The Senate was called to order at 12:16 o’clock p.m., Senator Cohen of the 12th District in the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The Senate will now come to order. I’d like you to turn your attention to Acting Chaplain, Tim Kehoe.

ACTING CHAPLAIN TIMOTHY KEHOE:

Please bless us with the inner strength so that our lives and our work may be a blessing on others. Amen.

THE CHAIR:

Well I am excited to say we have the third graders from A.W. Cox Elementary School in Gilford and I wonder if they will lead us in our Pledge of Allegiance today? If everybody can stand up?

THIRD GRADE STUDENTS A.W. COX ELEMENTARY:

(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:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and good to see you up there today and I'd also like to welcome A.W. Cox Elementary third graders from Gilford today and thank you for leading us in the Pledge of Allegiance. I had my son's school come here a few years ago and did the same thing and it's really a joy and it's so great to have kids lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance so good morning and thank you for being up here today. Madam President, at the moment, I will yield back to our President before I make another motion, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff, and I just wanted to especially recognize A.W. Cox Elementary School today because amongst the students here today is my daughter, Ryan Cohen, so that's exciting for me. [Applause] And I also just, I'd be remiss in not mentioning this is a very special week for teachers and I really want to recognize all of the hard work that you all do on a regular basis shaping the minds of these young people and thank you so much for all of your hard work. [Applause] Happy Teacher Appreciate Week! Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Yes, thank you and we thank you for mentioning that, Madam President. It is Teacher Appreciation Week. It's also Nurses' Appreciation Week as well and we thank all of our hard-working teachers and our nurses and all those who take care of us and help us to learn
and grow and certainly want to thank Senator Cohen for leading us today and bringing the class and helping us with the Pledge of Allegiance. With that, Madam President, I move that we recess for the moment.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate stands in recess.

On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 12:25 p.m. recessed.

The Senate reconvened at 1:54 p.m., the President in the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you for your patience. Madam President, I have a couple of markings please?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 46, 45, calendar 36, Senate Bill 1, I'd like to refer that to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 24, calendar 316, Senate Bill 372, I'd like to refer that to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 52, calendar 317, Senate Bill 393, I'd like to refer that to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Yeah. We will stand at ease.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President?

THE CHAIR:
Yes, please.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President for our go list at the moment?

THE CHAIR:

Yep.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 25, calendar 327, Senate Bill 252, I'd like to mark that go.

THE CHAIR:

Yep.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 26, calendar 332, Senate Bill 682, I'd like to mark that go. On calendar page 7, calendar 131, Senate Bill 923, I'd like to mark that go. On calendar page 46, calendar 136, Senate Bill 863, I'd like to mark that go. On calendar page 28, calendar 349, Senate Bill 556, I'd like to mark that go. On calendar page 48, calendar 259, Senate Bill 702, I'd like to mark that go. On calendar page 28, calendar 357, Senate Bill 1082, I'd like to mark that go, and on calendar page 39, calendar 433, Senate Bill 693, I'd like to mark that go. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. So noted. Mr. Clerk.
THE CLERK:

Page 25, calendar number 327, substitute for Senate Bill 252, AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONNECTICUT FOOD POLICY COUNCIL.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President, nice to see you today.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Same here.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this bill before us makes some important changes to the Connecticut Food Policy Council's membership and their duties. It expands the current membership from 12 to 19, adding such positions as the Commissioner of the Department of Consumer Protection and the Department of Economic and Community Development.
This comes to us from members of the Food Policy Council and advocates for their work with the recognition of the important work that they do and how it may interface with these other agencies. It also changes some of the duties of the Council and this bill had brought bipartisan support in our Committee and I hope that it will have similar support here in this Chamber today. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further? Senator Sampson, good afternoon.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. The bill before us is a good bill. As was just mentioned, it came out of the GAE Committee unanimously. It is a good update to an existing Food Policy Council and I support it. I suggest my colleagues do as well. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):
I rise in support of the Food Policy Council bill and I would like to thank the GAE Committee for bringing this bill to the legislature and getting the work done. I've been doing the food work in Connecticut and started a Food Policy Council in Bridgeport. This bill will help strengthen a statewide effort to bring people together, understand the importance of a policy from a state level, and I thank you. I hope you'll support the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you. I rise just for a question or two for the proponent of the bill. With regard to the --

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you. With regard to the initiatives moving forward, is this food policy going to be for everybody that makes food in the state or for? I'm not quite
sure where this is going. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Through you, Madam President. Madam President, the bill before us does not direct any particular policy be adopted by the Council or moved forward by the Council. It just makes changes to the things that they consider in their work and the membership of the Council. It's not a directive with regard to any particular policy concerning food. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It does say examining food and nutrition-related programs, issues, and policies, developing recommendations to promote a strong food economy, and support strong community access to healthy foods. I'm wondering if that might be a way to, to expand into food products that are, that are provided to schools or children or senior centers. I'm not sure what these policies to do because I may have some ideas with regard to these issues. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

Through you, Madam President. The legislation before us asks the Council to look at the issues that the good Senator just referenced, but it does not commit to any particular policy with regard to food. It just adds these things to the list of things that they are asked to examine and consider in their work and if someone had concerns about the Council and how they might approach this work, I would point out that the membership of the Council does have appointments from our six legislative leaders so any of us who had an interest in seeing who was on the Council or making sure that a particular appointment was made, I'm sure we could do good work in lobbying our respective leaders and talking with them about the appointments that they choose to make to this Council. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you. I thank the Senator for that answer and I'm sorry that I was not clear in my question. I was trying to determine whether this was going to be strictly a public concept or a public/private concept where these things would be addressed to the entire community and I'm still not sure whether I have that answer. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

Through you, Madam President. I couldn’t hear the totality of the good Senator's question. If he could please repeat it?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you and I would just remind the Chamber to have quiet so that we can hear the debate. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. My apologies to the Senator. I'm wondering if this is to address these programs in examining food issues and policies in the private and the public sector or just the public sector? Through you, Madam, or just the private sector? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Through you, Madam President. This Council looks at the totality of access to food in our State and the legislation before us does not contemplate a distinction between food that is made available through the private sector, the public sector or any other. It asks, the current charge of the Council is to look again at food policy across the board in our State and the changes here are an augmentation to that.

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

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you to the good Senator for her answers. I just have one comment. I had an opportunity to meet the chefs that are handling the New London School Food Program who are doing banner work in introducing nutritious and healthy foods to the children in the school districts in New London and so part of my reasoning to stand here and ask the Senator the good questions of whether this particular Council may be of benefit to the City of New London and to, in fact, we just had a conversation to expand that program to other school districts in the State so I'm wondering if that was the priority for this or if they were gonna talk about getting into the private sector and to try to get involved in the commercial aspect which I may or may not have agreement with, but I do thank the good Senator for her answers and I thank the President for her time here today.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the bill? If not, we will have the Clerk please call for the machine.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

I'm not against the bill if that's --
Thank you, Senator Formica. So with that we will have a machine vote.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if there is no objection, I would ask that we place this bill on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection and Senator Formica, sorry, it was very loud in here. So you are a supporter of the bill and you don’t mind this being on the Consent Calendar?

