The Senate was called to order at 2:58 p.m., the President in the Chair.

DEPUTY CHAPLAIN BONITA GRUBBS:

From You, Most Holy One, we have received the gift of time. It is precious, valuable and sacred.

We measure it in minutes, days, months and years that seem to pass by too quickly, especially when deadlines approach.

We mark it by significant life events, priorities, and responsibilities that are personal and meaningful, especially in connection with family members and friends.

Therefore, I ask that You draw near to the Senators and staff inside and outside of this Chamber who know and feel the current pressure of time because they have much to do today and in the days ahead.

Be their pace maker, guide and light. Guide their steps as they address the many pressing matters that await deliberation and agreement. Help them to use their time wisely and judiciously and celebrate achievements.
Give them the grace and stamina to do what is just, right and fair, as well as the space to celebrate the gift of time off. In Your name, Amen.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Reverend Grubbs, and I'd like to invite Senator Sampson before he steps into the caucus room to come and lead us in the Pledge. Senator, if you would please join us.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

[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:

Thank you, and for a point of personal privilege, I'd like to invite Eli Roche to the dais so you can see him. He has been an intern in the Lieutenant Governor's Office for the past semester. He went to Weston High School, and he is attending Wesleyan University. And he will be a junior in the fall, and he is studying both government and environmental studies. And he is looking forward to being an intern for both Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro and Senator Blumenthal this summer in Washington DC, and he's been very inspired by his experience and watching many of you work so diligently in the Senate. And I would just ask that you give Eli your very warm welcome. [Applause]

And Senator Slap, I understand that you have a point of personal privilege as well.
SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, I rise to also acknowledge one of my great interns and wanna thank him. His name is Alex Dahlem, and he is from Glastonbury -- so not from my district. He's a junior at Trinity, and he actually joined me many months ago now when I was in the House and has gone on a wild and crazy ride and ended up in the Senate here with me and has just been a tremendous source of assistance, helped with research and working on testimony, and he really approaches the internship with professionalism and intellectual curiosity. And, in fact, he's so dedicated that I don't even know if he's in the chamber right now. I'm not sure where he -- where he went, but I wanted to make sure that we -- we took a moment to -- to thank Alex. We also have a citation for him as well. So, again, just wanted to thank Alex Dahlem, again, a junior at Trinity, and really gives us great -- great hope for the future with Alex. Thank you. [Applause]

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Duff. [Background laughing] I think this might be Alex. ["What an entrance" in background] A warm welcome for Alex Dahlem who was -- just so you know, Senator Slap gave a great speech on your behalf. [Applause]

Good afternoon, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Now that's an entrance. [Laughing] Thank you, Madam President. Does the Clerk have Senate Agenda No. 1 on his desk?
THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda No. 1, dated Thursday, May 23, 2019.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move all items on Senate Agenda No. 1, dated Thursday, May 23, 2019, be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda be incorporated by reference into the Senate Journal and the Senate Transcripts.

THE CHAIR:

So noted and so ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. For our go list at the moment, Calendar page 59, Calendar 84, Senate Bill 884, go. On Calendar page 4, Calendar 85, Senate Bill 886, go. On Calendar page 7, Calendar 111, Senate Bill 452, go. On Calendar page 41, Calendar 472, House Bill 7218, go. On Calendar page 42, Calendar 476, House Bill 7223, go. On Calendar page 41, Calendar 473, House Bill 7219, go. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 59, Calendar No. 84, Senate Bill Number 884, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ADMINISTRATION OF EPINEPHRINE AT THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES WILDERNESS SCHOOL.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Yes. This a bill that will really improve safety for children who are attending this DCF Wilderness School. It allows DCF personnel, with consent of the child's parents, to administer epinephrine. They have to be trained. They do have protection from legal liability. It passed unanimously out of the Children's Committee and out of the Judiciary Committee, and I ask for my colleagues' support.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Good afternoon, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

I also rise in support of this bill. I think it is good, smart, commonsense legislation aimed at basically making sure that kids are protected, and I do thank the Chairman for his leadership on this issue. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further?

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

If there is no objection, I would ask that it be placed on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar No. 85, substitute for Senate Bill Number 886, AN ACT CONCERNING THE LICENSURE OF THE ALBERT J. SOLNIT CHILDREN'S CENTER.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Thank you very much. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Yes. This bill requires DCF to submit a report not later than the end of this calendar year with legislative recommendations for the Department of Public Health to essentially licensure of the Solnit Center. There are two of them in the state of Connecticut. There was a tragedy at one recently, and the belief is having DPH have some oversight and licensure of the facilities will improve the public health at these facilities. It did pass unanimously out of the Children's Committee, and I ask for my colleagues to support it now.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I also rise in support of this bill. I will align my comments with
Chairman Slap. This did come out of committee unanimous, and I support it fully. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

If there is no objection, I would ask that this bill also be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 7, Calendar No. 111, substitute for Senate Bill Number 452, AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CHILD WELFARE AND POLICY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Yes. Thank you. I ask for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill please.

THE CHAIR:
The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Yes. This bill creates a State Oversight Council on Children and Families to replace the State Advisory Council on Children and Families. It also requires the State Oversight Council on Children and Families to report annually to the Joint Standing Committee of the General Assembly cognizance of matters relating to Appropriations and Children. I would ask if my good colleague and Ranking Member, Senator Kelly, might want to comment further on this bill. So, I would yield to him.

THE CHAIR:

To you accept the yield, Senator Kelly?

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Yes, Madam President, and thank you, Chairman Slap. Yes, this is a -- what I think is another good common sense piece of legislation aimed at basically oversight of DCF, so that what we can do is improve outcomes and make sure that children entrusted to their care receive the appropriate services and protections that they are entitled to. I think this committee, which received by -- you know, I'm gonna say unanimous support in committee -- I think it's just something that is necessary and is warranted, and to that end, I fully support this piece of legislation. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I think the bill is a good bill, and I support bill. Madam President, my concerns are the number of members that are on there, and I think it becomes a little bit too unwieldy of a committee to establish where we want this to go. So, with that, Madam Clerk, I'd ask the -- Madam President, I'd ask the Clerk to call LCO 8341, please Mr. Clerk.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8341, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Madam President, I would move the amendment and request permission to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to summarize.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, what this does, as I said, it just limits the number of people that are on this committee, which -- to a lesser number, allowing it to work in a more efficient manner. Not a lotta tricks to this other than reducing the membership, Madam President, so I would seek the circle to adopt the amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the amendment as described, please signify by saying aye. ["Aye" in background] Opposed? The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I don't wanna belabor the point. I would note that DCF did testify against this bill and thought that it was an unnecessary layer of oversight. That said, I will call for a roll call vote, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. With that, 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 vote has been ordered
in the Senate on Senate Bill 452 as amended by Senate A. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 452 as amended by Senate A. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 452 as amended by Senate A.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk would you kindly call the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Bill 452 as amended by Senate A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 41, Calendar No. 472, substitute for House Bill Number 7218, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SAFE STORAGE OF FIREARMS IN THE HOME AND FIREARM SAFETY PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Winfield, good afternoon.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in accordance with the House.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This is a bill that comes to us through the Judiciary Committee. What the bill is seeking to do is expand firearms safety storage laws as they pertain to home -- the premises of the home currently under the law. What we're seeking to do is move from the age of 16 to 18, where someone would have to secure their firearms --

THE CHAIR:

Senator, if you would just pause for one moment. It is getting very loud in here and very difficult to hear what you are saying. So, if the chamber could please keep that in mind, and Senator please proceed.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I apologize, I have a hoarse throat today. The requirements of the bill would be moving the age of --
THE CHAIR:

I apologize again, Senator. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. May we stand at ease for a moment please?

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

Good afternoon, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would like to yield to Senator Winfield, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, and Senator, before you begin, I just want to welcome the guests to our Senate gallery. We're very happy that you are here today, and once our Senate proceeding begins, we just want to remind those of you who may not have been here before that there is no video recording or photo taking allowed, per our Senate rules. And we are so happy though that you are here to listen to and observe our debate. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I think I'll just go back to the beginning. So, I've already made the motion. This is a bill that comes to us through the
Judiciary Committee. Unlike many of the gun bills, this came to us on a strong vote out of the committee. I believe it was 34 to 4. This bill seeks to expand the requirements to secure a firearm in a home, and it seeks to expand it by going from the age of 16 to 18 -- that is the trigger for securing those firearms. It also seeks to make sure that the firearms, whether they are loaded or unloaded, are secured when the trigger, if you will, happens.

The safe storage requirements will apply when the resident is not eligible to grab the -- I'm sorry -- I'm sorry -- let me approach this this way. I'll just detail that we have new requirements for securing the firearm, and then we also make sure that the education program that we have for K through eight is expanded to K through 12.

I wanna talk a little bit about how we got here. I talked the other night about my experience with losing a child and how that affected me. And oftentimes when I'm talking to people about what we do here in this circle and downstairs, I talk to them about -- because people approach us and they wanna know why their individual issue doesn't necessarily make us move, and I tell them that unfortunately we're governing for all of the people, so an individual story doesn't necessarily make us move. But the truth of the matter is that sometimes an individual story or a family story actually does make us move, and I think we find ourselves here because there's a family in the state of Connecticut that lost a child and that's the Song family. And the story of the loss of that child, I think, has made us come to realize that we should take a look at what we're doing in the state of Connecticut and
whether or not there are things that we can do to regulate firearms in such a way so as to not take away anyone's rights but to make people more safe. And I think that's why you get the vote that you get out of the Judiciary Committee -- a bipartisan vote, a strong vote of nearly all the members of the committee.

I talked the other night about how devastating it was when I lost that child that I had, but I didn't have that child for 15 years. I couldn't image what it would be to have seen that child develop, to watch the unique gifts that all children bring to us, and then lose those -- that child. So, as I've thought about this bill for the last couple of months, that's been ever-present in my mind, and I think that what we seek to do here today is exactly the right thing, and I would urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Nice to see you here this afternoon. This is not an easy vote for me, but over the years, I've been lucky enough -- knock on wood -- to represent the good folks of north-central Connecticut for lo these last 27 years. And I know they feel very strongly regarding Second Amendment rights and actually feel that Connecticut has some of the toughest gun laws in the United States, maybe only second to California. But I will say this, I distinctly remember the day of the public hearing that we had on several gun bills.
And that public hearing, Mrs. Song came and testified, and it was probably the most -- I wouldn't characterize it as heart-wrenching -- it was so thoughtful and literate. It was all delivered very thoughtfully, very much from the heart, from the perspective of Ethan Song. And his mom recounted that day every step of the way as if it was Ethan that was testifying before us. And that was more than just public testimony -- that was the love of a mom. And I have a 15-year-old, and I can't imagine what it would be like to lose my son.

We had commissioner that has since retired in the last year whom I worked very closely with -- I won't say his name -- but he lost his son at a young age as well to a disease. And so when I would visit him in his office, he would have the picture there of his son. And he said to me that being the parent of a child that you have lost is the worst club you can ever be a member of and you can just never leave -- because it's the kind of pain that I could not viscerally imagine, but I know there are those folks out there that have lost children, and it's just a void that can't be filled.

I will commend -- I would commend the Song family for not doing what I probably would do, which would just be curl into a ball and just hide away from life because the pain and anguish would be too much to bear, but they decided to try to make the gun storage laws that much better so there would be less chances of tragedies like this every occurring to any other family. And for that, they are to be truly commended. While folks in my district may ultimately disagree with the bill, it certainly has been pursued with the utmost dignity and respect for the remembrance of Ethan Song. And we don't see
that all the time in this building, and that's why it does make this a difficult decision. But for the reasons that I see some minor flaws in the bill -- but I don't wanna go that direction -- but for the reasons that I do have a perspective on, what my part of the state views regarding these issues, I will be voting no. But it is a no with the utmost respect to Ethan's mom and dad, friends and other loved ones, siblings, and to all those folks that have striven mightily to try to take a tragedy and make something good of it.

To move this matter along this afternoon, Madam President, at this time, I would like to yield to Senator Sampson.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson, do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

I do, Madam President, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

I wanna start by associating myself with the remarks of my very well-spoken colleague, Senator Kissel. Obviously, this is a very difficult issue to speak about, and even more difficult to speak out in opposition to; however, I feel compelled to do so. I think that this is questionable public policy, and despite the circumstances that led to it, I believe
it deserves the same scrutiny as anything else we do and possibly even more so.

Being here all the way back after the tragedy in Sandy Hook gives me some perspective and reminds me that it is not a good idea to make public policy based on an emotional response to a tragedy. It is much more important that we get these things right. Like everyone else, I am saddened by the terrible tragedy and the loss of Ethan Song. I cannot imagine the pain that his family is feeling, and I completely understand their desire to achieve some kind of justice and to do something in his memory, but I have concerns about what the actual bill language says.

In truth, it makes very minor changes to what is an already existing law, and that should give us some pause because the existing law was clearly ineffective in preventing what occurred. And I don't know why anyone would think that the minor changes that we're making in the law with this bill would achieve a different result. And outside of being able to say that we did something here, I don't know what the endgame is as far as public policy in trying to prevent a further tragedy.

Are we trying to change the law in a way to capture the circumstances that occurred in Ethan's case -- to make that homeowner a criminal? I think it's important that people understand exactly what happened. I have scoured the news reports. I've read the police report. Some things we don't know. But what we do know is that the firearm was stored in a closet in the master bedroom. The gun was unloaded. It had a trigger lock, and it was in a cardboard box inside a Tupperware container. The
ammunition was separate but also contained in a cardboard box, presumably in the same closet. Apparently, Ethan was friendly with that homeowner's child, and together they went into the parents' master bedroom, into the closet, and discovered this firearm. Some say that might've happened at a previous time and he was aware of where that was, but either way, that's the situation and as a result a horrible, horrible tragedy occurred.

I wanna just talk about the language in the bill, so we understand exactly what it says. It starts by saying that no person shall store a loaded or unloaded firearm in premises that are under their control. This is a pretty broad term, and it raises some concerns for me because it doesn't just necessarily apply to the person who owns that home, but I can think of a number of other circumstances where someone might be in control of someone's home. Even a babysitter, who is taking the place of control of the home from someone's parents when they go out for a Saturday night date or something like that, could potentially be caught up in control of someone's home. Even a realtor showing a property -- I'm a real estate agent, and you know, generally speaking, I try and keep my clients with me and be respectful of someone's home when I'm showing that property, but that's not always possible, especially when there might be young children around and you're trying to keep them corralled.

Further, it goes on to say that the firearm must be kept in a securely locked box or other container. It doesn't say what a securely locked box is. It doesn't say that the box must be made of metal. It does not say that it must be secure enough that someone could not break into it with the skills and
household implements that might be available to a teenager. It just says a securely locked box. Does that mean a toolbox? Does it mean a jewelry box? Does it mean, more appropriately, a safe? And why bother even indicating that it has to be a securely locked box if it is still acceptable in this language to store it in an "other container"? What could an "other container" be?

If you go on to line 12, it talks about "in a manner which a reasonable person would believe to be secure." This is another broad term, and I'm gonna make a point in a few minutes about why I am talking about these broad terms, but it's important to note that that's exactly what's happening here. This language can capture things outside the circumstances that I think that we all would agree might be worthy of a criminal act. But, in this particular case, we need to ask ourselves was the homeowner in Ethan's case someone who reasonably believed his firearms were secure? And that's the question before us really in a lot of ways in this bill. But I would submit that that depends on who you ask.

There was another terrible tragedy that happened in Colorado recently where a young person, 16 years old, and their friend, who was 18, broke into their parents' gun cabinet in their home and took the firearms, and later there was a shooting at a school. I don't know. Part of me says, no, it's not reasonable to believe that the person in charge of the premises thought that they were leaving the guns in a negligent way. I think they probably believed they were doing it in a reasonable way. But you have to ask yourself whether it's unreasonable to think that a teenager in wooden
glass gun case is enough to stop them if their desire is to actually get into it. I think that's a subjective term.

And the reason why I bring this up is because this bill goes pretty far. In Section 2, what it does is it makes someone strictly liable, and strictly liable means that there is no requirement under the law to prove that the person, in this case the person who has the premises under their control, is actually responsible -- just that the facts occurred. In fact, there's only five cases in our Connecticut law where the term strictly liable shows up. I asked the Office of Legislative Research to provide a document that shows those cases, and one of 'em is the current law, but it's a rare item where we say someone is strictly liable without really a review of the facts.

I'll just read from the report, it says, "Under this doctrine, an injured person is not required to show that his or her loss was caused by the defendant's negligence. It is sufficient to show only that the defendant engaged in ultra-hazardous activity that caused the defendant's loss." And I can understand what ultra-hazardous activity is -- I mean storing toxic waste or something like that, but to secure a firearm in a way, in your own home, that you think that it's secure, I don't know if it rises to that. It goes on to say, "circumstances and continues -- conditions in its use, which irrespective of a lawful purpose or due care involve a risk of probably injury to such a degree that the activity fairly can be said to be intrinsically dangerous to the person or property of others." And I know people that own firearms. They're not keeping firearms in their home because they're intrinsically
dangerous to others. They keep firearms in their home typically for their own self-protection.

So, I just see that strict liability is quite the stretch. And that refers to the civil liability, but this bill also makes that person who is in control of the premises criminally responsible and charges them with a Class D felony, which is a significant crime. Other Class D felonies include assault in the second degree with a firearm. That's different than failing to store your firearm in a way that's sufficient to prevent a series of events that no one could've predicted from happening. Strangulation or suffocation is a Class D felony. Sexual assault in the third and fourth degree are Class D felonies. There's plenty more. I won't go on to discuss them all, but these are serious, serious, serious crimes.

