the military, having served in the Army myself. I think it's important that we recognize that many women have given their life for this country. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Osten. Back to you Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if the Clerk can please call the items on Consent Calendar No. 1 followed by a vote, please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:


THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk and the machines will be open if you would kindly count -- call the vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Consent Calendar No. 1.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

On Consent Calendar No. 1.
Total Number Voting 36
Total Voting Yea 36
Total Voting Nay 0
Absent not Voting 0

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) Legislation is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That concludes our business for today. I'll yield for any Point of Personal Privilege or announcements, please.

THE CHAIR:

Any Point of Personal Privilege or announcements? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Senate Republican will caucus tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. in the caucus room.

THE CHAIR:

Any further points or announcements? Hearing none, this session is adjourned. Go forth and -- oh, sorry Senator Duff, Senator Duff, I apologize.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. That's okay. Thank you, Madam President. We all want to leave. Madam President, the Senate will convene tomorrow at noon. And with
that I move we recess -- adjourn, I'm sorry, we adjourn subject to the call of the chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much. (Gavel) We are adjourned. Go forth and govern.

On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 10:15 p.m. adjourned subject to the call of the chair.