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

I have no problem with it being on the Consent Calendar and I apologize for being so soft spoken this morning.

THE CHAIR:

Usually not a problem [laughter] but thank you and without objection, please make that note, Mr. Clerk. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I just want to yield to any points of personal privilege or announcements and also ask the Clerk on the next bill, Senator Calendar page 26, calendar 332, Senator Bill 682, if we can just PT that and after and points, to move onto the bill after. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Very good, Senator Duff. Any points or personal privilege? Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and it is my pleasure to take a point of personal privilege and introduce to the Chamber a constituent, constituents from my District, from New Fairfield, Connecticut. We have with us today Terra Volpe Martin and her daughter, Katie Volpe Martin who's 9 years old and I want to especially acknowledge the role that Katie has played in our legislative process because she in fact testified before the Education Committee this session and so it's wonderful to have young folks who are so aware of what's going on in the world and are willing to come here and share their point of view with us so I'm delighted to introduce them both today and I would ask you to welcome them to the Chamber. [Applause]

THE CHAIR:

And Senator Kushner, we will just thank Terra Martin Volpe and Katie Martin Volpe for their advocacy. We appreciate their great service to our State. Thanks for visiting us today. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 7, calendar number 131, substitute for Senate Bill No. 923, AN ACT ALLOWING BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR REGULATED PROFESSIONALS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Stand at ease for a moment, please.

THE CHAIR:

We will stand at ease. Thank you. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Will the Clerk return to the call of the calendar, please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. The item has been called and Senator Abrams, good afternoon.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I apologize, but I need a minute. Can we stand at ease for a minute?

THE CHAIR:

The Chamber will stand at ease.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):
Thank you, Madam President. This bill adds licensed behavioral analysts to a list of providers who are eligible for professional assistance program for health professionals. It's a voluntary program and includes confidential rehabilitation program that provides various services for health professionals with chemical dependency, emotional behavior disorders or physical or mental illness. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further? Senator Somers, good afternoon.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill. This bill was brought to us by the behavioral analysts, excuse me therapists, analysts/therapists and they have requested to be part of Haven Health and Haven Health takes care in a confidential manner, all of our healthcare professionals. They pay a fee of $5 dollars with their license fee and then they are allowed to go in a confidential manner to be able to discuss their personal issues, if they have any dependency in a way that is confidential and does not jeopardize their work environment so this is something that over the years, many of our clinicians have come and asked to be added to this. It's a good bill. It keeps our healthcare, it's care for our healthcare workers and they need care also so I fully support this bill and again, it did come based on their request and I hope the circle will join us in supporting the bill. Thank you.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

I would add that this bill passed unanimously out of Public Health because of the need for this and I would ask that if there is no objection, I move to place this item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 46, calendar No. 136, substitute for Senate Bill No. 863, AN ACT CONCERNING EMPLOYMENT PROTECTION FOR MEMBERS OF THE CIVIL AIR PATROL.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney. Good afternoon.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):
Thank you, Madam President. This bill will extend protections to members of the Civil Air Patrol. The Civil Air Patrol is the auxiliary of the US Air Force and they will assist the Coast Guard in search and recover missions and also assist the State in times of emergency. What this would do is prohibit employers from penalizing them from having to miss work when they are called up to duty.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 28, calendar No. 349, Senate Bill No. 556, AN ACT CONCERNING ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN RETIRED PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano, good afternoon.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Good afternoon, Madam Chairman. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and move
passage of the bill and waive its reading and seek leave to summarize the bill.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. This is a strike all amendment.

THE CHAIR:

I see so, pardon me, Senator, if we have an amendment then the Clerk needs to call it before you summarize. Mr. Clerk?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

I would ask for the amendment to call LCO 7552.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7552, Senator Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is an interesting and it's been somewhat of an emotional bill for us in the building this year. It's an act concerning additional compensation for certain retired safety employees. It involves the town of Norwalk and the very horrendous accident involving a police officer
who was close to retirement, who at a training session on duty was actually mistakenly or accidentally I should say shot and had to terminate his employment. He was just short of retirement and so the fiscal impact on him and his family was significant. What this bill does, this arose out of his employment. He suffered in the line of duty within the scope of his employment and that was important and so what this bill does is it allows a municipality with two-thirds of a vote of its elected officials or its council, there's so many different terms that we have that I'm trying to get the right one, the governing body, two-thirds of a vote of the governing body can in fact restore that difference for that employee so it's a good bill. It makes sense. It's the type of bill that you never expect because those kind of things just happen and it's our job to react. The community can't do it on its own so if we authorize this, then Norwalk, if they choose to do so with a two-thirds vote would be able to do this for this particular employee.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Champagne?

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

I rise in support of this amendment. It was an emotional time when the family came in, especially listening to what has happened to that family with the children. This is not a mandate. This is something that the municipalities can do if they wish and, like I said, I do support this amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, thank you very much, Madam President. I just rise for a quick question on the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Certainly I can understand the situation and support the situation. I'm just wondering if municipalities can do this already by vote of their municipal body?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Through you, Madam President. It is our understanding that there was no specific allowance to do this so by the state statute, by doing this, it allows the municipalities that opportunity.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Thank you, good Senator.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, with the amendment adopted, it basically is the description of the bill. I would urge adoption of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Duff?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I want to thank, well speaking in support of the bill I want to thank Senator Cassano for his hard work and members of the Planning and Development Committee on a bipartisan basis. This issue came out of an incident that happened in Norwalk and we had heard about the police officer who was unfortunately shot while working at the gun range in Norwalk and it was an unfortunate incident all the way around. Unfortunately, the officer is, will be permanently disabled, won't be able to go back to work and trying, in order to help him and his family to be able to kind of bridge a gap
that exists under current law. Now this doesn’t put any kind of a mandate on any community; it just allows this to happen with the approval of the town's or city's legislative body, which I think is why we’re seeing bipartisan support. Obviously, we all want to support our police officers, our first responders. They do a good job for us and so this, but I think this proposal that we have out here certainly is one that meets the needs and that does it in a way that makes sense.

I also want to thank the advocates outside of this Chamber who have been helping the Roselle family, for advocating for this as well. I appreciate their efforts also and again, I want to thank Senator Cassano and all of the members of the Planning and Development Committee for their hard work on this issue in getting us here today. Thank you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I see it's a strike all amendment. I would urge, if there's no opposition, that we place it on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no opposition, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:
Page 48, calendar No. 259, Senate Bill No. 702, AN ACT CONCERNING THE TRANSFER OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY RECORDS BETWEEN AGENCIES.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, we're going to PT this item and if the Senate can stand at ease for a moment, please.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if the Clerk would now call an item previously marked PT, calendar page 48, calendar 259, Senate Bill No. 702?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk?