And, of course, this case is a tragedy, but what the person who would be in charge of the premises is responsible for is a long way from the actual tragedy itself. There's also an education piece in this bill, and I know that there are some folks who consider themselves to be pro Second Amendment advocates who are very pleased that that education requirement is in there. I'm among them. I think that that is a addition to the bill that is welcomed, but honestly the language in here doesn't guarantee that it will ever happen or that it will be implemented. And I think calling it education is also a bit of a stretch, since it's nothing more than a guide that would advise children -- 'cause that's who it's intended for -- from kindergarten to age 12 that if they see a firearm that they should report it to an adult and stay away from it, which I
think is good advice that anyone could and should
give to their kids.

I have an amendment, Mr. President. It is LCO 8754.
I ask that it be called and I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8754, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment would
strike the underlying bill and would provide a tax
credit for the purchase of a gun safe -- the purchase of a gun safe.
I move adoption, and I ask that when the vote is
taken it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

It will be so ordered. There'll be roll call taken
at the appropriate time. Will you remark, Senator
Sampson?

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment, as
I said, is a very simple amendment. It doesn't get
rid of the existing law, but what it does do is it creates a new mechanism, which I believe achieves the exact desire of what the bill before us is supposed to do and that is to incentivize homeowners to store their firearms safely. I don't think the underlying bill achieved that -- the underlying law -- and I don't think changing a few words in that underlying law is going to achieve that either, especially since it's quite clear in the bill before us and the underlying law that it doesn't really go into effect until after a tragedy occurs.

This is a real thing. People will go buy gun safes if we give them a tax credit to do so. What better way to incentivize people to actually store their firearms safely than to give them a reason that they can measure and see to do so. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, Mr. President. I think it's a common sense solution to this problem. It doesn't undo the existing law that we are only making a tiny change on the edges of, and it creates a real incentive to create more safety in the situations we're concerned about. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. First, let me apologize for when I was bringing the bill out, I went back to the other night -- now, let me address the amendment before us. I rise in objection to this amendment. The amendment fundamentally changes what we are
trying to do here. I recognize how we get to the amendment, but what we're tryin' to do here is the right approach. And let me talk about that approach because I don't think this is just an emotional response. I think emotions generated the conversation, but there was a process in place where there was a hearing. There was a debate about the bill after that hearing in a committee meeting, and now that bill has gone through the process and sits on the floor. And as much as I wish emotion worked on a lot of policy, emotion often does not carry the day because that's what the process is for. We get here because in the Judiciary Committee 34 people thought we should be going here. We get here because this bill went through the House downstairs and came to this chamber. That's why we're here -- not just because of emotion.

I think we should rise and oppose this because the questions that Senator Sampson was asking as he led up to bringing it out are questions that can be answered. Reasonable person is a standard that we use in the law. All that it means is that we're talking about the average judgment of a person, the average skill of the person, and the average care of a person. We've used that standard before. It's nothing new. And it is an appropriate standard to use, particularly given what we're talking about.

And yes, we're talking about strict liability, but it just means that it'd happen and a person who is the defendant in a case would be responsible despite whether or not, as Senator Sampson suggested, they had done some -- and I just wanna talk about the issue, since it was part of the lead up to this amendment, about a babysitter, someone who's watching a house, and their responsibility. If you
look at the bill itself that the amendment would be striking and replacing, all this says is that the person who's in control of the house shall not store or keep. Well, that babysitter's not storing anything and that babysitter's not keeping anything, and if they were, then yes they should be responsible. So, for those reasons, I rise in objection to this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I'd ask that -- when a roll is taken --

THE CHAIR:

It's been requested already. Senator Sampson requested it at the time he brought out the amendment. Will you remark further, Senator Sampson? No? Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further? If not, the Clerk will proceed to a roll call on the amendment.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8754. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8754, House Bill 7218. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate. Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8754.
THE CHAIR:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If so, would you please check the machines and make sure that your vote is properly cast. Mr. Clerk, close the vote.

CLERK:

Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8754.

Total number voting 36
Total number voting Yea 2
Total voting Nay 34
Absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:

The amendment fails. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I think it's unfortunate the amendment failed, as I believe that that tax credit would have encouraged many, many people to go out and purchase a gun safe and ultimately store their firearms in a manner that would prevent tragedies in the future. And we can't really speculate on which approach would be more effective, but I'm glad we had the opportunity to consider it. I have another amendment, Mr. President. This one is LCO 8738. I ask that it be called and I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8738. Senate Schedule B.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a very straightforward amendment that would remove Section 2 of the bill in its entirety. I ask that -- that -- I move adoption [laughing] and I ask that when the vote is taken it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Roll call will be ordered at the appropriate time. Will you remark, Senator Sampson?

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. When I was going through the bill, I mentioned that I thought that some of the terms were very broad and that we could encompass a lot of circumstances that I don't think most of us would consider to be a situation where someone really is responsible for what happened -- that they may have done their due diligence in a way to, at least in their own minds, protect against the potential of such a tragedy occurring. But this bill does not take that into consideration and instead chooses to enforce strict liability in the event that something occurs, and for me, Mr.
President, that is just simply going too far. We don't use strict liability in our laws because we like to give the opportunity for the court to look at the facts and determine whether or not there is a reason to believe that the -- in this case the person who is in control of the premises is truly responsible or not.

That strict liability being in this bill takes it a step beyond where it should be in my mind, and I'd like to see it removed. A yes vote on this amendment does that. It does not change the bill. The law will still go into effect. The changes that are being made here will still go into effect. The criminal penalty will remain in effect. The only thing that's happening here is we are going to remove what I think is an unnecessary and overzealous element in the existing law, which is this strict liability piece. I urge everyone to vote in favor of this amendment regardless how you're gonna vote on the bill at the end. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the amendment -- on Senate Amendment Schedule B? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in objection to the amendment. What this section of the bill does is it doesn't change what we have in current law, which is strict liability. What it does is it moves us from the age of 16 to 18. We've had a lot of discussion over a number of years in this chamber
about -- and in the Legislative Office Building -- about who are and who aren't minors, and we've made changes over the course of a number of years. And 18 year olds certainly, the way we've constructed the law in Connecticut, are minors still with judgment that is not the same as the people who sit in this chamber. So, I would rise in objection and ask people to join me in voting in the negative. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. If I may, a question to the proponent of the amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator Witkos. Senator Sampson, if you would prepare yourself for the question.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Through you, Mr. President. If this language is existing in our statutes regarding strict liability, has there been an incident that you are aware of and would share with us that have gone through the courts that folks have been impacted by that existing language? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:
Senate May 23, 2019

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the question, and honestly I think I have that information here, but I have not reviewed it. It is in that OLR report I mentioned earlier -- all of the cases that have resulted in a situation where strict liability was enforced -- but forgive me, I don't have an answer to the question right now.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos, you have the floor.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President, and through you, when you're saying it's strictly enforced, would that be enforced by the prosecutor? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson, would you care to respond?

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Yes, Mr. President. This strict liability applies to civil matters only and not criminal matters -- so, no prosecutor.

THE CHAIR:

Thanks, Senator Sampson. Senator Witkos, you have the floor.
SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President, and if the good senator could provide maybe an example of -- take a few minutes to go through your notes here to -- I'd like to get a better understanding of why we're changing or attempting to change existing law if it was brought forward in a civil suit, and what was the outcome, and what did they -- if they held any standard in there, what were the implications of the standard? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a quick look at the OLR report tells me that the existing cases in our current law have to do where someone is typically storing something that could pose a potential significant danger to others, more so than a firearm that might be owned by someone for self-defense. We're talking about the storage of ultra-hazardous chemicals, toxins. The most noteworthy place it shows up in our law is strict liability for the actions of a dog. In the case of a dog bite, something like that, we hold the -- the owner of the dog responsible.

There are a few cases listed in this report. The first case they list has to do with the context of blasting and explosives, Whitman Hotel v. Elliot and Watrous Engineering in 1951. There's another case involving highly volatile chemicals in 1991, an illegal display of fireworks in 2000. There's a
case of the storage of a significant amount of gasoline. Those are the kind of issues that show up in this OLR report. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the good senator for the answers to those questions. I had some concern when we -- when I initially read the bill on the strict liability. I was a little unclear as to how often it was utilized in our court systems, and I think I've gotten the answer to that. So, I thank the good gentleman for his answers, and I thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule B? Seeing none, Mr. Clerk, if we'd proceed to a roll call vote on Senate Amendment B.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 8738, House Bill 7218. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment B, LCO 8738. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:
Have all the members voted? Would you please check the machine to make sure that your vote is properly cast, and Mr. Clerk, if you would call the vote on the amendment.

CLERK:

House Bill 7218, Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 8738.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Yea</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

The amendment fails. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you again, Mr. President. I will be very, very brief, just to wrap up on the bill itself. Disappointed that that amendment failed also. I offered that amendment in all sincerity to fix what I think is a glaring problem in the underlying law and something that really ought to be addressed. That strict liability issue is a concern. Someone could make a diligent effort to store their firearm in a safe manner, and if they fail to do so through any kind of thing -- the failure of the locking mechanism to work, circumstances beyond their control -- they could end up being strictly liable. And I just think that is a shame that we would put that on the citizens of this state without the
opportunity to argue in their own defense about those circumstances, and sadly that's what strict liability does.

The bill before us, as I said, only changes the existing law in a small, small way. It changes loaded to include unloaded firearms. It changes the word location to manner, and it changes the impact for minors under 18 -- or under 16 rather -- to now under 18. And if I had the opportunity to have voted on the original law, I would've voted against that also, and the reason why is this is not an effective way to treat this situation.

We are, by supporting this type of policy, reaching into the private residence of some other person and telling them what is appropriate for them as far as the safe storage of their firearm. There are people all across this state that own firearms, and they own them for their own personal protection. There are people that are in fear of their ex-husband, their ex-boyfriend, someone coming to hurt them. They live in a bad neighborhood, there's been a rash of crimes, and they feel comfortable having a firearm to defend and protect themselves. That is their right, guaranteed by our United States and State Constitutions, and I don't think it's a good idea for us to be telling people how to handle that situation in their own home, and that's precisely what this bill does. And, in effect, it does it very ineffectively because there is no punishment under this language unless a tragedy occurs. I think that's a result of the acknowledgement that we don't really have a right to tell people how to store their firearms. But, what it doesn't do is create a decent incentive in my mind to make sure that people do, and that's why the offering of the
gun safe credit I thought was a better idea because that certainly wouldn't violate anyone's constitutional freedoms, and it would give people the opportunity to store their firearm in a better way of their own volition -- that they might actually do just because of the credit.

I also don't like the idea that someone who, through circumstances beyond their control or foresight could end up becoming a Class D, I think it is, felon as a result of this language. I think that is simply creating another victim and is completely unnecessary. It doesn't solve the underlying problem which we all want to address, which is to prevent tragedies like this. And as a result, I will be voting no, Mr. President. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in strong support of this bill. As a former teacher and administrator, I can tell you that I was halfway through my career when the tectonic shift brought on by Columbine occurred. It's a definite before-and-after, and if you haven't experienced that, then I don't know who I could even begin to explain it to you.

The part of this bill I would like to speak to is the part that talks about educating our young people. Everytown for Gun Safety in 2015 reported
that at least 265 children under the age of 18 picked up a firearm and accidentally shot themselves or someone else -- accidentally. This usually occurs when kids find an unsecured gun at a home. They also report that although in the early years the chances of those kind of accidents happening are high, they actually dip between the ages of about eight, nine, and ten, and then steadily begin to increase again through 17.

Four point six million of our kids live in homes with unlocked and loaded guns. We really need to do something to make sure that we protect our children, and I think this bill addresses that. It expands the age of education from grade 8 through grade 12, which is a response to the fact that we do see an increase through high school of these accidental shootings. It allows the State Board of Education in consultant with the Connecticut State Police Chiefs' Association to develop guidelines and make those available to local and regional boards of ed. And then the one place I will agree with others in this circle is that although this bill does not require school systems to use this information, and being an educator I would have liked to have seen that, I think that I can trust the advocates in each town to lobby their local boards of education to make sure that this gun safety is taught to our children.

Lastly, I would like to thank the people in this room, who allowed their love for their children to reach out and protect others from experiencing the same tragedy that they've experienced and provoking the conversation and moving us to action. It will be my absolute privilege to vote for this bill. Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. President, and good afternoon. I stand in strong support of Ethan's Law. Many of you know that this legislation was born out of a tragedy, a tragedy that occurred in my hometown. On January 31, 2018, a family was forever changed, a community was forever changed. It's the day that Ethan Song walked out of his house, walked down the street to a friend's house, opened up a closet, took out a box with an unsecured firearm with the bullets inside the box, the keys inside the box, loaded the gun and accidentally shot himself in front of his 15-year-old friend. Lives changed forever, and a life gone forever.

I remember getting the news that evening and feeling such pain and sorrow as a parent and trying to relate to what the Songs must be feeling. I remember talking to my own children about this terrible accident, and what had happened, and their attempt to make sense of it all -- their shock, their disbelief -- and knowing that other families were having that same discussion with their children. I remember the days that followed, watching a family deep in grief and an entire community in mourning. What Kristin and Mike Song have gone through, no parent should have to endure. What they have done in the wake of this tragedy has been absolutely remarkable. With grace and courage,
they speak to everyone who will listen about how to fix our broken laws. With grit and determination, they work closely with legislators to ensure the passage of this legislation. Because of them, in partnership with Representative Scanlon, who has done a tremendous amount of work on this as well as Senator Winfield of the Judiciary Committee and the rest of my delegation, we can create a safer situation for children and families in Connecticut, a safer Connecticut.

Sadly, this narrative that I speak to today is not unusual. There are children dying each and every day due to unsecured firearms -- needlessly. So, I beg of all of you today, do the right thing and vote in favor of this excellent piece of legislation. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. So, I am rising to ask everyone to join me in voting in the affirmative. I wanna say what I said earlier. Actually, let me -- let me make a remark to something that Senator Kissel said. The family is in a very unique club, a club none of us would like to be in, and unfortunately I can understand that club -- not in the way that they do, but I understand that club. But that's not why we are standing here, not just because of the emotion -- that's what began this conversation. And I don't
know if this is appropriate or not, but I give them a lot of credit because at the point that they're at, I couldn't have done what they did. But as I said, that started the conversation. But how the conversation took place is as all conversations in this building take place -- there's an idea, there are advocates, there's emotion around every issue in this building.

I don't know of too many issues on the committee that I chair that aren't emotional in one way or another to someone. But there was debate, there was concern for the law, there was conversation about the way in which we do this, and at the end of the day the bill that is before us is a result of a process that brings us to a place where what we are about to vote on is a better law than what we currently have, and that's as it should be.

And I would ask you if you understand that the process allows for us to have conversation, to build better laws, and you understand that this was a conversation that has built a better law that we've incorporated 18 year olds, who we now consider under the law minors, that we've asked people to lock your gun up in a safe container, whether it be a box or some other kind of container. And we haven't really changed that law that much, but in some ways, for some people, we've changed the laws in very significant ways after this vote, then you will join me in voting in the affirmative. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, Mr. Clerk, please proceed to a roll call vote.
Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7218. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7218. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.

Thank you. Have all the members voted? Please check the machine to make sure your votes are properly cast. And I've been asked to remind the -- the gallery that even on matters of strong interest and emotion, such as this, our rules do not allow for -- for demonstrations of noise in the gallery. So, again, Mr. Clerk, if you would call for the tally on this.

House Bill 7218.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bill passes. [Background talking] The Senate will stand at ease.

[Gavel] The Senate will come back to order. The Senate will come back to order. Please let us give our attention to the pendency of business here. Mr.
Clerk, if you would call the next item that has been marked go.