CLERK:

Page 48, calendar 258, Senate Bill No. 702, AN ACT CONCERNING THE TRANSFER OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY RECORDS BETWEEN AGENCIES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley.
SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Thank you, Madam President. It's a pleasure to be here in the circle on this wonderful afternoon. Madam President, I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Uh, Madam President, just to give a little bit of background to my colleagues in the circle, this is a piece of legislation that we worked arduously during the Public Safety Committee. I want to really highlight and commend my colleague, Senator Champagne for the hard work he's done in highlighting some very basic deficiencies that government has when it comes to reporting or sharing information of a background check, when it goes from municipality to municipality in dealing with government workers, so I really want to commend him for highlighting those things. Oftentimes in the circle, we are I would say ignorant to the struggles of different areas and different areas of our great State or different departments and I really commend him in showing how we can streamline this process and become more efficient as government so I thank him for that.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill. It's exactly what Senator Bradley said and I want to thank him for his hard work as well on this bill. This streamlines it and still protects the FOI provisions of Connecticut law. Right now with the fear of FOI violations, the police department supplying the information will hold it up and make it go through attorneys, sometimes block, uh, holding up the transfer records in at least one case that I know of for years. So I urge my colleagues to support this. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Champagne. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

I rise in support of this but I also want to more importantly acknowledge the collaborative effort of our Chair in Public Safety and also the House Chair, Representative Verrengia, but I also wanted to acknowledge Senator Champagne’s good work, bringing his law enforcement background and understanding to create efficiencies, to get services and information delivered effectively so I wanted to take a moment and urge support of this, but also acknowledge proponents of this for their wonderful work. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Hwang. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further? Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY:

Madam President, if there is no object and no further remarks, I move that this item be added to a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Seeing no objection, so ordered and Mr. Clerk, let's just make sure that we know the proper legislation for the record and Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just for clarification, it's calendar 259, Senate Bill No. 702 which I believe was on the board.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

So noted.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Madam President, I would refer an item please, on calendar page 42, calendar 448, Senate Bill No. 3. I'd like to refer that to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and two items I'd like to remove from the Consent Calendar followed by votes.

THE CHAIR:

Sure.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

One would be on calendar, I believe it's calendar page 7, calendar 131, Senate Bill No. 923. If that can be called for a vote, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk, and the machine will be obtained once it is on the board.

CLERK:

Page 7, calendar 131, Senate Bill 923, AN ACT ALLOWING BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR REGULATED PROFESSIONALS.

THE CHAIR:
And will you please let the Senators know that that item is on the calendar and should be voted upon. It's on the board.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 923. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 923.

THE CHAIR:

And I would just advise the Senators to stay in the Chamber because we will have another roll call vote right after this one, please. Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On Senate Bill No. 923.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></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>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Before we get to the next item to vote on I just want to take a moment of personal privilege, please?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Today we have one of our former colleagues from the House of Representatives here in the Chamber, Representative Bruce Morris who's visiting us here on a number of issues. He may have retired from the legislature but he's still involved in a number of issues around the State and I just would ask that the Chamber give our normal warm welcome to our former colleague, State Representative Bruce Morris. [Applause]

THE CHAIR:

Welcome, Reverend Morris. Thank you for visiting with us and, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if we can now ask the Clerk to call a vote on calendar 136, Senate Bill 863 for roll call vote, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Oh, I'm sorry. We need to remove that item from the Consent Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

So noted. The item will be removed and the Clerk will call that item, please.

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 46, calendar No. 136, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 863, AN ACT CONCERNING EMPLOYMENT PROTECTION FOR MEMBERS OF THE CIVIL AIR PATROL.

THE CHAIR:

The machine is open. Senators, please cast your votes.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 863. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 863. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 863.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be closed and Mr. Clerk, would you kindly announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 863.
THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. We're just waiting on an amendment or two so if the Senate could stand at ease for a moment, please?

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Going to move on another bill that we previously marked PT which is calendar 332, Senate Bill 682, if we could mark that go as our next item.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, so ordered and Mr. Clerk, would you kindly announce that legislation?

CLERK:

Page 26, calendar No. 332, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 682, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A REWARD PROGRAM FOR
STATE EMPLOYEE REPORTING OF WASTEFUL PRACTICES. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Mr. Clerk and I recognize Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the bill before us today reestablishes a reward program for state employees that find waste in state government and rewards them for doing such. It allows state employees to come forward with suggestions and makes them eligible for potential awards if they are able to find savings in their work for our state. I want to thank the members of the GA Committee for supporting this bill broadly in our Committee, in particular the vice-chair of our Committee, State Senator Will Haskell, who not only came forward with this important idea, but worked diligently to develop this piece of legislation in a way that will function well in all of our agencies of state government and create this important incentive for state employees to come forward and help us make sure that we're running our state government in the most efficient and effective way possible. Thank you, Madam President.
Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment. It's LCO No. 8454. I would ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and that I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk, kindly call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8454, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the amendment?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the amendment before us makes a change to the underlying bill that allows or makes certain that if any practice that is brought forward by an employee that is alleging that it is wasteful, that that employee is not eligible for an award if they were contributing to such waste. I encourage my colleagues in the circle to support this administration.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just want to speak briefly in favor of the amendment. I think this is a common sense provision. I am very pleased that we are adding this to the bill to make something which I think should be obvious, but we wanted to make it explicit in the language that if you are part of the problem, that you shouldn’t be benefiting from the solution, and I encourage adoption of the amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the amendment as discussed? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the amendment as discussed, please signify by saying Aye.

SENATORS:
Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. First and foremost, I want to thank the Chair of the Committee, Senator Flexer, for her leadership on this issue. I think that Senator Flexer is not only a good friend of
mine in the circle, but also a friend of all Connecticut taxpayers as we work to root out inefficiency and build a state government that works for everybody. I also want to briefly thank my friend, Representative Jane Garibay, who comes from the town of Windsor. This is really, this legislation would not have been possible without her idea and it is in fact modeled on a program that's worked very well within the municipality of Windsor to help save that town government some money.

I think that the underlying importance of this bill is that we have to move away from us versus them rhetoric when we're talking about improving our state government and streamlining our bureaucracy. Nobody knows the ins and outs of our agencies better than the folks who actually work within the state government. That's why I'm thrilled that with this bill, they will become our partners in figuring out where, how we can spend our money more efficiently and where there is a duplicative process perhaps, where there is an expensive practice, where there is inefficient behavior so I want to thank Representative Garibay. I will be emphatically voting in favor of this legislation and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm glad that the previous amendment was adopted, but in light of the rest of the bill, I just wanted to stand briefly and explain that I will be voting no on the legislation
before us. It's something that I've struggled with since we had the bill in the Committee. I'm not averse to the notion that we should somehow incentivize folks in our state government to find savings that will benefit the taxpayers of Connecticut. I'm certainly in favor of that. I just have an issue I guess with the idea that people who work in public service being rewarded for something I think they should be doing automatically. I believe that anyone who takes a job in our state government is a public servant. I think they have an obligation to their neighbors to find savings and make that known to their you know managers and so forth so that we can indeed run a tighter ship and save the taxpayers money. A policy that creates this incentive somehow could potentially another incentive to perpetuate waste for the purpose of finding solutions to it. I just don’t see it as the right type of policy to make this type of change. I would call upon every State employee to let us know where we can save money to benefit them and their fellow taxpayers and not enact a reward system for doing so.