CLERK:

Page 42, Calendar No. 476, substitute for House Bill Number 7223, AN ACT CONCERNING THE STORAGE OF A PISTOL OR REVOLVER IN A MOTOR VEHICLE. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield, the distinguished Chair of the Judiciary Committee.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in conformity with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The bill has been moved in concurrence with the House. Will you remark, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. The bill before us prohibits the storing or keeping of a pistol or a revolver in an unattended vehicle -- motor vehicle -- if that firearm isn't in a trunk, in a safe, or a glove box, a locked safe, or a locked glove box. It also -- that motor vehicle is considered unattended if someone who is under the age of 21 and who is the owner or operator of the vehicle, or the passenger
inside the vehicle, isn't close enough to prevent the unauthorized access to the vehicle. The bill specifies some law enforcement that are not subject to the provisions of the bill. That would be DESP, police officers, police departments, the military, members of the department of corrections. It also allows for the penalties under the bill to be dismissed -- the charges to be dismissed -- should one who is subject to those comply with court orders and complete probation. It's a good bill, and I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

I stand in opposition to the bill. I think it's got some flaws in its drafting, and again, I believe that many folks in my district feel that Connecticut already has some of the toughest gun laws in the United States of America, and I don't see a groundswell of support for further gun regulations. And I will leave it to others in our caucus to flesh those issues out. And if I may, Mr. President, if I might yield to Senator Sampson.
SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

I know that they had a long debate in the House of Representatives on the bill that's before us, and I'm actually quite pleased that a number of amendments were adopted that improved the language significantly. And this bill's actually very close, in my mind, to being acceptable, except for a couple of significant concerns. I have a few questions, Mr. President, that I'd like to ask the distinguished Chair of the Judiciary Committee, if he is ready.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator Sampson. And, Senator Winfield, prepare yourself for the questions.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you kindly, Mr. President. So, I notice right in the beginning in Section 1, it says "in any motor vehicle," and I just want to set -- question for the record whether or not we are including things beyond
cars and passenger trucks, but also would this bill apply to motorcycles or to campers, other types of motorized vehicles on our roads? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. And, through you, Mr. President, the answer to that would be found in line 12, or actually lines 11 and 12, where "see" begins the answer to the question, as motor vehicles defined as the definition given in Section 14.1 of the statutes. I don't remember that off the top of my head, but I could look it up and read it to you, if you would like. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. You have the floor, Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President. I'm familiar with Section 14.1, and I know it does include motorcycles, which I guess is just a question that I wanted to get on the record, partly because motorcycles obviously pose a different set of issues than automobiles do when you're being asked to store your firearm. I also notice that the bill is very specific to age 21, and I would assume that's because this bill applies only to pistols and
revolvers and not to long guns. Is that correct?
Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Winfield, would you care to reply?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Mr. President. I believe that to be correct, but I'm not sure which section the good senator is talking about. And just so I don't say something that is not correct, I would ask if he could point out the line so that I could verify. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm referring to lines 5 and 6, where it says, "motor vehicle is unattended if no person is at least age 21 who is the owner or operator of such a motor vehicle, is inside, and within close proximity to the motor vehicle to prevent unauthorized access." And I notice that we use the age 21, and I was just asking if there -- what the purpose was of choosing 21 versus 18 or even 16. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Winfield, would you care to respond?
SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Mr. President. I think that has to do with ongoing conversations about responsibility and ability to think in certain situations. I will say that I wasn't involved in that portion of the drafting, so what I represent I believe to be true, but I cannot verify that at the moment. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Sampson, you have the floor.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. And I notice this bill does specifically only mention pistols and revolvers, and for the record, this does not apply to rifles. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Mr. President. For line -- in answer to Senator Sampson, in line 10 and line 11, the bill specifies that it does mean, in fact, pistol and revolver as defined in Sections 29 through 27 of the general statute.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Sampson, you have the floor.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President, and I appreciate the answers. I just wanted to get that set of circumstances on the record. So, I see that it says that it is perfectly acceptable -- and I'm glad that these changes were adopted in the House -- that someone could store their pistol or revolver in a locked trunk, a locked safe, or a locked glove box, but do I read that correctly to assume that simply having it in a locked car is not satisfactory? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Mr. President. I will answer that by expanding upon the example. I think this will be acceptable to Senator Sampson. If one were to have their pistol or revolver in the car, for instance, on the -- in the back seat and the car is locked, that would not be acceptable. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. [Coughing] Senator Sampson, you have the floor.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):
Yeah, thank you, Mr. President. I'm not sure I heard exactly what you said or understood it, and I'm very sorry for that. Just to reiterate, the question is, I understand locked safe, locked glove box, locked trunk, but if the vehicle itself is not locked and it's in the locked glove box or not in the locked glove box -- what are the circumstances? Does the car require to be locked too? Or if the car is not locked, but the glove box is? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Mr. President. I do think that that's a slightly different question than I perceived, but I will say that what this bill talks about is, as Senator Sampson pointed out, the trunk being locked, the box being locked, and those things. And so, I would suggest that the reading of the bill that I have is that those parts of the vehicle, if they're considered parts of the vehicle, must be locked. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Sampson, you have the floor.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I think that's all the questions I have. I'll let the gentleman sit down. This just speaks to just the overall confusion I
have with this bill. I think it's -- it's got a good intent. We're trying to prevent, you know, firearms falling into the hands of criminals by them being stolen out of, you know, parked vehicles. I think that makes a lot of sense. There are a number of ways we can approach that, and I'm just not certain that this bill gets to that because in some ways I think we're preventing the owner of the vehicle from making their own decisions about the proper way to store their firearm in a way that's best to secure it and to make sure it's not stolen by setting these parameters.

I'm also curious to understand why we would go through the trouble of making this requirement for pistols and revolvers but leave rifles alone. So presumably, under this language, you can store your rifle out in the open in your vehicle, and that's not a crime, but yet if you lock your car and the gun is in the glove box that is a crime. And -- that just doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

I wonder also about what happens when someone steals a car. Now clearly that's a crime on its own, but is there any liability for the person who owned the car to begin with for the way they stored the firearm at that time. And in our laws in Connecticut, it is a requirement that you must report a stolen firearm. So, if someone steals a firearm from a vehicle and that person goes to report it, could they find themselves in trouble. In fact, I'll ask that question of the proponent of the bill. Could you ultimately put yourself at risk of being guilty, I believe, of a Class A misdemeanor for reporting the theft of your firearm from your vehicle? Through you, Mr. President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Mr. President. I guess I would have to ask for more details on the situation. I'm not sure what the question is asking. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Sampson, could you clarify the question?

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Certainly. I came up with one scenario, which I will repeat, which is someone owns a vehicle, the car is locked, they have a handgun that is in the glove box, but the glove box is not locked. I believe that would make them liable under this bill for a Class A misdemeanor in the first offense. If someone were to steal that firearm under those circumstances and that person reported it, would they be subject to prosecution? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Mr. President. I will say that if the individual reporting should have secured the firearm
under the provisions of this bill, should it become law, and they did not and they reported it, it is within the realm of possibility that there is a prosecution. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Sampson, you have the floor.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. So, that's interesting. I almost think that it might have been a worthwhile endeavor to provide some sort of immunity if the person reports the stolen firearm, since our ultimate goal is to keep that firearm off the streets in its entirety. I guess that's my main issue with this bill is its -- it covers some of the things. I would much rather see legislation that maybe created a crime for someone leaving their firearm exposed on the passenger seat of the car, creating an attractive nuisance for someone to create a crime. But I can see people who, again, trying to do the right thing, getting caught up and becoming responsible when they were not, you know, intending to commit a crime.

I also -- I have a question about line 6. It says, for the purpose of this section, "A motor vehicle is unattended if no person who is at least 21 years of age is in within close enough proximity." So, if someone stops at a gas station or a Dunkin' Donuts say, and they leave their car for the very few minutes to run into the store, would that qualify as leaving the vehicle unattended and therefore create
liability under this bill if it becomes law?
Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Mr. President. I think it depends on the circumstances of that particular situation. Simply leaving the vehicle, of course, does not. I think it depends upon whether or not the individual is able to prevent that unauthorized access, and that is a matter of the circumstances on the ground as we look at that individual circumstance.

I will say this, while I did answer the previous question, the further question was not asked about so what happens if there's a possibility of a charge being brought. And if you look at lines 53 going forward down to Section 2 there, which is on line 58, the court can order a suspension of the prosecution if that individual reported the circumstances or the facts that report the crime the good senator was asking about. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Sampson, you have the floor.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President, and thanks again to the gentleman for the answers to his questions.
And this time I'm not gonna ask any more questions. I do, however, Mr. President have a number of amendments. The very first one I'd like to offer is LCO 8744. I ask that the Clerk call it and then I'll be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease for just a moment. Mr. Clerk, call the amendment please.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8744, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. This is a very straightforward amendment. It would change in Section 1 the crime of stealing a firearm from a Class C to a Class B felony and in effect increasing the penalty. Through you, Mr. President. Oh actually, I'm sorry, I got sidetracked. I move adoption, and I would ask that when the vote is taken, it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The amendment has been moved, and a roll call will be ordered at the appropriate time at the end of debate. Will you remark further on the amendment, Senator Sampson?
SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Sorry, I've got a lot of papers in front of me, I'm tryin' to keep my documents straight. The intention of this bill, I think, is quite clear, and that is to prevent firearms from falling into the hands of criminals, and it does that in the bill before us by punishing the owner of the firearm if they are somehow lax in the way they secure it, which is certainly a worthwhile approach if done correctly. This change that I have here, I think, is a much more direct approach, which it makes a much more significant penalty in the case of someone who would steal that firearm by increasing that from a Class C to a Class B felony, and I encourage my colleagues to support it. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in objection to the amendment. Mr. President, the increase in the penalty suggested by the amendment, I do not believe to be the correct approach for several reasons. One, a class -- the class of penalty that we already have, which is a felony, is not an insignificant punishment. There's nothing to my mind that necessarily suggests that increasing the penalty would do us any better than we currently would have under the law. Also, the reality is that this is a -- to my mind a good piece of law, and I would not like it to have to go back through this process
simply to increase a penalty, which we have no reason to believe would make anyone more safe than they already are. So, I would rise in objection.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule A? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would please call for a roll call vote on Senate Amendment Schedule A.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. House Bill 7223, Senate Amendment A, LCO 8744. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment A, LCO 8744. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

House Bill 7223, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8744.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CHAIR:


SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Nice to see you up there. Yeah, so that's unfortunate. The bill before us, again, only addresses a certain small percentage of firearms. It does not address rifles, and there were those few inconsistencies that I mentioned earlier, including the fact that the new law we would be creating would not even apply to someone leaving a rifle on the passenger seat of their car unlocked, but yet it would still penalize someone who put a handgun in their glove box out of sight and locked the car. To me that's an inconsistency that I don't think is appropriate, and I thought that a more direct approach, which rather than penalizing the person who would be the victim of the crime of having their firearm stolen, that we would approach the offender directly by increasing the penalty for stealing the firearm in the first place, and that's unfortunate.

Much like the previous bill, which dealt with the safe storage of firearms in the home, this bill deals with safe storage of the firearms in a car. And again, it would require some people, I know that there are changes made in the House that improve the bill dramatically, allowing someone to use their glove box and in the case of some folks who have pickup trucks to be able to use their tool box in the back, but there's a great number of people who live in our state that drive SUVs, and they don't have such a place to store firearms. And as a
result, I have another amendment, Madam President. This one is LCO 9148. I ask that it be called -- that the Clerk call it -- and that I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9148, Senate Schedule B.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson, please proceed to summarize.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is a very straightforward amendment. It strikes the underlying bill, and like was attempted on the previous bill, it would replace this, the bill, with a credit for the purchase of a gun safe -- again, creating a genuine incentive to gun owners to store their firearms properly instead of creating a crime that is going to only apply in some cases and, in my view, under a law that if this passes in its current format is ill-conceived and poorly -- poorly written. This is straightforward. It says to people, buy a gun safe. It's a good thing to do. You get a credit. And I move adoption, Madam President, and I would ask that when the vote is taken, it be taken by roll. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you. A roll call will be ordered after discussion on this amendment. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in objection to the amendment. I think obviously the amendment striking the bill, as the proponent of the bill, to my mind is a bad thing. I also think that many SUVs I know have glove boxes, and the bill allows for that as a method of locking the pistol or revolver as well as having it in a box of some sort. So, I think the amendment before us is not a good amendment given what we are attempting to do here today, and I rise in objection. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call the roll, and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. House Bill 7223, Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 9148. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Amendment B, LCO 9148. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.
Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 9148. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, would you please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 9148.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As we have been discussing, the goal of this bill is to encourage folks to store their firearms in a safe and secure manner to prevent the theft and the potential for these firearms to end up on our streets and potentially involved in crime, something that I am very, very concerned about. And I know that we're gonna do another bill today, and I plan to -- to speak at length about that subject in particular.
There was another inconsistency that I mentioned with the bill that's before us that is something that came up during the public hearing and also once the bill passed in the House of Representatives, and several folks approached me and said that we really should address this concern. And that is a situation where someone might be on their way to the gun range to practice 'cause they're involved in target-shooting or they're going hunting or they're doing something like this, and the bill is very specific about saying that a motor vehicle is unattended if the owner or operator or passenger is not within close enough proximity to prevent unauthorized access.

And, you know, one of the issues with this bill is that we live in a world where there's a great many places that you cannot carry your firearm -- the post office, a lot of government buildings, even some movie theaters. So, it presents a problem for folks who do want to follow their -- their Second Amendment right to carry a firearm on their person. They would have to take that firearm off and leave it in their vehicle to enter that place, and this is how this issue comes about. And we heard a lotta testimony about concerns about folks having to get out of their car and being exposed while they're putting the firearm in the truck, and more and more people are going to be aware that these firearms are out there, potentially creating a situation where a criminal might witness them do it and, you know, start the process of a crime. Something we wanna avoid.

One of the very similar situations that was brought up though is folks that might simply just wanna get out of their vehicle once they stop for gas or they
stop to get a coffee -- something like that -- and I'm afraid that the language in the bill would potentially put them at risk because they simply, while doing their due diligence and securing the firearm in the car, they go into the gas station and then come back. So, I have a very simple amendment to resolve this issue, Madam President. It is LCO 8740. I'd ask that you have the Clerk call this amendment and I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8740, Senate Schedule C.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson, please proceed to summarize.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. In line 3, this would add the word -- words rather, "after unattended for an extended period of time." It's a very simple amendment. I move adoption, Madam President, and I would ask that when the vote is taken it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. The amendment will be taken by roll -- a roll call vote. Would any other senators care to remark? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Senator Witkos.
SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If I may, a question or two to the proponent of the amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and through you, I was over on the other side of the chamber discussing another bill with another senator, and I missed one part of what the amendment does. Is the strike-all amendment? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. No, it is not. It simply adds a few words to make it quite clear that leaving the car unattended -- we would be changing it to "leaving unattended for an extended period of time," allowing someone to go into a gas station or a Dunkin' Donuts, something like that, and come out and not be in violation of this law. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):
So, thank you, Madam President. I thank Senator Sampson for that answer. That's the only question I have. Ladies and gentlemen, I think this is a good amendment, and it should be supported. I know there's been talk about the display of firearms, or it could be termed open carry, and by allowing this to -- this amendment to take place, somebody that in the example that Senator Sampson gave could run into the convenience store real quick, pick something up, or run into a local bathroom, or run into the front office of a school if they're picking up their child, where they're not allowed in a gun-free zone to do so, without having to get out of the car, potentially walking out to the back, locking up the weapon into a trunk. And again, this doesn't change the bill. It adds on. It doesn't strike it. It's not a strike-all. It adds a little extra, I would say -- I don't wanna say convenience because not only is it a convenience, but it's a bill that, in the examples that I gave, would cause less alarm to somebody who saw somebody walking around outside of their car with a gun tryin' to put it in the car. I urge the chamber's adoption of the amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the amendment before us. I recognize what it is attempting to do. I think it does have a significant change to what the underlying bill is attempting to do. Madam
President, I listened as the conversation spoke about the brandishing, if you will, of the weapon in order to put it into the trunk. I don't think that's necessarily required to do. I think there are ways to put the weapon in the trunk without exposing it to everyone. I also think that, depending on what the situation is, if we've thought about where we were going, the weapon could be in the trunk or in the glove compartment or somewhere that could be locked when you get out of the car. If you have a box that certainly is the case. So, I think there are plenty of ways that a person who wants to transport their weapon is able to do so and not make everyone who's around them who may not be someone who understands guns feel insecure, and I would rise in opposition to the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further? Senator Bizzarro, good evening.

SENATOR BIZZARRO (6TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, I just rise -- just in listening to the debate between my colleagues here, you know, I had a couple thoughts. I do worry with respect to this bill if it passes. I worry about a scenario where if I pull into the post office in downtown New Britain in the middle of the afternoon and I've got a firearm on me, I'm gonna have to -- if I don't have a locked glove box, I'll have to get out of the car and I'll have to, you know, take the gun off of my person, lock it up in the trunk. People might see me. It might cause panic. And I understand the senator
from the 10th district's point about there being ways to do that without causing alarm and doin' it discreetly. But just for the record, Madam President, I think part of the problem that I have personally with these types of bills is that, yeah, there may be ways of doin' it, but now we're putting an undue burden on people who are doing nothing but just exercising their right to possess a firearm. I mean, so now, somebody's gotta figure out a way to be discreet about doing something that's not illegal at all. And I think that's a problem. I mean, yes, maybe in this particular instance in a vacuum, it doesn't seem like a big deal, but everything, Madam President, is related. Everything we do here is related, and we continue to chip away at our Second Amendment rights when we pass bills that really don't have the effect that they purport to have. And so, I think that we really need to be guarded against doing that because, at the end of the day, all it does is just galvanize the pro Second Amendment -- the vigilant pro Second Amendment groups.

So, I would just urge caution to all of my colleagues around the circle, and just keep that in mind -- that perspective -- that the more we try to pass legislation that really does nothing in terms of protecting people but galvanizes the opposition, we're just not getting anywhere. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Bizzarro. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Senator Miner, good evening.
SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Good evening, Madam President, and I would just like to say that I'd like to align myself with the comments offered by Senator Bizzarro. I think statistics will bear out that tomorrow morning, or the next day, or the day after that, gun sales in the state of Connecticut will have gone up, not down. My constituents are very concerned about some of the gotcha moments, not in the bill that we just passed, but certainly in this legislation where, as some of my colleagues have said, a simple stop for a cup of coffee -- where someone actually gets out of the vehicle, takes their gun out from underneath the jacket where it was not in plain sight, and put it in a trunk -- now alerts people that there's a gun in the trunk. And so, what could've easily been put in an armrest for the five minutes you're in a coffee shop will now become a crime. And so, I do think that there is great wisdom in what Senator Bizzarro has said, and I would urge us to support this amendment in the hopes that we make this bill better. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise because when I look at this law and the way it's constructed, this is a locked vehicle. When I lock my vehicle, whatever I have in my vehicle that I'm legally able to carry, it belongs to me. And I think what this -
- the creation of this was for -- was in case somebody breaks into my vehicle and steals from me. Yet, when I look around at the cases that are before our courts, one of the first charges that's always dropped is the firearms charge, especially if there's any type of mandatory sentence. So now, if you put your gun in your car and somebody breaks into your car and steals it, I'm required to report it. And when I report it, I get arrested because it wasn't in a locked compartment. So now I'm the victim of a crime being victimized by the state. That is just wrong. That's why I will not support this law. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call a roll call vote, and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7223, Senate Amendment C, LCO No. 8740. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the -- in the Senate. Senate Amendment C, LCO 8740. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate. Senate Amendment C, LCO No. 8740. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.
THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, would you please announce the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Amendment C, LCO No. 8740.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Yea</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Nay</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Amendment fails. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise for some remarks please on the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, throughout my time in the legislature, when we've had conversations about what I call "gun bills" and I think many of my constituents refer to as "gun bills," we always end up having a conversation about prosecution. And, Madam President, the statistics
are rather striking. In almost every case, when there has been a charge filed including a firearm, at least in the majority of them they've been nollied, not prosecuted -- any number of different positions taken, but no one is ever convicted. And that is consistently a struggle that my constituents express to me -- that why do we put these bills, these laws, on the books and then not prosecute people. Why do we find some level of sympathy, empathy, acceptance for people that want to commit a crime, whether it's kidnapping, armed robbery, the list goes on and on, Madam President, and yet the penalty never follows the action. And here we are again with another bill. I had a conversation -- I've had a number of conversations about the legislation that we're gonna vote on here this evening -- and it's claimed that the reason for this legislation is that somehow guns are taken out of vehicles. And statistically, that doesn't seem to be the case.

The majority of gun-related incidents aren't necessarily borne out of my neighbor's stolen car or one of my constituents that happens to be running in for a cup of coffee or getting gas or anything like that. In fact, I can't find any statistic that bears that out. Certainly, there is a lot of gun crime that goes on in the state of Connecticut. I would suggest that it's gang related. I would suggest that it's drug related. I would suggest that it's turf. And certainly those guns came from somewhere because most of the people that commit those guns, especially under the age of 21, can't legally own 'em. They can't even possess 'em.

I worked with Senator Looney back when we passed 1160, and I remember a long conversation he and I
had about the drug trade and how it's part of the
cost of narcotics in some cases that not only
firearms but firearms and ammunition end up finding
their way into the system -- because the money is no
good if they can't protect their corner. And it --
it makes sense to me. I'm just not sure that
passing another law here -- in fact, I'm quite sure
that passing another law here written this way is
necessarily gonna help that situation.

Madam President, I have been fortunate to enjoy
firearms use since the age of 14, and that's why the
bill that we passed was very important to me, both
for what it attempted to correct and what I wanted
to try and make sure we didn't create. If we are
going to continue to pass laws that don't respect
people's right to engage in lawful activity with
firearms, I'm afraid the incidence of illegal
activity and the incidence of accidental activity
are only going to increase. I know many people in
my district under the age of 21 that either have a
hunting license, belong to a shooting club, may
engage in firearms activities, even in association
with a school program. Some have been accepted to
college. Some have gone on the military, and they
have learned how to handle, how to store, how to
control, how to clean -- everything to do with a
firearm -- and I would suggest to this chamber that
that's what we should be trying to focus on.

In the bill that we pass, certainly there's an
education component. I honestly hope that someone
takes action on that component. I don't think we
need to pass a law that says I've gotta take a
handgun and lock it up in a box somewhere -- it's
necessarily gonna make it any better. I think I
would agree with Senator Champagne. I'm almost
getting tired of having to defend my right to own something, whether it's jewelry in my house or something in my automobile and that somehow society seems to be accepting of the fact that it's just part of life. You've got somethin' somebody else wants, they got a right to take it -- and I don't think that's the case. I can guarantee you that is not the case in my house.

And so, Madam President, I do think there's a big difference between leaving a gun on the dashboard of my car and having to secure it in a way that somehow we think it's more appropriate because it is gonna somehow change the statistics. I don't know anyone that owns one of these firearms that would think leaving a loaded firearm or a firearm on the dashboard of their car is acceptable or appropriate. It goes against every bit of training anyone has ever gotten. And if something happens with it, they should face whatever the penalties are, but this is not gonna change, in my estimation, gun violence one bit. And more than likely we're gonna have another category on this list that has more nollies on it than convictions, and that new category is gonna be failure to store the firearm in a vehicle appropriately, and then 100 percent of those are gonna be nollied. Or, frankly, maybe because it's someone who lawfully owned a gun, they'll get prosecuted, and I think that'll be the worst possible outcome. So, I do not rise in support of the bill. I am opposed to it. And I thank the chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Will you remark
further on the bill that is before us? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would please call the roll, and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7223. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7223. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate, House Bill 7223. [Background talking]

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7223. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 7223.

| Total number voting | 35 |
| Total voting Yea    | 20 |
| Total voting Nay    | 15 |
| Absent and not voting | 1 |

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.
Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This bill, AN ACT CONCERNING GHOST GUNS, comes to us through the Judiciary Committee. The bill prohibits someone from completing the manufacture of a firearm without obtaining an engraving or affixing to that firearm - -
-- affixing to that firearm a unique identifier, a serial number from the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection. It requires that the department develop a way that those serial numbers would be produced. The serial numbers have to conform to federal numbering requirements, and those -- the frame of the -- the frame on the lower receiver would have to have a serial number as well. The bill before us also prohibits someone from transferring what are considered ghost guns under this law, unless they're law enforcement. It also prohibits someone from manufacturing the firearm that is made from a polymer plastic unless that polymer plastic capacity walk-through metal detector test. And it's a good bill, and I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Kissel. [Background talking]

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Good evening. I stand in opposition to this particular proposal. I appreciate the efforts made by the proponents. Even in the public hearing, it did not appear that this is a widespread issue in the state of Connecticut -- a few isolated cases, but certainly not a giant threat to public safety. And also, it begs the philosophical question as to when is essentially a hunk of metal and its composite parts, when does that actually become a firearm. And it's almost like we want to regulate something that is almost a firearm but not quite a firearm, and as much as they've -- the proponents have worked hard
on the language, that question to my mind still remains.

I watched the debate in the House, and I wanna credit Representative Doug Dubitsky. He raised the issue of, you know, we get these catchy titles and then we move with legislation -- first, you know, Saturday night specials, assault weapons, and now ghost guns -- and, you know, most of my constituents don't even know what a ghost gun is, but calling something a ghost gun, the implication is it's something very scary. Do we want kits flown in from California and other states if they're a huge menace to the state of Connecticut, but my position would be that once you've actually created an unlawful firearm, that's the crime already and you're already in violation of our state laws. And at this time, Madam President, I'd like to yield to Senator Sampson, if he would accept the yield.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Sampson, do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

I do, Madam President, and --

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you very much to the distinguished Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee. I align myself
with his comments completely. We are all trying to do our best to make sure that we live in a state that is safe and that we pass laws that are intelligent and thoughtful, that preserve the rights of our constituents, since we represent them, and simultaneously do our job here, which the priority ought to be public safety and consumer protection. But I have to ask, Madam President, when we have a bill before us that says, AN ACT CONCERNING GHOST GUNS, just how far down in the barrel we have gone to find another gun control bill. Connecticut has more gun control laws than just about any other state period. And I would argue that the majority of those laws make no impact on crime, and they impact only law-abiding gun owners. And I think it's about time we had that conversation in this chamber.

What is a ghost gun? That's a really good question. Ghost gun, I think, refers to a commercially available product specifically, but it's been used to title this bill for some sort of political effect. But I will start tonight, Madam President, by asking the proponent of the bill just that question, if you'd be inclined to answer for me. What is a ghost gun? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, thank you, and to the proposer of the question, I think a ghost gun is any gun, whether it be a gun that is manufactured in whole or in part, that doesn't have the serial numbers as
described under this bill. I think a ghost gun would be the type of gun that we today in the news see in Waterbury a man being arrested for printing a 3D gun and having a bullet in the -- in the gun ready to go. I think a ghost gun are those things that, again, do not have the serial numbers affixed to them, as we suggested, so therefore are invisible in the way that we would think of a ghost. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate that answer, but would that mean that this bill does not contemplate anything other than what you described as firearms? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. I'm not sure how to answer that question. The bill contemplates everything that -- what I said in my answer was all of the things that are laid out under the bill. So, not trying to be flip, but I guess the answer is, yes, it would not encompass anything that was not part of that answer because my answer replied to the whole bill. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

The reason why I ask my question again is because of the language, and the definitions that are contained in the bill before us. And it's very, very important that we understand what we're talking about with the terms that are used in this bill. And firearm is defined in Section 53a-3 of our laws, and I've got the definition here. I printed it out in huge letters so I would know what it is, but it describes a gun basically, a gun that actually -- well, I'll read it, it's short enough. Firearm means any sawed-off shotgun, machine gun, rifle, shotgun, pistol, revolver, or any other weapon, whether loaded or unloaded, from which a shot may be discharged -- what we would all commonly refer to as a gun. But this bill contemplates a lot of other things besides just firearms, and I guess that's the issue, is -- things other than firearms, are those a menace to our society?

Through you, Madam President. Has anyone committed an act of murder or violence with a ghost gun that is not a firearm? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. I'm not sure that I could actually answer that question. People have committed murder with all types of implements, so I'm not sure that I could represent an accurate
answer to that question. If the question is to find out if that is a common occurrence, I would say the answer then would be no. But I think it would be impossible for anyone to represent that they know for sure that that has never happened, although I would suggest that if the good senator is referring to the parts of the bill that talks about parts of a gun that later may be finished, then probably not. But it is within the realm of possibility that that happened as well at some point. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and thank you to the distinguished Chair of the Judiciary Committee. I appreciate his answer very much, and I know I put him kind of on the spot to answer a difficult and complex question based on the terminology in the bill, and he did an excellent job. And I would agree -- if you're talking about the things that qualify as firearms, you can probably find evidence of that, but this bill contemplates other things that are not firearms, not yet firearms, and that is really precisely the question that's before us about what -- a ghost gun technically would qualify and whether it's good policy to ban them.

I was gonna go through the bill in some detail, but I don't know that I really need to do that since there's really just a couple of sections that I wanna touch on, and then I will give you my take on what we're doing here before us. Let's start with
Section 2. Through you, Madam President. It says no person shall complete the manufacture of a firearm without subsequently obtaining a unique serial number, etc., and that is line 17. I would like to know, through you, Madam President, what the definition of manufacture is? And I know it does exist elsewhere in the bill, but I'd like to get it on the record. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Ah, Madam President, if you'd give me a second to find the definition. Thank you, Madam President, and thank you to the proposer of the question. In Section 2, for the purposes of that question, manufacture means, and I will read from the bill to get it accurate, "To fabricate or construct a firearm, including the initial assembly -- including the initial assembly," and that is the definition. It goes on to further explain what a firearm is and that's Section 101 through 105. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I appreciate that answer very much. That is going to be very important in a moment. The next section of the bill after -- well, I think it's still in Section 2 --
says that once someone completes the manufacture of that firearm, not later than 30 days after, they need to contact our Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection and let them know, so that they can provide a serial number, which will be affixed to the firearm. It goes on to say that the commissioner of that agency will produce that firearm serial number, but they're gonna determine first if the person is prohibited from purchasing a firearm, and then they are going to immediately -- and it says "in no more than three business days" -- they are going to review this person's application and issue that serial number. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. President -- or Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. I believe that the good senator reads the bill correct.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'll just say that that stuck out to me because I know that when you attempt to get a pistol permit in this state, it takes eight weeks to go through the background check process to obtain a pistol permit. And in this bill, we are saying that the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection is only given three days to do a
thorough background check before they issue someone a serial number for one of these firearms, which presumably is no longer a ghost gun once it gets its serial number. In lines 50 and 51, it makes a statement that I think is maybe the most important statement in this whole bill that doesn't need to be here because this is already the law, and it says, "No person shall transfer to another person any firearm manufactured in violation of this section." But no one's allowed to transfer firearms in Connecticut anyway, since we have passed legislation that requires a background check for every transfer. And I'll come back to it later, but that's at the core and heart of this legislation, and why I would say that it's unneeded.

The next paragraph, I wanna thank the Chairman for his efforts on this bill along with colleagues in both chambers and both parties for recognizing that there are a great many firearms that were sold in the past, antique firearms and even firearms in the '50s and '60s, that were sold commercially without serial numbers and have made an effort to grandfather those firearms in by making this bill only prospective. And I want to state for the record that I am very, very appreciative because I know many of my constituents would have been adversely affected by that, and it was a big deal to make sure that that accommodation was made.

I noticed also, going forward, on lines 94 through 100 that any person that violates this provision and manufactures a firearm without getting the serial number is guilty of a Class C felony, which two years of the sentence imposed may not be suspended — a mandatory minimum sentence, which I've heard over and over again that we don't like mandatory
minimums in this building and we wanna give discretion to the courts, but in this particular case, I guess no such discretion should be allowed.

We already covered lines 101 to 105, which talk about the manufacture of firearms. In lines 115 to 118, it says that the department, when they are asked to produce that serial number, they shall maintain identifying information of the person requesting the number or mark, and of the firearm or unfinished frame or lower receiver, which I thought was interesting, for which each such number or mark is requested. And through you, Madam President, I would just like to ask what identifying information they are collecting.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. Certainly, they would keep the person's name, and I'm not 100 percent sure what that identifying information would be, as the bill does not specifically lay that out. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you. I appreciate that. It goes on to say, as I just mentioned, not just the firearm but the unfinished frame or lower receiver, which if I got
this correct, back in Section 2 it said that you needed to get the serial number only upon the completion of the manufacture of a firearm, and I'm curious to know why those terms, unfinished frame or lower receiver, are contained in there. And the reason why I ask is that if you go on in the bill, you will find out that there is a section that says an unfinished lower receiver is not a firearm. So, through you, Madam President, why is it we would be maintaining identifying information and providing serial numbers for items that are not firearms? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. I think as part of the discussion around the term being used here, ghost guns, the unfinished frame or the lower receiver has been very much a part of that conversation. The concept that the lower receiver itself in the conversation has led many to believe that it is the most essential part of the potential gun going forward, and so as the conversation developed, it became important to many people engaged that that portion be identified. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):
I can certainly understand the gentleman's answer, and I appreciate it very much, but it illustrates the problem with this bill. It goes on in the bill to say that no person shall purchase, or receive, or sell, or transfer an unfinished frame or lower receiver, and then it says no person shall deliver or otherwise transfer an unfinished lower receiver again. It says it in a couple of different places. But then, you discover later that the definition of an unfinished frame or lower receiver means a blank casting or machine body -- keyword -- intended to be turned into the frame or lower receiver of a firearm, as defined in my document, a gun, of the general statutes, with additional machining, etc.

So, it's quite clear that a unfinished lower receiver -- and for the sake of the people watching or listening to this, I'll try and simplify this situation, and then we'll do it backwards. Everyone knows what a gun is -- a gun is a finished machine that has the ability to fire a projectile, a bullet. If you start disassembling that machine, you will get to a point where there is nothing left but the basic framework that everything else attaches to, and by itself it's not a firearm because it can't do anything. It may not even have a trigger, or a barrel, or any place for the bullets to go, and that is a lower receiver. And traditionally, the federal government has considered that a gun for the sake of transfer so they could document what firearms are in possession, and because firearms are often disassembled and assembled as part of the maintenance of them, and they wanna be able to track them.

It's going a lot further to say that something that could be made into that part is now an issue, and
that's what this bill proposes to do. It's saying an unfinished lower receiver, which is that part before it's been machined completely into the item that could be built into a gun. And this is an incredibly difficult thing to do because where exactly is that point, ladies and gentleman. I have a huge boulder in the front of my driveway. It's a huge boulder. In fact, I'm told it's where they founded the town of Wolcott 'cause it happens to be on Bound Line Road, the boundary line between what was once Wolcott and Farmington, but that boulder probably has some iron content. At some point, that could be melted down and turned into enough metal to create a lower receiver and then be made into a firearm, as defined in this section. But what good is that boulder to anyone, and why are we calling that a ghost gun -- because that's exactly what this -- this bill does. And it's even worse than that, ladies and gentleman, because they recognize in this bill that my boulder is probably not gonna be turned into a gun, so now they're relying on a concept, which we should never put into our laws, and that is the concept that is enumerated in lines 269 through 272, which says that it's intended to be a firearm.

Who is to know what someone's intent is? And before we charge them with a Class C felony with a mandatory minimum of two years, shouldn't we be making a law that is a little less subjective than for someone to say that person intended to turn that block of metal into a firearm without reporting it to the Department of Public Safety? That would be my argument. If you go on to read this, it does acknowledge that an unfinished frame or lower receiver means a blank that’s intended to be turned -- again, a subjective term -- with additional machining and has been formed in a machine to where
most has been completed. So, I guess it does get a tiny bit more specific, but what is most -- 50 percent, 80 percent. At what point does a block of metal become even part of a gun, and why are we regulating it to this point? I wanna just explain what has been happening in this legislature, over the last ten years that I've been here, on gun laws. We keep passing more and more gun laws. I keep voting no on them because they're not doing anything to help anyone or stop any crime. They are only interfering with the rights of law abiding citizens who want to protect themselves, their families, and might run into a school to save people. That's who we are interfering with.

Let me tell you about this ghost gun thing. Only two things can happen. If someone has got the ability and technology to be able to take raw materials and construct a firearm and use it for nefarious purposes, they're gonna do it. This law's not gonna stop that. They're certainly not gonna call up the Department of Public Safety, Madam President, and say, oh, by the way, I've just created this evil, nefarious firearm that I'm gonna commit a crime with. They're not going to do that. But there are plenty of people -- good, law-abiding, decent people -- that believe that firearms are necessary for our common safety, and I would argue that firearms provide the safety in our society.

When we have a problem, we call a police officer. And part of the reason we do is because they have a firearm, and they have the ability to defend themselves and us. Well, we live in a country where we are guaranteed the right to our personal defense. It's a core part of being an American -- a core part -- that says that not only you are a free person and
you have -- you get to choose your own path in your life but you get to defend yourself too. That's what the Second Amendment is really about. And the Bill of Rights is a recognition that the government has no right to interfere with our ability to defend ourselves. Now and I'm with people who say, I want commonsense gun legislation, except let's have the common sense.