It reminds of a story recently. I was actually in the checkout line at Walmart and I was about to walk away after paying for my items and the person behind me called me over to tell me that I had left my change there on the counter and when I thanked them for doing so, they said oh you know you owe me now, etc. and I basically said actually no, you did the right thing and I don’t think people in our society should expect an award for doing the right thing and I guess that's the principal.

THE CHAIR:

Senator hold that thought and I would just ask us for some quiet in the Chamber because it is getting
difficult to hear your points so quiet in the Chamber, please. Thank you. Please proceed, Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I was really on more or less the last sentence of my remarks. I will just close by saying that I do believe there is value in this policy. I understand why people are supporting it. I just, as I said, I think that we should not be rewarding folks for doing something they should do automatically and I'll be voting no today. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you will kindly call a roll call vote and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 682. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 682 as amended by Senate Schedule A.
Total number voting 36
Necessary for adoption 19
Those voting Yea 35
Those voting Nay 1
Absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good afternoon again, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President, would the Clerk please now call calendar page 45, calendar 44, Senate Bill 20, please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:
Page 45, calendar No. 44, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 20, AN ACT PROHIBITING THE IMPORT, SALE AND POSSESSION OF AFRICAN ELEPHANTS, LIONS, LEOPARDS, BLACK RHINOCEROS, WHITE RHINOCEROS AND GIRAFFES. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of a strike all amendment, LCO 8398. I would ask that the Clerk please call the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8398, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Madam President, thank you so much. Actually, I would ask, I believe the Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 8459. I would, I would ask that we withdraw the previous amendment, 8398 and ask the Clerk to please call LCO 8549.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8459, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this bill seeks to prevent the importation, possession and sale of Africa's big six species that includes the African elephant, the African lion, the African giraffe, black rhinoceros's, white rhinoceros's and the African leopard. Exceptions to this would be if an owner of one of these species or a product of one
of these species is in possession at the time of the passage of this bill and obtains a certificate of possession from DEEP and also certain exceptions exist in terms of taxidermists that operate lawfully in the State of Connecticut as well as for certain universities seeking research through the big six African species as well as museums within the state so I urge my colleagues here in the Chamber to pass this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I just wanted to query the proponent of the amendment through you if I might.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Just to make sure, or would you rather do it after the passage of the amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Up to you, Senator.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Well I was just looking at the Chair. Why don’t we do it now? So through you, Madam Chairman, uh, Madam
President. First of all, let me just say that I appreciate the work that's gone into improving the language in this bill. For a number of years we've looked at similar legislation, I think there was the big five and now it's the big six and so in its current construction, it does appear to be me that there have been numerous changes since the bill left the Committee and my question starts first of all with, it is specific, as I understand it, that is African elephant and not any other kind of elephant. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes, that is correct.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

And in Section 1c, line 15, there is no obligation, while it uses the word shall have the authority, there is no obligation to a constable or a municipal official to actually investigate if someone says oh, I overhead at the bar or my neighbor has a coat or whatever, through you, they're not obligated to do that in my reading of this bill. Is that correct? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Cohen.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Yes, that is correct. They shall have the authority although it is my understanding that when law enforcement officials receive a complaint, most often they follow through on those complaints with investigation.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

And so as part of that investigation then, I think line 17 speaks to a search warrant so I don't, I'm not a policeman, I'm not an attorney, but I'm concerned about the layperson in the State of Connecticut. This bill is rather descriptive. It says in whole or in part and so my read of the bill is that if my wife was given a coat that had a leopard skin collar and I wasn't in the legislature, in all likelihood, she'd have no idea what was going on and so conceivably, someone could be out, someone could be asked if that is in fact an actual leopard skin collar on the coat. If the coat ended up going back home and went back in the closet, would law enforcement have to get a warrant before they entered the house? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. It is my understanding that yes, that they would need a warrant before
entering and certainly, a judge would need to sign off on the appropriateness of such a warrant being issued.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, it's my understanding that this is intended to clue, include animals that are both alive and not alive and so in the case that an animal is alive and someone makes a claim that there's an elephant on such and such property and law enforcement wants to go investigate that, if it is not an African elephant and the person makes that claim, what happens then? Does the, does the individual who's made the claim that that's an African elephant have some due process to prove that it's an African elephant before a warrant gets taken out or is just someone's word and hearsay? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. Well I would think they would be beholden to due process through the law and go before the judge and have to present any evidence to show that perhaps it is an Asian elephant and not an African elephant. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Miner.
SENATOR MINER (30TH):

So if I understand the gentle lady correctly, then it would be in this case, let's say my constituents' obligation to demonstrate the lineage of the elephant to prove that it was Asian, not African. Is that correct? Through you?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes, in that case, I would believe so.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, on line 27, there is the word certificate. It's my understanding that this bill requires that anyone that has a part or a whole to make a declaration to the DEEP and get a certificate in possession and so in that case, if the gentle lady knows, who will keep the records of those certificates so that they know who's been issued a certificate at some point in the future thinking that someone may have a tapestry of some value that they want to sell and it was properly declared, had its certificate and then as I understand the bill, the way it's drafted, you'd be able to actually sell it. Through you.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. The Department of Environment, Energy and Environmental Protection would be in charge of issuance of said certificates and would also, I would believe maintain a record of said certificates. I would anticipate that the owner of such big six African species or parts thereof would also have a copy of that certificate.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And so, just to be sure, the obligation to maintain the state's record will fall to the DEEP so that if a property owner has the appropriate certificate and enters into an agreement to sell the item, transfer the certificate, the agency then would be able to determine whether or not that was a legitimate certificate for that item and therefore, it wasn't an item that would have come into the state on some kind of a phony certificate so there's no question as to whether the possessor is the only, is the holder of the only document. Otherwise, I'm not sure this will work. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):
Through you, Madam President. Yes, that is my understanding, that the agency will have a record of such certificates that are issued.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And in the last section K, there's some language in here about taxidermy. We have at least a couple of taxidermists here in the State of Connecticut that have some history actually of doing these rather large animals and so it's my understanding in section K that that business practice would be allowed to continue. They would not be required to have a certificate and possess and if the animal came from, it would have to come from outside the State of Connecticut, is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes, that is correct. The animal would have to be obtained from outside of the state. The taxidermist would then have up to nine months to perform the business that they were contracted to before shipping it back to the individual out of state at that point because at that point, this bill would have become law and certainly, not legal to have such a, such an animal in their possession unless, of course, they do have a
certificate of possession in which case, if there were a repair needed to say a stuffed species, then the taxidermist would be able to provide such repairs to that animal and then ship it back to the owner of the certificate of possession.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So under that scenario, even someone that's in state would have the ability to send their specimen to a local taxidermist and have it repaired if it needed repairs with the certificate and get it back so it would actually go from property in state to the taxidermist back in state, but because it had the certificate and was registered and was possessed prior to the passage of the law, they would be exempt as I understand it meaning that they could have that work done and get it back without penalty. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes, that is correct.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I thank the gentle lady for her responses and her work on this bill. Two things. I don't know what goes into the making of every garment. I have been in homes where I've actually not anticipated seeing perhaps a wall hanging that may have come from some family member many years ago but it has great sentimental value and I know we think that a lot of people think we watch what goes on up here but I am most often not surprised to find out that many people don’t know what goes on up here. I know that the penalty phase has been reduced in this bill, but I remain concerned that there are circumstances where someone's collar or someone's tapestry, I'm not naïve enough to think that someone's full stuffed white rhinoceros could somehow have been mistaken for something else, but there are sometimes very small pieces of these animals that end up in jewelry or something else and I think most people won't know. They may go into, uh, some store somewhere and want to liquidate assets of their parents and now be in violation of the law for having tried to sell it.