You know, after Sandy Hook, we passed a couple of laws. We passed a law that said that you could only put ten rounds in your firearm. Let's think about how that works or not. So, I'm a law-abiding person, and I try and obey all of the laws that are passed in this body and on the federal level that we have before us. So, of course, I'm gonna put ten bullets in my gun. But, let me ask you a question, do you think that someone who is hell-bent on terrorizing a school, or even someone who's gonna go rob a liquor store, sitting out in their car and loading their gun, do you think that they're going to actually stop when they get to ten bullets? Of course they're not. It's ridiculous to even say. But I will tell you who's gonna have ten bullets -- the guy who is at home some night at three in the morning when somethin' goes bump and there are people breakin' into his house. And they're gonna be armed with God knows what because they're criminals, and they don't care that the law says ten bullets.

Laws like that do not make a difference. Universal background checks -- I support universal background checks. I think it's a decent mechanism to try and track the transactions of firearms. I'm fine with that, but let me explain something, universal background checks are not universal. They're
voluntary. If me and the good senator from the 6th district decide we are gonna exchange firearms, we're two law-abiding guys, so we're gonna go down to the firearm dealer, and we're gonna process our paperwork and pay our fees. And we're gonna get our backgrounds checked, and we're gonna transfer those firearms. But you know what's gonna happen if we're not two law-abiding guys and we are planning some terrible crime or act, we're gonna go exchange our firearms in the parking lot of Walmart at 2 a.m. -- not a universal background check, a voluntary background check.

And this bill, Madam President, is more of the same. Ghost guns -- when it first came out, I was wondering what the heck that was. What is a ghost gun? Is it an ethereal gun, or is it a gun that belongs to an ethereal person? What it is is nothing. It's a block of metal, and we shouldn't be trying to navigate the waters of what someone intends with a block of metal because we can't do it. It also relies on a faulty premise -- the premise that somehow we are safer if guns have serial numbers. Just to let you know, almost -- lots of guns have serial numbers, for sure, but for a long, long time guns did not have serial numbers. And as I said earlier, countless guns were produced in the '50s and '60s that exist today that don't have serial numbers -- antique firearms without serial numbers and guns built by enthusiasts that don't have serial numbers. There almost never used in a crime.

Also, a criminal can remove a serial number with a -- with a file, if he so chooses. The thing is that all that does is it allows the government to have a record of that transaction, but we should wonder
about whether or not that's a good idea. First and foremost, most states don't register firearms at all, and in fact, this state doesn't technically register any firearms except for the ones that were caught up in the so-called assault weapons ban that occurred after Sandy Hook, which was also another thing that does not affect criminals who will easily go across state lines to obtain these firearms. It does nothing but inhibit someone who is just a law-abiding citizen who wants to engage in a sport.

History tells us that the registration of firearms can only lead to a very, very bad outcome. So, as I said, this is not going to impact someone with criminal intent. If the person has the means to produce a firearm and do harm with it, they're going to do so, and they're not going to get a record by contacting the Department of Public Safety. So, will this bill harm anyone? I don't know. It's certainly not gonna harm the guy who's aware of it and knows enough to call up and say, hey, I gotta get my serial number. But what I'm worried about is the fact that most people I know are not watching every move that this body makes, and somebody is gonna get caught up in this when they're a decent person who's never gonna commit a crime ever, and now we're gonna pass a law that gives them a Class C felony -- mandatory minimum two years -- because they're somebody who, you know, trains and likes to shoot firearms as a hobby.

Madam President, I have an amendment. I know I've said that a few times today, but I promise this is the last amendment that I'm gonna offer today, and it's the most important one that I'm gonna offer. It's LCO No. 9372. I ask that the Clerk call it and I be allowed to summarize.
THE CHAIR:

You are undeterred, sir. It's impressive. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9372, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to summarize, Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you very kindly, Madam President. The amendment before us strikes the underlying bill and proposes to reinstate the Statewide Firearms Trafficking Task Force and funds it by taking funds that would have otherwise been used for the Citizens' Election Fund. I move adoption, and I ask that when the vote is taken it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

The vote will be taken by roll, and will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I am indeed undeterred because I believe that the principles and values that created this great country are great, and those people back then recognized that we must, at all costs, maintain our freedoms, that the government
must be responsible to the people, and that we need
to provide protections to make sure that our
government does not go too far and interfere with
those freedoms. We need to maintain our freedom of
speech and the press and our ability to assemble and
to petition our government, but we also need to
provide for our own protection, and that's the
purpose of the Second Amendment.

This bill, Madam President, is only going to impact
a few random people that get caught up in it. I
submit it will not even catch a single person who is
intending to do harm with a so-called ghost gun.
The few cases that have been discussed about ghost
guns in the news, those people violated plenty of
other laws. Mainly, they transferred an illegal
firearm. We don't need a new law to catch that. We
have that law.

In my email inbox the other day, I got the -- the
briefing from the Connecticut Against Gun violence,
and I went through it, and I always listen and try
and understand exactly what they're saying. But I
thought it was really interesting that they
mentioned a bunch of statistics about gun violence
in our state, and so I went and I printed the
articles and one of 'em I found shocking. It's from
February of 2018, Groundhog Day actually, from NBC
Connecticut and the reporter is Shyang Puri (and I'm
sorry if I made a mess of the name), but this is
about guns stolen in Connecticut showing up in crime
scenes -- something that concerns me greatly and
something that's never addressed in this building.
Year after year after year after year, our crime
statistics, they don't change much because almost
all of the gun violence that does happen is by
illegally-owned firearms in the cities. That's what
it is. And our laws about the number in the chamber, and we're gonna go after this certain kind of rifle -- it doesn't affect any of that, and it just continues and continues, and you have gang violence and you have illegal guns that are stolen from homes and cars, which we talked about earlier, and they end up in crimes. But I wanna just point out a couple things. In this article, I found it fascinating 'cause there is a claim in here that says, "However, in Connecticut, criminals are unlikely to face punishment for stealing a gun. In fact, over the last five years, charges for stealing a firearm were dropped more than 70 percent of the time." And they link to an OLR report, an Office of Legislative Research report, which I printed out so I would have it tonight, and sure enough, I go through and read through the firearm stats, and I have those statistics right here. It says from 2013 to 2017 -- we don't have anything later than that yet -- but it looks like there were a total of around 250-300 stealing a firearm offenses, but only 50 or 60 each year were prosecuted and the person was found guilty. In more than 75 percent of the cases, they were nollied.

So, that goes to something I say all the time when we have this gun control argument, which is what we should be doing -- well, the first thing we should be doing is we should be prosecuting the laws we have. If we're failing to prosecute the laws that we have, then what good are more laws? We need to actually hold people accountable when they put other people at risk. There's also a bunch of statistics that talk about the repeat offenders -- people we know who have committed these crimes in the past -- and yet, year after year, this legislature passes more and more policies that hold criminals less and
less accountable. We have the Earned Risk Reduction Program that lets people out for good behavior, simply for signing up for something they never even attend. We have the Raise the Age Bill. There's car thefts galore all across the state because of that, and I would submit that some of these young people that are getting their start in crime stealing cars will ultimately be people that end up in these statistics over here. We need to go the other way. We need to actually prosecute the crime that happens before us.

I know I've been talking quite a while without getting to the substance of the amendment, so I will do that. The amendment does exactly that. After the terrible tragedy in Newtown, this body passed a sweeping gun control bill, and I will tell you, as I already mentioned, some of that I don't think had any effect, but there were good things in it. And one of the good things that was in it was the creation of something called the Statewide Firearms Trafficking Task Force. This is a program designed to allow law enforcement agencies all across our state to work together in concert to track and apprehend people that traffic in stolen firearms. In the process, they catch all sorts of other crimes, drug trafficking and gang activity and that kind of thing, and I talked to officers involved in that program. But you know what's so sad ladies and gentleman is that that program was funded for one year, the year after we passed the bill, and then I guess it was passé and this legislature didn't see fit to fund it ever again after.

This amendment, Madam President, strikes the underlying bill, which will have no effect on catching criminals or making our world a safer place
or stopping gun violence, and replaces it with something that actually will. It funds that program again, and it takes the money from something that we can all do without, which is the money that goes into the fund that pays for our campaigns, our political campaigns, the Citizens' Election Program.

So, Madam President, I'm offering a choice to this body. They can either do something that is completely effective, that we know works to help crack down on crime and to go to the heart of the problem, and the only expense is they're gonna have a few less bumper stickers in their next campaign. Or you can vote down my amendment, and we can continue to bother some guy who is just trying to follow his hobby and not impact any criminals whatsoever. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing today. Please pass this amendment. Please tell the people in this state that we wanna do something about gun violence for real for once. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Winfield, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. In 2007, I was an activist, an organizer in a community, and I was approached about running for office. And I didn't have a political background. I don't have a political family. I had no entrance into politics that would be an entrance that would allow me to be in this body. What did allow me to be in this body was a program that was newly formed, and it was a
Citizens' Election Program. It didn't just allow me to be in this body, it allowed a lot of different voices that normally would not be in this body. Now I know that over the course of a number of years, we've talked about the Citizens' Election Program as the program that provides us with bumper stickers and pizza. Sure, it does that, but what it also does is it opens up this process to people who are not a part of the process normally. It makes it possible for people like myself, who were busy trying to help people on the streets of New Haven and not concerned so much about being elected or seen, to become people who can elevate their voice in a way they otherwise could not. I don't think it's as simple as it's often put.

The task force that was spoken about I think is important. I have been a person who has been talking about making funding for that task force ever since it was created. Those two things being true, what the proponent of the amendment seeks to do eviscerates the underlying bill. I think the underlying bill is important as well. I don't think the choice is binary. I think the choice here potentially could be that, as we think about what we want the state to be, we want it to be a state that has this particular law -- and by this particular law, I mean the underlying bill -- and a task force to do the job that we talked about the task force doing. That's another choice that wasn't spoken about in the discussion.

Look, at the end of the day, what we're talking about is the regulation of potentially dangerous firearms, or instruments meant to become firearms, and I recognize that there are concerns about that, but this amendment is not the way to go about it.
So, I rise in objection and would ask people to join me when we vote by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? If not, a roll call vote has been requested, so Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the vote on the amendment, and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7219, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 9372. An Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7219, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 9372. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, if you could please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 7219, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 9372.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The amendment fails. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and good evening to you.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

I rise for a question for the proponent of the bill, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield, prepare yourself. Please proceed, Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good evening, Senator. I received an email this afternoon from one of my constituents who asked if this proposal would have an exemption, and in his words, for those of us that make replicas of antique muzzle loading firearms. These guns do not have serial numbers and never had, and he goes on to talk about why he doesn't think that that should be necessary. And I look at the bill on page 50 -- I'm sorry, page 3, number line 52, it talks about the provisions of this section shall not apply to any
antique firearm as defined in 18 U.S.C. 921. So, if we move back to the exceptions, which I'm seeing on page 16, it talks about antique firearms would be an exception. And then moving to page 20, under Background, Antique Firearms, "Under federal law, an antique firearm is --," number 2 indicates that any replica of such firearm, if it is not designed or redesigned for using rimfire or conventional centerfire fixed ammunition -- or uses rimfire or conventional centerfire fixed ammunition that is no longer manufactured, that would apply to be an exemption.

So, my question is I'm hopeful that I can reply to this constituent of mine and say it looks like there would be an exemption for you to continue making your replicas of these muzzle loading firearms. Am I reading that exception as the intent of this legislation? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And after all of that, I hate to just answer your question with a yes, but that is the answer to your question.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

That's really -- I needed a yes or no answer, and I appreciate that. It seemed like I was coming to that conclusion -- thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank --

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

It seemed I was coming to that conclusion, but I wanted to make sure that was legislative intent.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator, for your answer.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I just wanna rise briefly and thank the proponents of this legislation, not only Senator Winfield as well as Senators Duff and Looney but also the many advocates who have been in this building for weeks and weeks -- wearing orange, wearing red, and wearing green and arguing for commonsense gun laws that in my view, Madam President, are long overdue. The principle behind this legislation is quite clear, and that's that no person should be able to bypass our gun laws by ordering pieces and parts of a gun online and assembling it in their own home. And, Madam President, having served on the Judiciary Committee,
there was skepticism as -- when we were hearing the bill and debating the bill in that committee -- as to whether this poses a real threat, whether ghost guns really do endanger the daily lives of Connecticut residents.

I happened to read in the Hartford Courant this morning, Madam President, that Waterbury Police make an unusual gun arrest. "Man Had a Plastic 3D Printed Gun" -- that was the headline -- and as I read on, I found out and I'm reading here from the Courant, the officers saw a white-handed pistol in the man's waistband. It turned out to be a plastic 3D printed gun with a live 22 caliber round in the barrel. Even though they are made out of plastic, such guns are capable of firing.

Madam President, ghost guns and 3D printed guns, they do pose a very real threat. And what we seek to do in this chamber today is very important, and that's closing a loophole. The question before us is should we allow people who wouldn't pass a background check, who are prohibited from possessing a firearm, to buy a do-it-yourself gun online, and I think certainly the answer is no. The threat isn't only the man who was arrested today, Madam President. In Willimantic, a teen was arrested in an attempt to sell multiple firegun -- firearms that were ghost guns. When the police questioned him about it, he said he couldn't keep up with the demand. There was another man who tried to sell ghost guns on Armslist.com. The advertisement read "No serial. Completed from 80 percent lower. No paperwork."

This is frightening, Madam President, and I think it's exactly the sort of issue that my constituents
sent me here to address. I met so many parents on the campaign trail who told me that they had a pit in their stomach when their kid got on the bus in the morning. They had a pit in their stomach when their child went over to a friend's home in the afternoon. I talked to so many students who told me that they couldn't focus on the schoolwork that was on their desk because they heard a loud noise in the hallway and were consumed by the thought and the fear of where they would hide in the event of -- that their school was the location of the next school shooting.

I wanna push back, Madam President, on something I heard earlier mentioned in the chamber. That's that gun laws don't work. That they don't make us safe. That the historic laws that have been passed in this chamber in the past haven't made Connecticut a more safe state. The reality, Madam President, is that Connecticut has the third strongest gun laws, and it's no coincidence that we have the fifth lowest rate of gun deaths. In a study conducted by Columbia University that analyzed 130 other studies, one clear principle came through, and that's that restricting access to guns and their purchase is clearly associated time and time again with reductions in firearms deaths.

Before I was a candidate, before I was a state senator, Madam President, I remember standing on the steps of this state capitol with thousands of people who were gathered to fight for commonsense gun violence prevention -- exactly the sort of bill we have here today. And I remember in my remarks quoting Justice Brandeis, who said that "States can be a laboratory of democracy." I think that today, Madam President, in this chamber, I'm proud to say
that we're not just a laboratory of democracy, we're
a laboratory of courage in standing up to the NRA.
We're a laboratory in compassion in making sure that
every student can feel safe in the classroom. So, I
thank my colleagues, Madam President, who will be
supporting this legislation. I will be voting
emphatically yes because I believe this is exactly
what I was sent here to do.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I have been inspired
by my colleagues here today who have spoken out in
favor of gun prevention -- gun violence prevention,
which I feel so strongly about, and you know
particularly, Senator Haskell, I'd like to
associated my remarks with yours. I feel like you
really addressed the issue very clearly. And I
wanna thank Senator Winfield for his leadership on
this issue and on so many issues -- he makes me so
proud to be a colleague -- and, you know, to all the
proponent -- all the advocates that are there, so
many of you are friends of mine and people that I've
worked with and people that I've gotten to know in
the last year as I ran for Senate. And I just
wanted to say that, you know, I grew up in a
household where we did not own guns and we did not --
I was never exposed to guns growing up. And my
family really believed very strongly that this
country had a problem, that we didn’t know how to
legislate and how to govern properly to reduce gun
violence. And that's the household I grew up in,
and so I always had that feeling, but I never really experienced the intensity of that until the shooting in Newtown, Sandy Hook. And, you know, I live in Danbury, which is very nearby, and I have three children, and they grew up in Danbury, and each one of my kids knew someone who was killed -- from very different experiences -- you know, from the principal, who had been the vice-principal at Rogers Park, from a teacher who was in the choir with my daughter at Danbury High School, from another teacher who was engaged to be married to my son's colleague, his son. And it hit us so hard, and I realized, you know, I felt so emotional about it.

And recently I was invited to a meeting in Bethel with the Moms Demand Action, a few months ago, and I got very emotional when I started talking about it. And I realized there are people in the room that were there that day, and if I felt this emotional and this strongly, I couldn't imagine the emotions that were being felt by the teachers and the parents who experienced that. And I felt embarrassed that I was showing my emotion in the face of what they went through, and they assured me not to be embarrassed, but it was -- you know, I never -- I didn't want them to think that I didn't understand that the intensity of my feelings was magnified so many fold by what they'd experienced.

And so, from the very beginning, when I decided to run for the State Senate, I knew that this would be an opportunity to support our state in legislating to protect our citizens from gun violence, and I'm very proud to stand here today and take this vote. And I will be voting in favor. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? Senator McCrory. Senator Bergstein to be followed by Senator McCrory.

SENATOR BERGSTEN (36TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I'll be brief. I first wanna thank Senator Winfield for his incredible leadership on this issue. And I just, in case there is any doubt in anyone's mind that ghost guns are not a real threat to public health and to the safety of our communities, I just want to refer to the actual website, Ghostguns.com, which advertises itself as an entity that sells unserialized and unregistered weapons. That is their -- that's their market play. So, we already know that that's appealing to people who do not want to have registered weapons, who do not want to be known for having a gun, which leads us to believe that they don't want to be responsible gun owners.

And if there's still any doubt about whether these weapons would be owned by responsible gun owners, here's a quick list of what those weapons are that they're selling: AR-15s, AR-40s, AR-45s, glocks, MP5s, and AK-47s. And while I am not a firearms expert, I know that these are weapons of mass destruction. These are weapons that are designed to kill multiple people within a matter of seconds. These are not for sport. These are not hunting guns. These are simply designed to take as many lives as possible in the shortest amount of time. So, I rise in support of this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Bergstein. Will you remark further? Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise just for a few comments. Not long ago, after the Sandy Hook massacre, the state of Connecticut passed some great, great gun laws, strengthening our gun laws in the state of Connecticut. That was done a while back. I was in the House at that time. But at that time, I think -- no, I'm sure -- I was the only individual from my side of the aisle who did not support that legislation, and I explained why I didn’t support that legislation. At the time, I said that although it sounds good, I didn't think it was gonna solve the issues of gun violence that has been goin' on in my community for a number of years -- years and years and years prior to the events that took place at Sandy Hook. So, I didn't support it, and now we're here five-six years later, looking to pass new legislation, which I'm gonna support by the way.

And I want everyone to understand that I believe in the Second Amendment. I have a permit. I carry a weapon. That's important to me. That's important to me 'cause I know the history of people from my community. I was -- my parents was raised in the South, and I understood that and I was reminded as a child that it is important to have -- you need to be responsible to have guns because, if you didn't, my grandfather told me, we wouldn't be here today. He used his weapons to defend his land and defend his families when the Night Riders came to wanna scare him and intimidate him from his business. He used
his weapons to defend himself. So I support that. I understand that.

There was talk today about the good guys, so-called good guys and so-called bad guys when it comes to guns. And how is it that the so-called bad guys are getting these weapons, and where are they getting 'em from. The bad guys I know don't have permits. The bad guys I know have felonies. They'll never be able to buy a gun. The bad guys I know can't come up in here and advocate. The bad guys I know, I had a conversation with, and I asked these so-called bad guys, where are you getting these weapons from 'cause there seem to be a lot of 'em in my community. Weapons -- they can find a weapon, we can find a gun faster than we can fresh lettuce in my community. That accessibility to a weapon is easy. So I can't for the life of me understand -- there's no gun stores in Hartford. I don't believe there's a gun store in Bridgeport. And I can safely probably say there isn't a gun store in New Haven. But somehow, these weapons are getting in the hands of these bad guys.

So the only way, in my opinion, before I did a critical analysis and talked to some of my bad guys, I said in order for a bad guy to get a weapon, he has to get it from a good guy 'cause the good guy has the means of getting these weapons. I had that conversation with a so-called bad guy. I said how you get these weapons? Oh, he said, I get 'em in many a ways. The good guys go to other states and bring the weapons back. The good guys buy the weapons and sell 'em to us. The good guys trade weapons for drugs. The good guys leave their weapons available so I can get them. The good guys give us their cars, and we trade 'em for weapons.
And I know it's true because I saw, not too long ago, about a week-and-a-half ago -- it didn't happen in Connecticut but in California, right in a community right outside of Compton in L.A., there was gun bus. And in a wealthy, wealthy, wealthy community, the feds found 1,000 guns, unmarked, right in that community outside South Central.

And I wonder, for the life of me, how many of those weapons got in the hands or would've been in those hands of those bad guys? And I'm thinkin' to Connecticut, well, how many of those weapons that are being purchased by the good guys are gettin' in the hands of the bad guys? And we see our murder rate increase. And I'm not quite sure if this legislation will solve that problem. I hope it will. I'm gonna support it. I'm gonna support it, and I hope and pray that it will help solve that problem.

Lastly, when I was following what happened at Sandy Hook, I read the newspapers and I was tryin' to figure out well where did the mom purchase the weapons. And lo and behold, the mom purchased weapons at a gun store in East Windsor, Connecticut. That's where those weapons were purchased, and don't you know, for the life of me, a little more research showed that at that same gun store, they were busted by our law enforcements for not being able to identify where over 100 weapons have been misplaced. They couldn't account for over 100 weapons in that store. And I said to myself, where are those weapons? Could those weapons be the same ones been used in violence in one of these urban communities? I think so 'cause those bad guys couldn't buy guns from that store. These are facts folks. This is what's happening. So, yes, let's support this
legislation. Yes, let's make it tougher. But the reality is, somehow these bad guys -- and, oh, I forgot, mind you, the -- the offense for the gun store owner, I think they got hit with maybe a year penalty or a fine, and I said to myself, if that -- a young person in my community had one of those weapons in their hands, I know they're facin' some serious time. So, the responsibility really was on the good guy, who allowed those weapons to get in the hands of the bad guy. But if the bad guy gets the weapon in his hands, he goin' to jail. He's goin' to get a felony. He's not gonna be able to go to college. But the good guy, who allowed it to happen, gets a slap on the hand.

That's the facts folks. Do your homework. So, yeah, I'm gonna support this legislation, but I'm not happy. I'm not happy 'cause the rules are not fair. The data speaks for itself. And matter of fact, when we changed that legislation in 2012, I think, or 2013, we even said if a bullet -- we treat a bullet just like we treat a gun -- and if a young person has a bullet in their possession they're gonna get the same offense as a person that had a gun. Read the law. Read the law. So, yeah, let's support this legislation and hope and pray that we have no more concerns, no more violence, no more anything -- we don't have the advocates come up every year to change it. But somethin' tells me that's not gonna be the reality 'cause that's not the reality I see. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Senator Bradley. Good evening.
SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I'd be remiss if I didn't rise to recognize the outstanding work of Senator Winfield throughout this process. I know the hours -- the countless hours of advocates who came up on both sides of the aisle to talk about this proposed legislation, and the way he vacillated and toiled with how we could address the issues that Senator McCrory was addressing here today of the violence that exists in our urban areas in the great state of Connecticut.

I think -- I think the good senator is right, Madam President, that this legislation and maybe possibly any legislation that comes out of our state will not be sufficient to curb the violence that happens in urban America. I think the senator is right when he says that what is occurring is not just a Connecticut problem, but it's something that other states need to partner with the state of Connecticut and follow in the leadership that Senator Winfield has provided, that former governors have provided, that current administration is providing. And without a kind of cohesive plan, we won't see violence in America come to an end.

I think that you're absolutely right in what you're saying, Senator McCrory, but Senator Bergstein hits on something which I think is particularly important, and I think I would echo something that Senator Anwar would agree with, and that is preventative medicine oftentimes is the best medicine. And although we have not seen the violence come particularly from ghost guns in the state of Connecticut, that they by and large are
stolen guns that oftentimes come from other states or come from the so-called good guys as Senator McCrory so eloquently stated, I think that preventative medicine in this case to get ahead of the problem, to curb the problem before it's a problem, it's a right step in the right direction. So, I -- I really do once again commend Senator Winfield for having the vision and the foresight to seeing that this quite very easily be a serious problem. When someone wants to operate in anonymity when having a firearm, when someone wants to operate in the gray or the black in terms of not being known for what reason they're using this weapon or that they have this weapon that has the capacity to inflict such massive casualties, I think that obviously there might be some nefarious reasonings there.

So, as a person who does defend and protect the Constitution, and all of us here who have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution, it is imperative that we protect the rights of those who do things the right way -- the good guy way -- but it's also imperative upon us to look at people who have nefarious reasons for holding firearms. And anyone who wants to hold a firearm of this capacity and not have it registered and not have it be known to the general public, I think might be operating for some nefarious purpose. So, I strongly support this piece of legislation, and I thank the good senator for bringing it forward.

THE CHAIR:

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of this legislation. First off, I'd like to thank Senator Winfield for his work on not only this bill but the other two pieces of legislation as well and the bipartisan support that has been around these pieces of legislation because these are important to the health and safety of the state of Connecticut.

Madam President, I am very proud of our state that we have very strict gun laws here in the state of Connecticut, which has happened over decades, but most recently because of the tragic events in Newtown. But that made us take a very close and harsh look at gun violence, not only in places like Sandy Hook but in places like our cities, our urban centers across the state of Connecticut as well. And through that came very tough legislation that put us on the map as having one -- as being one of the states with the toughest gun laws in the nation.

And while some may argue that our gun laws only restrict legal gun owners and do nothing for violent crime, in fact, the facts speak differently. The facts say that our tough gun laws have reduced incidents of gun violence, that they have reduced crime, that they have made our streets safer. And so, Madam President, we continue to build on those efforts across many years in trying to ensure that we do protect the citizens all across the state of Connecticut.

Madam President, we have worked very, very hard over the years to -- to help raise issues that have come forward, whether last year it was in bump stocks,
this year in ghost guns and safe storage, all the
types of things that we know make our state a safer
place for our residents. And we should be looking
at this in its totality because I do believe that
passing this type of legislation is extremely
important to the safety of our state. In fact, I
wish, as I say many times, I wish that our federal
partners -- I know our delegation supports these
efforts -- but I wish our Congress would support
legislation to ban ghost guns formally or ban AR-15s
or ban other weapons that we know are so destructive
to our society.

Many of us, year after year, or day after day, or
week after week, we see incidents of gun violence
across this country, and it does -- it just makes
our skin crawl. It makes us anxious. It makes us
wonder what's next. And when people have a
difficult time going into -- they have a difficult
time going to a mall and worrying about that, going
to school, walking down a street, going to church --
people should not have that fear of going to places
out in public and wondering if there's going to be
violence, no matter where it is.

And so now we have -- we have banned bump stocks.
We have taken a number of steps on various other
types of weapons that are out there, and now we look
at ghost guns, which I think a few years ago most of
us would have not even known that these exist
outside of the fact that we now see guns being
printed on a 3D printer or guns without a serial
number. And, Madam President, I think that that
then calls us to debate whether or not our state is a
state -- our state is as safe as it can be. And
when we look at that, the answer is no, and that's
why we come up with these pieces of legislation.
These are difficult. This is not a Democrat or Republican issue. This is an issue that sometimes some people of the same party disagree, some people in the various parts of the state disagree, but it's an issue where we have to have those debates in a respectful way and then figure out our path forward. So, I am appreciative of the fact of the steps that we have taken over the years for -- to reduce gun violence and gun incidents of violence, reducing crime in our state. I do think that the work we have done has worked, has made our state safer to be. I am proud to be in a state that has taking -- taken all these types of steps over the years to make a real difference for the people that we represent.

When I go back home, and I tell people that we voted for these three bills, I feel that a number of people will say thank you for making us feel safer. After the Parkland shooting on February 14, two years ago, I organized with the mayor of our city and our legislative delegation a march for change. With one week's notice, we had over 200 people march to say enough is enough of gun violence, and there were people from all spectrums. We had young people, old people, in between, and it really sent a strong message. It sent a strong message about the values we have in my district on this issue and I would argue across the state of Connecticut.

And so we have to continue to try and have our laws keep up with our -- keep up with technology. Sometimes this is why ghost guns is a little difficult to write into law, but we've -- I think we've struck the right balance. So again, Madam President, I wanna thank everybody who has worked hard on this legislation. Again, I wanna thank our
Senate President for his leadership and his efforts on this as well. These -- again, these are big issues. These are tough issues. And without Senator Looney's leadership on this, we wouldn't be debating this bill right now. So again, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation. Let's continue to make Connecticut safe. Let's continue to make Connecticut safer and ensure that we bring confidence to the people of the state when it comes to reducing gun violence and gun crime across Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us? Senator Looney. Good evening, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you. Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, speaking in support of the bill. I think this is an extraordinarily important bill, and it is interesting, I think, that we do have this trilogy of bills today and I think it's gratifying that we were able to do them all in succession.

First of all, I wanted to thank Senator Winfield for all of his work on -- on this effort and so many of the other Judiciary bills this session that often are contested in debate but that he does such a superb job seeing through to a conclusion of the debate. The two bills earlier -- Ethan's Law, I think that there is a broad consensus on that bill because of the tragic situation out of which it arose, and I'm so pleased we joined the House in passing that bill, and the second bill, the safe
storage bill regarding motor vehicles -- also, also important.

This bill, Madam President, is a sign of our continuing vigilance and the necessity for that vigilance. Six years ago, after the tragedy in Newtown, the Connecticut General Assembly passed a far-reaching model bill regarding gun violence and school security at the time. It came in the context of that awful event in December of 2012, and it was a bipartisan result in the end, which was one of the things that made it most gratifying. Ninety percent of the Democratic members of both chambers supported that bill, and almost half of the Republican members of both chambers supported that bill. It was the result of a long period of discussion and negotiation after a special committee was set up, a bipartisan committee, to look into the issue, held public hearings in different parts of the state as well as here at the Capitol, extremely well attended, high levels of interest, a tremendous amount of emotion involved in it.

And then the six leaders at the time, then Senate President Don Williams and me, as the Majority Leader at the time, and also then-Speaker Brendan Sharkey, and then-Majority Leader, now Speaker, Representative Joe Aresimowicz, and Senator John McKinney, then the Republican leader here in the Senate, and Representative Larry Cafero, the House Republican leader, spent a great deal of time with staff fashioning that bill. And for those who don't remember, the leading staff member and the point person in all of that was Joel Rudikoff, of our -- of our Senate legal staff. And the result of that bill was seen as a national model. In fact, President Obama came to the -- came to Connecticut.
shortly after that bill passed to celebrate its passage and hoping at the time that it would build momentum for passage of -- of a breakthrough bill in the United States Senate. Unfortunately, that didn't happen and hasn't happened yet. But this bill before us, Madam President, I think it is the direct consequence of someone -- something that was predicted shortly after that time. In fact, Senator McKinney, shortly after passage of that bill, was extremely prescient in something that he said. He said we have here a model bill, but this is a constantly evolving area where we will be impacted by new technology. That was in the infancy of 3D technology. He said in just a few years, we will have to be regulating or perhaps banning possession of an entire category of weapons that does not even yet exist.

And he was, of course, right, and that's why we are here tonight dealing with this category of new weapons in two kinds. That is those that can be assembled, created at home without any serial number, done in the 3D printer, as the one that Senator Haskell cited earlier today that was apparently used in Waterbury and discovered on the suspect this morning, and those that can be -- where parts can be received through the mail and then assembled into a completed gun. The purpose of doing that is just to evade the system. The very practice of doing that is an attempt to evade the law and is generally done with -- with nefarious intent. And that is why now we cannot ignore this new category of weapons that is trying to exist outside of our system of regulation.

We need to update our laws to deal with problems as they arise and are presented to us. This is a new
problem. This is our response. I think it is -- it is a responsible response. Just this last year, we dealt with the issue of bump stocks, as Senator Duff mentioned a moment ago, and I wanna thank him for all of his work on these three bills and his leadership in our caucus on them. The bump stock bill, of course, became dramatically necessary because we saw the carnage that happened in Las Vegas, when the gunman there was able to shoot over 500 people. Over 500 people were either killed or wounded with the rapid-firing guns whose capacity was enhanced by the gun -- by the bump stocks. This is what we are dealing with -- that the law has to struggle to try to keep pace with what's happening in the world. It would be irresponsible of us not to do so, and this is an effort to continue that vigilance that we are required to do, keeping always in mind the tragedy of Newtown as our motivating purpose here in Connecticut.

It's also, I think, significant to point out, as others may have before, is that the gun law we did pass in 2013 has had effect. We have had a significantly lower rate of crimes involving gun violence in the last several years than states whose gun regulations are more lax and more permissive than ours. These laws do matter. These laws do have an effect. We are not gonna just shrug our shoulders and say, well, there's nothing we can do, so why should we legislate. We do this legislation because it does make a difference.

There are facts, there are statistics that show that what we do does make it more difficult for guns to come into the wrong hands, not that we're ever gonna prevent them altogether. Criminals, as we know, are often creative, but it is our responsibility to do
the best we can all the time to make sure that we try to keep pace with every new outrage as we hear about it. And to do otherwise would be defeatist, and would be irresponsible, and I think in violation of our oath to protect the public. So I urge passage of this bill this evening. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly announce the roll call vote, and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7219. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7219. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate on House Bill 7219.

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on 7219. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7219. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? We will -- the machine will be closed, and Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly announce the tally, sir.
Clerk: 

House Bill 7219.

Total number voting 35
Total number voting Yea 28
Total voting Nay 7
Absent and not voting 1

Chair: 


Senator Duff (25th): 

Thank you. Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, we're going to -- oh, actually, I'd like to yield to Senator Sampson, please.

Chair: 

Senator Sampson, do you accept the yield?

Senator Sampson (16th): 

Yes, Madam President, and thank you very, very much to the Majority Leader. I rise for the point of a personal privilege.

Chair: 

Please proceed. I see we have some distinguished guests with us.

Senator Sampson (16th):
Yes, we do. Tonight we are going in the chamber with my dear friend, Lauren DiVirgilio. She is Miss Pre-Teen Central Connecticut 2019. She's from my hometown of Southington, and she is joined by her mother, Kim, and we're delighted to have them today. She does a lot for veterans in her efforts, and we wish her a lotta luck in the future. And I would encourage my colleagues to give them a nice round of applause and welcome. [Applause] Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Ladies, it's very nice to have you here. [Gavel] If we could have some quiet please. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, we're gonna recess till 7:35, and we're gonna -- we're gonna -- yes --

THE CHAIR:

And before we do recess, I just would like to take a point of personal privilege to welcome a former legislator and a very distinguished judge. Judge Abrams, your ears were burning. We were just speaking about you in the chamber, when your wife was not here -- I will say for the record -- and you remind us that all of us are supported by our family members, who are very loving and patient, especially in these last days of session. So welcome back to the campus. Thanks for visiting us. [Applause] And Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. It's also good to see Judge Abrams, a great guy -- a great representative who was very patient with a young legislator, and I'll certainly never forget that. Madam President, we're gonna recess till 7:35, and we'll -- the Senate Democrats will meet immediately for caucus. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. [Gavel]

On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 7:16 p.m. recessed.