The other thing that concerns me about the bill is that I think some people believe that hunting is inappropriate and certainly hunting of big six animals is inappropriate, but this is not an uncommon phenomenon worldwide and maybe the maybe that will change, but for right now it exists and for right now people have these collections and for right now it takes a lot of money and I worry sometimes that when you drive into Connecticut, the big sign that says Welcome to Connecticut doesn’t say and by the way, if you own one of these or one of those or one of these, um, you're in violation of the law and so you’ve got to get rid of your whatever. So those things do concern me, Madam President.
Initially, one of the other concerns I had is that I have a constituent that actually has some of these live animals and they're not a zoo. They're not, um, a non-profit. They happen to supply these animals to fair, to circus's. It's been a longstanding arrangement here in the State of Connecticut. They employ a number of people and I just didn't want to have this legislation force that individual to get rid of his animals and because of the accommodations in the bill, it's my understanding that at some point when he transfers his business to his children, sells it, those animals would not have to be euthanized just because of the bill and so I am grateful about that and as I said before, I am grateful for the work that's been done on the bill, but for the reasons that I've described, um, I'm not in a position to support the bill, um, but Thank you, Madam President and thank the gentle lady for her work.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the amendment as discussed, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):
Good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

I've been listening to the conversation here intently mostly because I haven't seen this bill in its final form until just a little while ago and I have just one simple question that I would just like to clarify. It appears to me that the language in this bill only affects this possession or trade of the items in question from the effective date going forward so it would not impact anyone who has already been in possession of these items. Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. Anybody in possession of parts or of these species would need to obtain a certificate of possession from DEEP.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

All right. Thank you, Madam President. So if I am in possession of one of these things and I'm not aware of this law, I could find myself in trouble with the law
because someone discovers that I am in possession. Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. It is correct that they would be in violation of the law if they do not obtain a certificate of possession within 180 days from the date that DEEP makes those available.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President and I appreciate the gentle lady's response. So I guess followup to that would mean that if I'm in possession and if I am smart enough and aware of rather is maybe a better word to use to obtain such a certificate, would I still be prohibited from transferring it to someone else? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. No, in fact you would not be prohibited from transferring that certificate to somebody else as long as you obtain the certificate of
possession within the 180 days once DEEP makes those available.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR Sampson (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate these answers. I'm sure this information's in the bill. I tried to follow along as much as I could but I'd just like to get all of that on the record and so I'm comfortable knowing what I'm going to vote in favor of potentially. So I guess I do have one final question which is regarding trade in general then, so if I have a certificate, I'm allowed to transfer it to someone else which I guess means that I'm allowed to actually transfer the ownership of this item to someone else, is that, uh, acceptable and the trade that is restricted in this bill refers to someone who does not have a certificate. Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President and through you, yes, that is correct. As long as they have the certificate of possession, within the guidelines laid out upon passage of this law, then they can transfer or sell and provide their certificate of possession, but likely at that point, DEEP would issue a new certificate of possession to the new and rightful owner.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That concludes my questions and I thank the gentle lady for her answers. Yeah, you know looking at this bill initially, I thought I was going to be in a position to support it since I gathered that it was limited to only case going forward and I think today most people are aware that the possession of these types of you know species that are endangered is something that the government is concerned with and trying to protect and I'm certainly sympathetic to that, but I think that it's a dangerous policy to expect that people live across our state are paying attention to every action that we take in this Chamber. I can see countless situations where people may be in possession of these items knowingly or even unknowingly about what they have and then to potentially be prosecuted for the mere possession of something that may have been in their family for a period of time. I just think it goes way too far and I'm disappointed that we didn’t draft a more common sense approach which is to just make this going forward where I think most people wound understand the circumstances a little bit better. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I wasn’t going to stand but I do, I do have a couple of questions through the passage of the bill. We're talking about selling and so on. If somebody has one of these items and they give it to their child, does that person have to get a new permit and how is this permitting process developed? Through DEEP?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President and thank my good colleague for his question. Yes, the rightful heirs of this specimen would indeed need to obtain a certificate of possession and the program will be developed through DEEP.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

I understand the intent. I also know that DEEP is down 1000 people and I can't imagine that this effectively can be done correctly but I hope it can be. I understand what we're trying to do. The other question that I would think the person on the street would ask cause I don't know the answer to this, we're talking about the African elephant. I believe there's an Indian elephant. What's the difference? Why one and not the other? [overlapping conversation] elephants.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. I will try and give my expertise on this. I believe it's the size of their ears [laughs], but no, in all honesty, I don't know what the difference is and I would certainly leave that up to the experts.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

And I don’t mean that as being a wise guy. I mean we had these discussions the other day about scrimshaw and I grew up in Nantucket, scrimshaw was a part of life, it was a part of the whaling industry and so on and if you own it and you’ve had it, to go through this kind of a process just seems bothersome. If we're trying to stop something from happening, I can understand that, um, but I just can't imagine a notification process out of DEEP where everybody that has one of these items is going to know about it and know that they have to register it and if they give it to their children, no, they have to register it again. I just find it a little complicated. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I have one question for the passage of this bill and the question is what would be the cost to register these items?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. There is no cost specified in the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

So will this be a cost to DEEP for the processing and did we get a fiscal note on this?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. There is no fiscal note.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Obviously if this is a new program within DEEP, I believe it is going to create a cost and I think we should look into what that cost would be to see if it is affordable for the state and if so, this should probably be referred. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I just rise to speak in support of the bill. I certainly appreciate the work that's been done by Senator Cohen and the Committee and work with Senator Miner and Senator Fasano on this. The issue came forward after a number of years ago when there was trophy hunting and concern about bringing those animals into various states, into Connecticut, and to try and send the statement about values we have her in Connecticut and preventing those animals from coming into our state. As we know with many pieces of legislation, you listen to the public, you work you talk to various folks, you make a bill better and I think that's what we've done by speaking to a number of different of my colleagues and we have an amendment that is a bipartisan amendment so again, I want to just thank the folks who've worked hard on this. I also want to thank the Friends of Animals located in Darien who've helped to bring this issue to my attention and again, just wanted to say thanks to everybody for their hard work on it and I urge my colleagues to support the bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? If not, if the Clerk would please call a roll call vote and the machines will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 20 as amended by Senate A. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 20 as amended by Senate A. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 20. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 20.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? Seeing that they have, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will announce the tally, please.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 20 as amended by Senate A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The measure is adopted. Mr. Clerk or Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

CLERK:

The Senate will reconvene immediately. The Senate will reconvene immediately.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff. Good afternoon, good evening, whatever we are here.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good evening, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President, would the Clerk please call on calendar page 14, calendar 195, Senate Bill 907 as a go and followed by calendar page 39, calendar 433, Senate Bill 693 and I'd like to mark that item go as well and lastly, calendar page 28, calendar 367, Senate Bill 1062, mark that as a PR, please.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Duff. So ordered, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 14, calendar No. 195, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 907, AN ACT CONCERNING THE RESIDENTIAL DISCLOSURE REPORT AND CRUMBLING CONCRETE FOUNDATIONS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Madam President, I move 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 LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this bill is designed to protect consumers, to provide purchasers of residential homes with more information about the status of the home, particularly as we face this crumbling foundation crisis, and provide more
information through the vehicle known as the Residential Disclosure Report. Specifically, the bill expands the information available within that report and also expands the number of instances in which that report is supplied. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 8472. I would ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8472, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Please proceed, Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Thank you, uh, Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this is a strike all amendment that makes a variety of changes to the underlying bill, but preserves the intent. It allows, uh, expands the use of the Residential Disclosure Report in the case of foreclosures, in the case of transfers pursuant to a court, and in limited cases, for properties possessed by a municipality and it requires disclosure of knowledge of testing, of repairs, and knowledge of the presence of pyrrhotite as part of that report. It also creates, uh, preserves the cause of action in the case when that information is supplied. Madam President, I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you. The question is on adoption of the amendment. Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Anwar.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise to support this amendment and this issue with the crumbling foundation is impacting a large number of communities. There are thousands of homes and people are literally losing their homes based on their foundations. Now what has happened unfortunately in some situations in rare instances knowingly, but in many instances without knowing, people have sold their homes and the new people coming to our community, new neighbors, they have bought a house which they thought was worth much more than it really was and this actually gives a protection from the consumer perspective to make sure that every home that is going to be sold in this region would have the information that is going to protect the consumer so individuals who have information on the concrete foundations with the illness would have to disclose this and this allows protection for the next buyer. The amendment actually has just cleaned up the language a little bit so that it makes sure that there are no frivolous lawsuits that would come. There was mention of pyrrhotite. Because of the fact that we do not know the exact amount of pyrrhotite that's safe for the concrete presence, that language had to be amended and that's what this amendment does so I would encourage everyone in this Chamber to support this.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Kelly.
SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I also rise in support of this amendment and I'd like to thank the good Chairman from the Insurance Committee, Senator Lesser, for his cooperation and diligence with regards to both the underlying bill, working through it in Committee, as well as the amendment that we have now before the Chamber. I would also like to point out the work of Senator Bizzarro who noticed that this was going to be applicable to municipalities and also Senators, I don't know did I call him Representative Bizzarro? No, Senator Bizzarro, Senator Champagne, and Senator Anwar for their help and cooperation in getting this bill to where it is right now, but through Madam President, I would like to for legislative intent ask a question to the proponent of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. So for legislative intent in section 2, sub-section B2, is it true that the defect described in line 283 means that the civil action that a purchaser may have against the seller requires that the seller possess actual knowledge of the defect? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Through you, Senator Kelly. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):
Through you, Madam President. Yes, although I don't know, I think the, I would suggest to Senator Kelly that his line reference may have been off. I think the civil action is actually at 325, but otherwise yes, I think that does capture the legislative intent as long as we're looking at the same lines. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Through you, Senator Lesser. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm just referencing the amendment. Thank you, Madam President. The defect that I was referring to is at line 327 and I believe the good chairman pointed that out and I would concur with that.

THE CHAIR:

Through you, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

I have no further comments.

THE CHAIR:

Through you so much. Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.
THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I'll be very brief. I don't want to keep anyone here. I know this is the last action of the day. I am rising in opposition to the bill before us. I'm certainly concerned about the prevalence of pyrrhotite in foundations across Connecticut and I want to do my part to make sure that we protect consumers as much as possible, but I am a real estate agent and I work in this industry every day and I deal with the form in question, the Residential Property Condition Disclosure Report every day of my life and over the last 20 years that I've been in this business, I've watched this form grow from a few questions on one page to now a five-page document, and I'm fearful that as it increases and more and more questions go on this form, it is having the reverse effect on the public.

We live in a free society and one of the principals that we live in is that buyers and real estate transactions are responsible for investigating the property before their purchase, and as a real estate agent, we are always encouraged to encourage our clients to get an inspection to make sure that they are doing their responsible part to make sure that what they're buying is what they expect. I see this form expanding doing two things. One, it is increasing the amount of potential liability on sellers who may be trying to do the right thing but because of their own lack of knowledge, might find themselves in some sort of legal trouble because they
failed to fill out the form thoroughly. I also noticed that more and more people are filling out the forms less thoroughly. The form gives you the option in a lot of cases to say yes, I am aware of some flaw in the property, no, I am not, but there are also boxes for N/A or unknown and I see a lot of these forms with unknown checked all the way down. I think the discouragement to answering the questions is a result of the fact that the form is just too invasive and is essentially telling the seller that you might be liable for all sorts of things if you try and answer this form honestly. I don't think that was its original intent and I don't think that we should be expanding that.