The Senate reconvened at 9:00 p.m., the President in the Chair.

CLERK:

The Senate will convene in 5 minutes. The Senate will convene in 5 minutes.

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

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Duff. Here we are.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good evening, Madam President -- exactly at 7:35 as I predicted in some other time zone. [Laughing]
Madam President, for our go list, on Calendar page 3, Calendar 65, Senate Bill 853, go. On Calendar page 22, Calendar 303, Senate Bill 1069, go. On Calendar page 6, Calendar 97, Senate Bill 817, go. On Calendar page 11, Calendar 170, Senate Bill 909, go. On Calendar page 24, Calendar 330, Senate Bill 643, go. On Calendar page 25, Calendar 338, Senate Bill 1091, go. On Calendar page 65, Calendar 392, Senate Bill 1083, go. On Calendar page 5, Calendar 90, Senate Bill 929, go. On Calendar page 60, Calendar 127, Senate Bill 47, go. On Calendar page 38, Calendar 445, Senate Bill 1098, go. On Calendar page 21, Calendar 287, Senate Bill 647, go.

And, Madam President, for the purposes of referral, Calendar page 3, Calendar 50, Senate Bill 752. We'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered and so noted.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, play ball.

CLERK:

Page 3, Calendar No. 65, substitute for the Senate Bill 853, AN ACT CONCERNING THE AVAILABILITY OF THE
REAL ESTATE LICENSING CURRICULUM FOR USE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Well, how're you doing, 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 MCCRORY (2ND):

Absolutely. Madam President, my esteemed colleague, Senator Berthel, is an expert in this piece of legislation, so I'm going to defer all my institutional values over to that young man and allow him to speak on this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel, do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good evening, Madam President. Yes, I accept the yield, and thank you, Senator McCrory, for those kind words. Madam President, the bill has been properly moved?

THE CHAIR:
Yes.
SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Okay, so --

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you. This bill essentially requires -- very simple, requires the State Department of Education within available appropriations and using available resource materials to make curriculum materials available to local and regional boards of education about the principles and practices of real estate and to encourage them to provide instruction in this area. Boards may use the materials to develop an instructional program for the public schools under their jurisdiction. So, essentially, this was a request that came through the realtors to try to encourage and entice young people who are in our high schools at the junior and senior level to consider taking the necessary course of study for the Principles and Practices Exam, which is required in order to get a license to practice real estate in Connecticut, and again to offer that curriculum in our high schools so that when a high school student comes out at the age of 18, they can sit for the exam and then become a realtor and hopefully start their career in real estate. So that is essentially the purpose of the bill, and I encourage adoption.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Berthel. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Will you remark further on the bill that is before us?

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection, I would request that we place this on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Senator -- okay, Senator Flexer would like to have a roll call vote, so with that, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the roll on that item please.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 853. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 853. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 853. Immediate Roll Call vote.

THE CHAIR:
Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted. The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, if you would please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 853.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Page 22, Calendar No. 303, substitute for Senate Bill Number 1069, AN ACT CONCERNING VARIOUS REVISIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE EDUCATION STATUTE. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you again, 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 MCCRORY (2ND):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO No. 9373. I would ask that the Clerk please call the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. [Background talking] Senator, could you repeat the LCO number please?

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

I believe the LCO number is 9373.

THE CHAIR:

No. Senator Berthel, what's the number? [Background talking]

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry -- 9170.

THE CHAIR:

There we are. Excellent.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9170, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory, please proceed to summarize.
SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this amendment has three new sections that will go along with the -- the underlying bill. It requires the boards of education to post their grade-level curriculum online by August 1. It also will require the School Governance Council to be extending its term from two term to four terms. And lastly, it requires -- it changes the law requiring student expulsion, so that in order to expel a student the student conduct must violate board policy and be a serious disturbance or a danger to others. Under current law, students must either violate policy or be seriously disrupting education. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Will you remark further? Senator Bethel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good afternoon -- good afternoon -- good evening, Madam President. Through you, just a couple of -- a few quick questions to the proponent.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you to the esteemed Chair. The Section 8, with respect to the change in terms from two to four years, can you just
explain why that's an importance piece of this -- this amendment? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENIOR MCCRARY (2ND):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, a few years -- about six years ago, we came up with the concept of a School Governance Council to help our communities, our teachers, and our parents and guardians to be more involved in the school, the way the school was being governed, and what we found is a number -- a number of people on that School Governance Council had an excellent time getting a lot of great work within two years on the council. Unfortunately, after their two years, they would have to be removed from the council. So, what we're trying to do with this piece of legislation is extend that term so that parent could serve on that School Governance Council for two more years, which will extend the term for four years. Through you, Madam President.

SENIOR MCCRARY (2ND):

Thank you, sir. Senator Berthel.

SENIOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the senator for the explanation. My next question is with respect to Section 9 of the amendment, and I -- I understand the use of applying both standards with respect to a violation of board policy and seriously disruptive
or endangering behaviors. I'm just wondering, again, if the good senator might explain why this change would enhance the legislative intent of the bill. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, yes, so clearly currently in our statute right now, in order for a student to be expelled from school, they will have to currently either violate or school policy, or the action has to be seriously disruptive and endanger others. What we're tryin' to do in this piece of legislation is try our best to keep kids in our schools instead of expelling them. So, their level of expectation raises a little bit [background coughing], so therefore the action has to be -- do both. They have to be a school -- I mean, violating school code and cause a disturbance. Currently, right now, you can actually violate school policy, and just because you violate school policy, you can actually be expelled from school. As we move forward, we would like for you to have to do two things. You have to violate school policy and also be very disruptive to a learning environment. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):
Thank you, Madam President. Again, I thank the senator for the answers. Through you, Madam President, with respect to Section 10, which basically requires boards of education to post their grade-level curriculum online by August 1 annually, through you, Madam President, is there a requirement today to post curriculum at some other point in time or at all? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Currently, no, school systems do not have to post a grade-level curriculum online, but this is a great opportunity for school systems to share best practices. If we know one school district has a curriculum that's being very effective in their community and another one is thinking about doing something of that magnitude, if another school district had this already posted online, they could look at that curriculum and make variations for the curriculum that they want to do in their particular district. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. And one final question, going backwards on the sections, in Section 6 of the amendment, beginning at section -- sorry lines 364
through 374 inclusive -- there is reference to a study that will take place beginning no later than January 1, 2020. And I'd just like to get some clarification regarding the study that this is not a goal to regionalize or do anything to force any schools in -- any of our public schools in Connecticut -- to be forced to regionalize. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Absolutely not. This is just for a school district to look at opportunities to work collaboratively to save on resources and opportunities for them to work together to bring down cost of education in those particular communities. Through you, Madam Speaker.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. I again thank the senator for his -- his explanations of and clarification of those sections. You know, the Education Committee worked very -- very well together this year and collaboratively on many of the bills that -- that we put together, this one included. And I think that these changes that are highlighted in this bill are -- are good for not only protecting our students and those adults that
will work with them but also to clarifying some of the processes and policies that we apply to how we are handling things that are going on in our school systems. So, again, I am proud to serve on the Education Committee, and I encourage full support of the amendment. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you again, Senator McCrory.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Berthel. Will you remark further on the legislation? Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam -- thank you, Madam President. I wanna thank the Chairman for his good work on this, and I appreciate the work on the collaborative agreement because I think that's important for a lot of our small towns. So, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Will you remark further on the bill that is before -- amendment? We are on the amendment that was brought forward by Senator McCrory. 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. ["Aye" in background] Opposed? The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRARY (2ND):

Yes, Madam President. Madam President, I just wanna give you a little more update on the bill. This
bill does a couple other things. It creates a separate criminal history check for our Teacher Preparation Programs, fulfilling students' requirement for schools, and it also establishes a separate criminal history check for other -- all other individuals performing services in schools. And lastly, another one of the items that this bill actually does, it requires a State Department of Education to update its comprehensive school health education component of the healthy and balanced living curriculum frameworks for January 1, 2020, to include sexual harassment and assault in adolescent relationship abuse and intimate partner violence. With that said, Madam President, again, I ask my colleagues to support this measure.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not -- Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Madam President, if there's no concerns, I ask that this bill be put on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, the item will be moved to our Consent Calendar. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 6, Calendar No. 97, Senate Bill Number 817, AN ACT CONCERNING HIGHER EDUCATION. There is an amendment.
Good evening, Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Good evening, 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 HASKELL (26TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment number 875 -- LCO No. 8752. Will the Clerk please call the amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8752, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell, would you like to summarize?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):
Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the amendment and move to waive the reading. I would seek leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please -- please proceed with the summary.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much. Madam President, this bill adds two additional Student Advisory Committee members to the Board of Regents of Higher Education in addition to adding two student representatives to the Board of Trustees at UConn. I will note, Madam President, that this bill has passed, I believe unanimously, in previous sessions. I wanna thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this bill as well as the many students who came to the legislature to discuss the importance of having a student voice on these important committees.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Will you remark further on the legislation? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, on the amendment, some questions on the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell, prepare yourself.
SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. I believe this is a strike-all amendment to the underlying bill. Could the proponent share why this amendment was subjected to the current bill -- Senate Bill 817? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the good senator from Fairfield for his question. The underlying bill is rather vague in nature, and we believed it would be an appropriate vehicle to combine two student representation bills that are elsewhere in the building at this moment into one more consolidated more efficient approach to increase student on both the Board of Trustees at UConn and the Connecticut Board of Regents. And, Madam President, if I may add, there's a basic democratic principle at play here, and that's that those who are most impacted by public policy should have a say in shaping that public policy. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President. I remember Senate Bill 817 and the testimonies that ensued in the
public hearing, and I remember the terrific feedback that was provided by many faculty members that voiced very strong support for the underlying bill as it relates to the study of the higher education system, particularly the Board of Regents. Many professors came out and spoke about the importance of conducting such a study to evaluate and perhaps enhance the educational systems following the transition to the Board of Regents, and I just found it very interesting that when we talk about democracy, the input of those valued faculty members that were so articulate and passionate in espousing the underlying bill that we would strip it in a way with this strike-all and replace it with a totally different bill that was not the intention of it. Through you, Madam President, I'd like get the rationale of that.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang. Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. And I thank my -- my colleague for his questions. Given the fact that this is now a bill about student representation, it's also important to note the many student representatives who came out and testified about the two underlying bills that -- that have been combined into one, namely HB 7119. There was testimony from the Graduate Student Senate that I found particularly compelling. They said, there is an abundance of qualified undergraduate and graduate students who are deeply invested in the well-being of the university as a whole and are interested in assuming a leadership role in steering the direction
of the University of Connecticut. Many have had full careers before returning to academia, while others are pursuing degrees while working in the public and private sectors. Their backgrounds could provide valuable experience to the Board of Trustees on multiple issues, problems, and challenges. I only bring up this testimony to say, Madam President, that there was a tremendous amount of input from students and faculty alike on the bills that have inspired the one we're debating here tonight -- the amendment we're debating here tonight. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, could I ask the proponent, in citing the testimony that was offered here just recently, was it related to Senate Bill 817 or was it totally related to a different bill? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank my colleague for his question. It was related to, as I said, HB 7119, which at the time was a different bill. What we seek to do here tonight is be a little bit more efficient in our legislating, given that the clock is ticking, in combining two House Bills, one having
to do with student representation on the Board of Regents and one having to do with student representation on the Board of Trustees, into a single bill, which is why, of course, I would wanna bring up the many voices who testified in support of those two House Bills.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President. I will not belabor the point, but as the good senator articulated earlier, it is the democratic process. It is important to have viewpoints represented. I feel badly for the faculty members that spoke so eloquently about Senate Bill 817 to conduct this study, to talk about the Board of Regents system, and this strike-all would eliminate that input. It would not offer any other vehicle for them to be able to articulate the points that they were so effective in persuading me. That being said, I will move on.

As to the underlying bill, as the good proponent cited earlier, the fact that this bill was passed overwhelmingly in the past, could the proponent cite when it was passed through in both chambers of the House? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I thank my colleague for his question. My understanding is this bill passed on a near-unanimous vote in the Senate in 2015. I can't speak to the action in the House, but I will notice -- I will note that one of the reasons for this bill is that 40 percent of UConn's revenue comes from tuition and fees. That's compared to just 25 percent in state block grants and additional payments and 26 percent in research funding and revenue from various university enterprises. In other words, students are contributing every day, whether they're paying tuition or whether they are paying the many fees that come with student life. And I think with that payment should come a say in things like sexual harassment and assault policy on campus and things like tuition increases.

And, by the way, Madam President, in 1975, the first student representatives were added to the board. At that point in time, the total undergraduate enrollment at UConn was 15,674 people, but today, Madam President, in 2009, enrollment has risen by 52.97 percent -- in fact, it's risen to 23,978 students. So why, even though the number of students at the university has increased dramatically, why hasn't the number of representatives and voices for those students within the board of trustees. That's the question that I think we have to answer here tonight.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I wanna compliment the good senator's remembrance of all of this data points, it's quite impressive. But that being said, could the good senator share how these representations with the additional student trustees be? Because current structure, as I understand it, is the elected presidents of each of the relative student bodies from the undergrad and the graduate students would be the student trustee representative. Where would the two additional student trustees be found, and what are the criteria for that selection? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and at this point in the debate, I'd be remiss not to note the hard work of my colleague, Senator Flexer, who actually is a graduate of UConn and was, I believe, involved in student government there. He's been advocating for this bill for many years. My understanding is that the UConn students elect, through their student government body, representatives to the Board of Trustees. So adding two additional seats to that table would not involve any change of procedure.

With regard to the Board of Regents, the two additional Student Advisory Committee members to the Board of Regents would be -- I'm just seeking the information here -- so, Madam President, the bill brings the total student members from four -- from two to four, bringing total membership on the Board of Regents to 23. Now the Student Advisory
Committee consists of one member from each CSUS institution, one member from each regional CTC and one member from the Charter Oak State College, who each serve a two-year term. Committee members are elected by the student government organization of the higher education institution they will represent. Members must be full-time or part-time undergraduate or graduate students in good standing at the institution that elected them. In other words, this Student Advisory Committee would select the four voices who would join the conversation within the Board of Regents over the very important policies that impact students every day.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President. I just wanted to get a point of clarification. I think the proponent spoke a little quick for me to understand. So, again, the first original two -- one would come from UConn, the other one would come from the graduate -- undergraduate, the other would come from the undergraduate. I believe the third cited was Charter Oak, which would be the new addition, and what would be the fourth? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):
Sorry, Madam President. To clarify, within the Board of Trustees at UConn, the procedure would remain the same, which is that the students would elect through a democratic process four instead of two members to join the Board of Trustees. When it comes to the Connecticut Board of Regents for higher education, those four voices would be selected by the -- and elected by the Student Advisory Committee. And I can -- I can go back and explain how the Board of Regents Student Advisory Committee members are selected, but it is representative, as can be seen in the OR -- OLR bill analysis for HB 5829, which was the related House Bill. The representatives come from a variety of campuses, including one member from Charter Oak State College, one member from each regional CTC, and one member from each CSUS institution.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Again, thank you. I wanna thank the proponent for the clarification. I appreciate that. Through you, Madam President. Even though we are raising this strike-all, the good senator cited House Bills that related to the student trustee editions. Could the good senator give me some perspective on testimony that was provided by UConn and the Board of Regents as it relates to the Board of trustees -- through you, Madam President -- because it is not cited related to this bill? So, for legislative intent, I just wanted to be able to ensure that even though those House Bills being discussed in the Senate, we raise the concern in testimony and feedback that was
going to be shared with this circle because those individual bodies have significant impact on this, and their testimony is important. So, through you, I'd like to ask the proponent of this amendment to share their feedback on the House Bill that we're trying to merge into here.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes. Thank you very much, Madam President, and I am appreciative of the good senator's question. I have before me testimony from Damon Reynolds [phonetic], an undergraduate student government external affairs chair. He's a senator at the University of Connecticut, and he provided testimony about HB 7119, which was the related House Bill concerning Board of Trustees and the number of student representatives on that board. He writes in the final paragraph of his testimony, "In closing, the representatives of the undergraduate student government understand the university's objections" - - and I'll get to those objections in a moment -- "that increased representation would be unprecedented and would grow a board that already has 21 members; however, it is important to recognize the financial decisions, university planning, and resource allocation that affects 24,000 undergraduates in stores and branch campuses across the state require proper accountability and debate from those very students. Setting the tone for this debate and the framework for further accountability will benefit UConn students and state residents for years to come. With those -- with
these arguments in mind, I urge your support of HB 7119 and thank you for your time."

With regard to another portion of the good senator from Fairfield's question, which is how has the Board of Regents and UConn's administration reacted to this, I will concede that the board has -- that UConn has made arguments that students aren't prepared, that they don't have enough time on their plate as undergraduate students to join the board. To that I would respond that this is not a conscription into service on the Board of Trustees. No student will be required to sign up, and many students, if you visit any one of our campuses across Connecticut, take on other responsibilities. I know, Madam President, that I worked two jobs in college. A lot of students pursue extracurricular activities. Students do things other than just go to class when they're in college, and one of those is get involved in their community, get involved in their local university, and in doing so, they wanna have a say in those important policies.