What we should be doing is trying to go back to the old system where we didn't try and hang every last thing around the seller, that might be potentially liable, but rather encourage buyers to do their due diligence and have a proper inspection before they make a purchase and as a result, I'm going to vote no today, Madam President. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Uh, yes. Thank you, thank you, Madam President. I'm going to ask members to vote strongly in support because while I do think it is important for purchasers of properties to do their due diligence, if you are a seller trying to do the right thing and you know that there is pyrrhotite in the foundation, if you know that there's been a crumbling foundation and you have concealed this and you are not disclosing
that to a buyer, that is the wrong thing and so what we should be doing and what we're doing in this General Assembly is providing information to the purchaser to protect them from being taken advantage of or being sold a property that is defective without their knowledge. This bill is a strong pro-consumer protection that provides purchasers of property with a peace of mind to know what has happened in the history of their property to the extent that that's available and I urge all the members to support this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Yes, I rise in support. Through you, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill. As I travel through my district, most of my district has a crumbling foundation. In fact, I was at Birch Grove Elementary School today and when you look down the side wall and the walls are bowing out. This is something that's going to be coming for us probably before the end of this session. You know when somebody purposely goes through and covers up the walls which we've had happening as well, it creates a problem for the buyers and if you know that this is happening and you sell your property for full value and somebody, the day they purchase it, the value is cut in half or even less than that, you know that is unfair and nobody should be put in that position. So if you know that this problem exists in your property, you should have to disclose it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Champagne. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Listen, I am a real estate broker and I totally agree that the disclosure, if there is pyrrhotite in the foundation and the seller knows about it as well as the real estate agent, they should be disclosing that material fact, so I stand in support of this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As somebody also who has been in real estate for over 20 years, almost 24 years now, the disclosure is an important tool to let buyers understand the condition of the property and it's really up to the sellers to disclose to the best of their knowledge defects in a property. Everybody likes to think that when they sell their house, that their house is wonderful and perfect. You go through the disclosure. Sometimes you realize your house may not be perfect as we think and it is up to the seller
to disclose to the best of their knowledge so that the buyers can understand, maybe the roof needs to be fixed or the age of the roof or other types of issues that may come up.

This issue that we're having with the crumbling foundations is not just a Connecticut issue, but is an issue in the area and maybe even far beyond that as well, but I think Connecticut has been a leader in working to help homeowners with this issue, help disclose the issue and frankly, it's probably going to be better that we have this for the sake of sellers because if it's disclosed by the seller and the seller has a signature on it, it may provide better comfort for a buyer so that they can at least and probably do their testing anyway or whatever the situation is, but it may be even advantageous to have that disclosed one way or another so that a buyer feels confident and maybe provides even greater value knowing that maybe the house has not been impacted by the pyrrhotite as well. So I think having this is a good thing so I appreciate the work of Senator Lesser, Senator Champagne and others who have been impacted by this, by this issue so much so. It's not impacted us down in Fairfield County, hopefully it does not, but I don't view this as a parochial issue.

I view this as a statewide issue that as a state and as a legislature we've got to come to grips with it. We've got to make sure we continue to address talking about people's lives, talking about people's largest investments that they have, their financial security whether they're selling or whether they're purchasing a property so as somebody who is in the business, has been in the business almost a quarter of a century, these types of disclosures are extremely important to put out there which is why we have the Residential Disclosure and Condition Report anyway. So it's, in
my opinion, as things change or as things are warranted, we have the opportunity really the responsibility along with the Real Estate Commission to raise these issues, address these issues and make sure we're keeping up with the times and I think that doing so is sending a good statement and a strong statement and I'm very proud, I'm very glad that we're doing this in a bipartisan manner and I would urge my colleagues to support the bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark? Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Madam President, another former realtor of 30 years, I think we need an organization of legislative realtors I guess. You know I think our reputation in selling homes was based on what that seller provides and how that seller handles that sale. There's an awful lot in a home that can be behind a wall or in a cellar or wherever it might be that as a buyer you will not see. The integrity of the seller is critical. They know the home. They've been in it. They understand it. The buyer has a visual impact and that's what they're buying. They're buying what they see. A seller is selling what he's lived in and lived through. There's a major difference and that's why that responsibility should be on the seller and not the buyer because he knows or she knows that property and I think this makes a lot sense.

Manchester is another one of those towns. We have one entire street that was built through a farmland and that entire street is crumbling. In fact, Senator
Champagne and I were talking about that. He's got one in Vernon like that. The entire street is crumbling, the foundations. They go across the line, remember Stafford is central to that area of Connecticut, but it's also 45 miles the other way and so if you go up around Sturbridge and all that area, they are suffering dramatically now as the foundations there are crumbling so if there is an integrity issue, which there is, it really is the obligation of the seller to provide that information. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Seeing that there is no one else who would like to speak, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call the vote and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 907 as amended by Senate A. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 907 as amended by Senate A. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? Seeing they have, the machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally, please.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 907 as amended by Senate A.

Total number voting 36
Necessary for adoption 19
Those voting Yea 35
Those voting Nay 1
Absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 39, calendar No. 433, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 693, AN ACT CONCERNING ADDITIONAL HOUSING PROTECTIONS FOR A VICTIM OF FAMILY VIOLENCE OR SEXUAL ASSAULT. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield, thank you.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark on passage?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. This is a bill that comes to us from the Judiciary Committee. What it does is the landlord in a dwelling is required to change locks upon the request of the tenant who is subject to a protective order or a foreign order of protection should the tenant request it and provide a
copy to the landlord. The landlord has a period of time in which the landlord has to do this and that period of time is two days. If the landlord fails to do that, then the tenant is allowed to move forward with the changing of the locks. If the tenant does that, there are requirements for what the lock has to be and it has to be done in workman-like quality.

This is a bill that we think is important because it provides protection to mostly women who are subject to protective orders because in that home, in that dwelling, someone who is the respondent of the protective order may have access to them and so one of the things that the bill does is it says that the landlord does not provide a key to that person who is the respondent.

There is an amendment in the system. It's LCO 8481. I'd ask that it be called and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk, kindly call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO 8481, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD:

Uh, yes, thank you again, Madam President. So what this amendment does, uh, in, uh, line 39 after, uh, the end of the line is where the period is, it adds in the words as used in this subsection, actual
reasonable cost means the cost of the lock mechanism as well as any fee paid by the landlord for professional locksmith services. What that does is it adds a little bit of clarity to what we're talking about when we say actual reasonable cost.

It also in line 53 at the end after the period, adds in language which provides the landlord with some protections from civil liability should they not give that key to the person who is a respondent and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Great to see you again this afternoon. I stand in strong support of the amendment. It does add to essential parts of clarification. I think delineating exactly what the cost should be for the lock and the locksmith services is helpful, but I think probably the most important part of his amendment is making sure that the landlord is immune from liability because we don’t want them to be exposed to a lawsuit by the tenant that under the provisions of the restraining order and this bill should it so pass would not be able to get back into their tenancy.

So for example, let's say it's two individuals, and again the underlying bill is essentially gender neutral, there's a restraining order, the landlord complies with this law and now the other individual, who may have already paid for that month's rent, it's the beginning of the month, but they paid for the
whole month, cannot get into those premises, can't turn around and say hey landlord, we have a contract. I don't care about this restraining order, I'm going to sue you. Landlords would be very hesitant to embrace this proposal if they knew that they would be exposed to that potentiality so this amendment is excellent in that it forecloses that as a possibility so I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORES:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much again, Madam President. I stand in strong support of the bill as amended. This is one of the primary initiatives of the Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence. It addresses and individual desire to be secure if there is a restraining order, a protecting order, a foreign order of that nature and it's an important piece of the overall puzzle to address domestic violence. I think it's reasonable. It definitely takes into consideration the rights of the landlord but I think
as a whole, even though it doesn’t seem like a huge initiative, this can give an individual that is trying to seek the protection of the court system peace of mind and a feeling of security and obviously if something has bubbled up so much that there's now, the courts are involved and there is a restraining order, that's a very serious situation and the quicker that an individual can have security, the less like that there will be the danger of violence perpetrated against them and so for that reason, I stand in very strong support of the bill as amended. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senate Kissel. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Technical difficulty there on my end.

THE CHAIR:

There you go.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm very pleased that the amendment that was just brought before the Chamber passed. I think it's an excellent amendment. It corrected the one significant concern I had with the legislation before us and I do intend on supporting the bill. I just have a couple of questions for the passage of the bill. Through you, Madam President, if I could.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, please proceed.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

I think it's in the first section but I would like to just make it explicit that in the event that the locks are changed and whether or not the tenant does it themselves or the landlord does it, the expense of the locks is to be borne by the tenant and not the landlord. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson, thank you. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, Madam President, yes.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

I'm sorry, Madam President, I was distracted. Could the gentleman repeat the answer?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you again, Madam President, yes.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the gentleman for that answer. I appreciate it very, very much. There is also in Section C a reference that says that if the landlord pays for the lock change and looks to the tenant to have it repaid, it says in some language a tenant's inability to pay the cost for changing locks shall not be the basis for a summary process action under Chapter 832 of the General Statues. I'm wondering if the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee would be kind enough to let us know exactly what that means. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. I believe that what we are forbidding the landlord from doing is beginning a process of getting rid of that tenant given that the tenant cannot make the payment imagine under this bill and I guess this is a good time to make a statement about that and why we might be doing that. Given what we're talking about, given the very serious nature of what we're talking about and quite frankly, the fact that people's lives may be in danger, people don't plan for that and so the person might not have the money at the time to put that money to put the landlord as we might hope they would be able to do. That would not be a reason for an adverse action to
happen upon that individual. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President and thanks very much to the Chairman for explaining that. I'm certainly sympathetic to that response. I do have some difficulty putting this responsibility back on the landlord who is certainly not responsible for any of the difficulties that the tenant is facing and to put them in the situation where they might have to ultimately eat the cost of the locks while their tenant is able to meet the other obligations under the lease makes this bill language less than perfect in my eyes.

It's interesting, we were just having a conversation a moment ago about sometimes we wish we might have yes and no buttons that are different shades of green and red and I am gonna support this bill at the end of this, but I do want to express that I have a couple of concerns. That is one of them. I think that is unfair to landlords and I wish that we had done a better job of addressing that so it was more fair. I believe the landlord is already being put out to some degree through no fault of their own in this legislation, but I understand the importance of it and the value of trying to protect people in need in our society and that's why I'm still willing to support it.

There's also the final section of the bill which says that a landlord may not require a tenant who is named
as a protected person under an order described in the
beginning which would be a protective order to pay
additional rent or an additional deposit or fee
because of the exclusion of a tenant who is named as
the respondent. I don't think this is necessary. I
think this language serves no real purpose. The
agreement between the landlord and the tenant is in
their lease agreement and neither party would have the
right to arbitrarily change the terms of that
agreement by charging a fee or paying less than what
was already agreed to so I don't think this is a
necessary section, but it doesn't also harm the bill I
don't think in any way. Again, the underlying intent
of this legislation I think is positive. I'm happy to
support it and I appreciate the work that was put in
by all the parties responsible and I know that there
were some modifications to the language to accommodate
my concerns and others' and for that purpose, Madam
President, I'm going to support it here today and I
thank the Chamber for their time. Thanks.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further
on the bill as amended? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just, I appreciate the
comments made, I just would say to my colleagues in
the Chamber, unfortunately, there is no perfect, but
there is protection and what this bill is offering is
not perfect, it's offering protection to the people
that we're talking about and I would urge all of my
colleagues to join me in voting to pass this bill.
Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you please, uh, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, if there is no further conversation or objection, I would ask that this be placed on consent.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, before we call the consent calendar, does the Clerk have Senate Agenda No. 1?

CLERK:

The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda No. 1, dated Friday, May 10, 2019.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move all items on Senate Agenda No. 1, dated Friday, May 10, 2019, to be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda be incorporated by reference into the Senate journal and Senate transcript.
Thank you, so ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Clerk please call the items on our Consent Calendar followed by a vote of the Consent Calendar, please?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 25, calendar No. 327, Senate Bill 252, page 28, calendar No. 349, Senate Bill 556, page 39, calendar 433, Senate Bill 693, and page 48, calendar 259, Senate Bill 702.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? Seeing they have, the machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally and we will entertain a point of personal privilege, but first, Mr. Clerk, announce the tally.
Consent Calendar No. 1.

Total number voting 36
Necessary for adoption 19
Those voting Yea 36
Those voting Nay 0
Absent and not voting 0

[Gavel] The legislation is adopted and I will call on Senate Looney. Senator Looney for a point of personal privilege.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President for a point of personal privilege. Madam President, this month, Muslims throughout Connecticut, our nation, and the world are celebrating the period of Ramadan with fasting and prayer. I just would like to acknowledge that and wish them best in their spiritual exercises during this time of reflection. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney for that and also now, I would like to call upon Senator Hartley for a point of personal privilege.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for a point of personal privilege, Madam.

THE CHAIR:
Please proceed.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, thank you very much. You know we have reached this point in the session sadly where --

THE CHAIR:

Could we have quiet in the Chamber please so we can hear Senator Hartley? Thank you.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you much, Madam President. We have, colleagues, reached the point in the session where sadly, our interns are moving on to the incredible things that they continue to do and in my office, I have been blessed once again to have an incredible young lady who is so energetic and has helped our office in so many ways and she has finished her final exams and is moving on for the summer break and into her senior year. It's Hannah Stevens and she is here to my left. Hannah is a junior, soon to be a senior at Trinity, our neighbor in Hartford. She hails from New Hampshire and she's a double major in English and in Public Policy and she has utilized all of those skills in our office throughout this entire session and I would just ask she, that's actually not as a result of anything I did, the boot and the crutches [laughter]. I immediately want to qualify that. She is also an athlete and was out for a jog and had a misstep but anyway, I ask the Chamber to join me in a round of applause in recognizing her work and thanking her. [Applause]

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

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. For the Republican members of the Finance Review and Bonding Committee, we will be caucusing on Tuesday at 9:15.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Any further point of personal privilege? If not, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President and Madam President, I want to wish everybody a great weekend. I would like to take this opportunity to wish all the moms out there a Happy Mother's Day on Sunday. Enjoy your day with your families and be pampered as you should be, not only on Sunday, but every day as well and the Senate plans on being in session next week, at least Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and we look forward to seeing everybody then. Again, safe travels home and with that, Madam President, I would urge, I would move that we adjourn subject to the call of the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. We are adjourned. Everyone have a great Mother's Day Weekend. Thank you so much.

On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 5:40 o'clock p.m. adjourned subject to the call of the chair.