So, I reject the notion that students don't have time and aren't interested because, as the underlying testimony makes quite clear, the students are interested. They do have a say. They're already involved in student government, and they wanna amplify their voices. They have their ear to the ground, so, Madam President, they oughta have a seat at the table.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate the eloquence of the testimony that was provided by the students. It's another reflection of the wonderful quality of education that we provide at UConn, and so I also wanna thank the senator for sharing such an eloquent testimony. It's interesting because unfortunately I do not have the luxury of having obtained the feedback and testimony from the Board of Regents as well as UConn in raising the concern about this because unfortunately it's not available. And as I ask the question, the good Chair of Higher Education did offer there were concerns raised, but there were no testimony being read from. So, my frustration in this is it is a viewpoint that is important in this dialogue, and as I gather from history in this building. I remember the testimony and the debate on this bill, and indeed this legislative body as well as the House were near unanimous in passing out statute -- Public Act 15-2 and 15-78, which allow the increase of student trustee membership in UConn and the Board of Regents. It was a bill that went through the normal process without a strike-all amendment to obliterate faculty input on the original Senate Bill 817, but unfortunately -- unfortunately, the bill was vetoed by then Governor Malloy, and his justification was that it is the purview -- at least as I understood it -- it is the purview of academic institutions to allow their Board of Trustees to the governance of the university.

The student contribution is absolutely critical, and that's why the original body intent was to have elected officials from the student body government, from the undergraduate and graduate programs, because they would offer a student perspective. But ultimately, as I even remember in our public
testimony on the House Bill related to the student trustee discussion, the debate went to the fact that, indeed, the students have a critical role in the governance and feedback on how the school is run, but ultimately it is the governance of our universities that should be left to the greater number of the Board of Trustees.

Again, we can go through this exercise again. We can go through the dual exercise in the House. But unless something has dramatically changed, unless our Board of Regents as well as the UConn trustees and the administration have changed their ideas in opposition to this, I believe we are taking up valuable time rather than being in a dialogue where all the parties could reach a mutual agreement. So, through you, I rise in my concern in opposition to this, one for its process, but number two also for the objective or trying to get good work done that may be value added. Unfortunately, I think because of the precedent of the veto and the objections of the bodies that are impacted by this, this may be a lot of work going up against nothing. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator Haskell to be followed by Senator Anwar.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President, and I thank my colleague and the Ranking Member of the Higher Education and Employment Advancement Committee for his -- for his comments. I'll note that we have a new governor, and hope springs eternal, Madam
President. I will say that between 2015, when that bill was vetoed, and 2020, UConn's tuition has increased by 31 percent. I'm not sure that would've happened if students had had a greater say in important decisions around college affordability and other matters with additional seats on the Board of Trustees and the Board of Regents. I'll also note that I have tremendous respect for the folks who represent our institutions here in the building, and having heard from them in the hallways, having heard from them in this chamber when they -- when they came to let me know their thoughts on the bill. I'm unsympathetic to their notion that these students are too young to process complicated budgets, but I have the utmost respect for their diligence in advocating for the best interest of their institutions on this university. And finally, Madam President, I do want to thank the Co-Chair of the Higher Education Committee, Representative Greg Haddad, who's been a tireless advocate for students, especially on the college affordability issue, but really every impact of -- every element of a student's life on campus, Representative Haddad has been working diligently to make sure that they have a say in the decision-making process as well as Senator Flexer, who has been fighting for this bill for many, many years. Thank you, Madam President, and then I would yield to Senator Flexer or Senator Anwar.

THE CHAIR:

We'll go to Senator Anwar, and then he'll be followed by Senator Flexer. Senator Anwar, good evening.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):
Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the amendment. I just wanna say a few things. I heard the interesting conversation between the Chairs, and on one hand we have a group of individuals who are appointed. On the other hand, we have a group of students who are going to be elected. And the fact that they are going to go through an election process is being looked at as a threat to democracy, and that's very difficult for me to understand because appointed individuals versus elected students -- how come the elected students are being considered as a threat to democratic process? And I think it's also recognition of the fact that we need to have all the stakeholders around the table. And in the absence of the balance of the stakeholders, we can make decisions which are not going to be fair towards one party, and we have seen that, and based on that data alone it is important for us as a Senate to stand united to support this amendment and subsequently the bill. Because if we don't have the students, who are the number one stakeholder in this effort, we are not doing our job as well as we should.

And I want to commend and thank the leadership of Senator Haskell for bringing this forward, and Senator Flexer, your work, because this is going to show positive results, and I'm hoping that as a society, as a culture, we'll be moving in this direction for other institutions to follow with having all the stakeholders at the table. So, with that, Madam President, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Senator Flexer, will you remark?
SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you. Yes, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in strong support of the amendment that is before us, and I would first like to thank the great leadership of my colleague, Senator Haskell, for his work on this bill. And I think his service here in the State Senate this year clearly demonstrates why it is so important in any body to have the voices of young people heard loud and clear. So, thank you, Senator Haskell.

The amendment that is before us is a critical issue. I am very privileged in the 29th State Senate District to represent every institution of public higher education in our state -- students at Quinnipiac Valley Community College, students at Eastern Connecticut State University, and students at the main campus of the University of Connecticut. And for many years now, the students at those institutions and all of our institutions of public higher education across the state have been asking for an increased voice in the bodies that govern their institutions. They are asking for that, as Senator Haskell detailed so well, because their tuition is continuing to grow, and that is because this General Assembly continues to level fund or decrease the amount of money we give to those institutions, so more and more of the operating budget from those institutions comes out of the dollars of tuition payments that students and their families make each and every year. For that reason alone, it is critical that we have more student voices on these boards that set the rates of tuition for these institutions.
As Senator Haskell also detailed, these bodies determine the policies for governing these institutions in a wide variety of areas. Student voices and the voices of young people are creating great societal change on college campuses and in so many other aspects of our society. It is more important than ever that we amplify their voices and make sure that their voices are heard and that they have a role in the decision-making process when adopting these policies. Four years ago, I was so pleased that this General Assembly, this State Senate, voted unanimously to increase the membership of students on the Board of Trustees at the University of Connecticut, and that the House of Representatives, every member of that body except for one voted in support of this legislation. And I'm hopeful we can have a similar outcome here this evening because, if anything, in the time that has passed since that piece of legislation was vetoed, it's become more critical that student voices be heard in governing our public systems of higher education.

We've only seen tuition go up at those institutions, and we've only seen -- frankly, it's my job to listen to those students, and sometimes they express to me concerns that the boards that govern these two incredible institutions, who provide great quality higher education for so many in our state, but sometimes the students just feel like sometimes the board's a little out of touch. And having this increased student membership, having louder student voices on these boards will alleviate that concern, and I don't think that that concern is misplaced.

Now we have great people who serve on both of these boards who are dedicated to public higher education
in our state, and I don't wanna diminish the work 
that they do, but some of them also confide to me in 
their service that it would probably be better when 
they're talking about some of these issues if 
students were sitting at the table next to them and 
having their input heard in real time when these 
decisions are being made.

So, Madam President, I am so pleased that we are 
debating this here this evening. I wanna thank 
again Senator Haskell for his leadership on this, 
and I wanna thank my partner in representing the 
people of Mansfield and the students at the 
University of Connecticut, the House Chair of the 
Higher Education Committee, Representative Greg 
Haddad, who has been a tremendous advocate for not 
just this legislation but students as a whole all 
across our state. And I'm hopeful that thanks to 
their leadership and the support of members here in 
this circle this evening, we'll be able to increase 
the voices of students and give them the 
representation that they truly deserve. Thank you, 
Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further 
on the amendment that is before us? Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I stand to support this 
amendment. I think it makes a lot of common sense 
that we have the consumers who will be most affected 
by this legislation be a part of the decision-making 
processes that happen at these meetings, that they 
can offer input and insight so that the people who
are making the decisions have a greater understanding of what their decisions will do to the student body, and I welcome their voices. These are young adults who will be entering leadership positions in a very short period of time, and this is just one more step in that direction. And I think that without them, the board would not be able to do a good job. So, I actually commend your restraint in only offering two more positions on the board. I would look for it to be more like 50/50 if I had my choice. So, thank you very much, Senator Haskell, for putting this legislation forward. Thank you, Senator Flexer, for working on this, and I ask my colleagues to support it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Madam President, if my colleagues have no further comments, I would ask for a roll call on this vote - - on this bill -- on this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

On the amendment?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes.
So, a roll call will be ordered on the amendment. Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the vote.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 817, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8752. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 817, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8752. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 817, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8752. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8752.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, if you could please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 817, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 8752.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Yea</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Nay</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:
[Gavel] The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? [Background talking] If not, the -- a roll call vote will be ordered, and Mr. Clerk, would you please call it.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 817 as amended by Senate A. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 817 as amended by Senate A. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, if you would please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 817 as amended by Senate A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:
Page 11, Calendar No. 170, Senate Bill Number 909, AN ACT ENABLING PERSONS TO SATISFY THE EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO REAL ESTATE BROKERS AND SALESPERSONS THROUGH AN ONLINE COURSE OF STUDY.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser, good evening.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Good evening, 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 LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, currently the Department of Consumer Protection requires that persons applying to become realtors take a classroom class prior to doing so and then also receive their continuing education requirements in a classroom. This bill strikes that requirement and allows online education as one option for receiving either the initial licensure or on continuing education licensure of a realtor. I urge members to support it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further on the legislation that's before us. Senator Kelly, good evening.
SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Good evening, Madam President, and thank you very much. I also stand in support of this bill. It's an initiative that has come a couple of times before the Real Estate and Insurance Committee, and it's a, I think, a smart idea, which will enable people to participate in this profession and yet still maintain the requirements and the necessary continuing education requirements of the profession. So, I would urge adoption. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I also rise in favor of the bill before us. I wanna just take a moment to thank the members of the Insurance Committee, the Chairman and Ranking Member here with us today for their efforts in shepherding this bill through the committee unanimously and bringing it before us tonight to pass the Senate. It's an initiative that I began a couple of years ago and initially met with some resistance from the Connecticut Association of Realtors, but we spoke off-line over the next several months, and they -- they came back and decided that this is a tremendous opportunity to help people transition from another career into real estate, to give people that wouldn't ordinarily have the opportunity through an online course through distance learning to make their dream of being involved in real estate a reality. It's a fabulous
bill. I'm excited to see it pass this chamber. Let's hope it gets through the House and becomes law. I urge everyone to vote in favor. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I have a few questions for the proponent of the bill.

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, could the good Chair of the Insurance and Real Estate Committee detail the change to the requirements that are outlined in this bill?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Through you, Madam President. Madam President, the bill removes the requirement that 60 classroom hours be done, and it allows that those hours also be done online. It -- there's also a
section in the existing statute that allows for legal compliance of 15 classroom hours and allows those to be done online. There's also four courses approved by the commissioner in real estate brokerage principles. It allows 15 classroom hours. It now allows those to be done online. There's a provision allowing two elective courses, each consisting of 15 classroom hours. It allows those to be done online. Then, subsequently, it, for continuing education requirements, it also makes a similar change. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, through you, these requirements are both for continuing education and the initial requirements that are necessary for real estate brokers?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, through you, so just to be crystal clear, we are changing what is now an in-person training requirement where someone would need to learn the requirements for being a real estate broker in person in a classroom setting and instead changing those requirements so that all of that education could take place only online. Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, that is correct. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, through you, is there anything in the bill that demonstrates how one would know that the 60 hours, the 15 hours, the various requirements that are outlined in the bill -- how would we know that that online component was thoroughly completed, and how can we have confidence the way that we do right now when that training is completed in person?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.
SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. I would refer the good senator to the language in Section 3d, which I believe references the Department of Consumer Protection and says that the Department of Consumer Protection shall, in consultation with the commission, adopt regulations in accordance with Chapter 54, concerning the approval of schools, institutions, or organizations that would provide such instruction. My assumption is that the regulations would contemplate fulfilling oversight over the schools, ensuring that the students do complete the required course of study. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, through you, did the Department of Consumer Protection provide feedback to the committee on this proposal, and if so, what did it say?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. No, we actually did not receive any testimony from the Department of Consumer Protection.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, and does the bill outline the regulatory or the regs review -- excuse me -- regulation process that the Department of Consumer Protection would have to develop? Does the bill give a timeline for that? Do we know when these regulations will be developed and when this transfer from a in-person training requirement to a strictly online training requirement will happen?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. The bill takes effect July 1, and then it also references that the effective date for this specific process about new brokers would be July 1 of this year. There's nothing in the bill that I see that gives a deadline to the department for the newly -- for any new regulations that might have to be adopted for online courses of study. I assume that they would have to apply to the department for approval. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, through you, do the changes in the educational requirements outlined in this legislation -- if the good senator wouldn't mind giving his opinion as to whether or not there might be any cause for concern that this training would not be up to the standards that we hold these people to now?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

That's a -- that's a good question. I don't -- I'm not a realtor, and I don't profess to know the ins-and-outs of the business. You know, the Insurance and Real Estate Committee did hold a public hearing. We didn't hear any concerns. I understand any time you're removing a classroom requirement, there are -- there are concerns that could be there, and I -- so I understand the senator's concerns. I don't think we heard any specific consumer protections that were raised in the Insurance and Real Estate Committee, and that's why the bill received support in equity. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, through you, is the purchase of a home where one
would work with a realtor often one of the biggest financial transactions that a person could make in their lifetime? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President, I believe so.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I have no further questions for the good Chairman, and I appreciate his responses this evening. I would just say that I think we should proceed cautiously with this proposal given that the purchase of a home is often the biggest financial transaction that many Connecticut residents will make in their lifetime. We need to be confident that the people who are ushering us through that process and those transactions have the best training and are adhering to the highest standards, so that when critical decisions in that process are being made, you know that the person knows the law and can best represent you in that transaction. And for that reason, Madam President, this legislation gives me grave concern and I will be opposing it. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Will you remark further? If not -- if not, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call the roll call vote, and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 909. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 909. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, if you could please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 909.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting yea</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Page 24, Calendar No. 330, Senate Bill Number 643, AN ACT CONCERNING THE REPORTING OF ELECTION RESULTS.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good evening, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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 FLEXER (29TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the bill before us makes a change to our election statute concerning the tabulator tapes that moderators must produce at the end of an election day. Those are the tapes that many of us in this circle are familiar with and look at anxiously at the end of the evening on election night. This bill will require that additional copies of those tabulator tapes be made available. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Thank you.
Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I have nothing to add. The good Chairlady of the GAE Committee did a great job describing the bill before us. This is an excellent bill. I think it's much needed. It's a way to keep track of that -- the all important tabulator tape that comes at the end of election night and save that for posterity so that we know exactly what happened, and I urge everyone to vote for it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the legislation? Will you remark further? Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if there's no objection, I move that we place this bill on our Consent Calendar. Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 25, Calendar No. 338, Senate Bill Number 1091, AN ACT DESIGNATING VARIOUS DAYS AND WEEKS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer.
SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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 FLEXER (29TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the bill before us is our annual days, weeks, and months bill. It designates certain days to recognize important moments in our history, important organizations, and important causes. These proposals came to us from a variety of stakeholders throughout our state. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO No. 9598. I ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and that I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9598. LCO -- Schedule Senate A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the amendment before us strikes one section of the bill, which will eliminate the cost to the underlying bill, and it also adds two new years and days to the -- two new days to be recognized. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. The question is on adoption of the amendment. Will you -- 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 before the chamber, please signify by saying aye. ["Aye" in background] Opposed? The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if there's no objection, I move that we place this bill on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 65, Calendar No. 392, Senate Bill Number 1083, AN ACT IMPROVING THE INTEGRITY OF THE CONNECTICUT BUSINESS REGISTRY.

THE CHAIR:
Good evening, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good evening, 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 WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This is a bill that comes to us through the Judiciary Committee. It is a bill that establishes new filing deadlines for corporations when they must file their annual reports. Those corporations that are formed prior to January 1, 2020, would be having to file their annual domestic reports within two years of their initial certification filing. And after that point, they would have to file within 90 days. It expands the information that would be provided by certain businesses. It allows the secretary to send default notices by regular mail versus certified or registered mail. In sections of statutes where it refers to "his" and it's talking about the secretary, it makes a change where we move from "his" to "the secretary." It requires the secretary to establish a trade name registry. It increases from $25 dollars to $50 dollars the fee that an office would pay to the Secretary of State when they serve process, and it's a good bill and it should -- I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel, good evening.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Thank you. I'd like to be associated with the remarks of Senator Winfield. Probably one of the most important parts of this bill for the Secretary of State's Office is the change from certified mail to regular mail. That will help speed up the process A, and B it will save tens of thousands of dollars from these essentially defunct business entities. And again, I would urge my colleagues' support. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the bill before us? Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no further comment or objection, I'd ask that it be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 5, Calendar 90, substitute for Senate Bill Number 929, AN ACT CONCERNING THE INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL MANDATED REPORTERS, THE DURATION OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT INVESTIGATIONS, AND THE REPEAL OF
CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I'd be happy to yield to Senator Winfield at any time though. [Laughing] I think he's okay though. 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 SLAP (5TH):

Yes. There is an amendment. So, if I could have the Clerk call LCO No. 9364 that would be wonderful.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9364, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to summarize, Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Yeah, a few different sections I just wanna highlight, one is -- and this is, I should say, from the Children's Committee and it passed unanimously out of the Kids' Committee, the underlying bill, and the amendment does one very simple but important thing, and I'll get to that in just a moment. But, as far as Section 1, we're adding really folks who are providers for DCF services, we're making them mandatory reporters. So, all vendors for DCF who have regular contact with children and employees of the juvenile justice programs to the list of mandated reporters. So, that's one thing that the bill is doing. It's also repealing just a couple obsolete reporting requirements. That's in another section of the bill. And -- and then as far as the amendment goes, it is really making this eligible for as much as $25 million dollars in federal funding by requiring background checks for folks at DCF licensed facilities. So it's going to, I would say, improve certainly security and oversight at the facilities and also, again, make this eligible for as much as $25 million dollars in federal funds, and there is a very positive fiscal note to go along with this. So, with that, I do urge my colleagues to support the bill and the amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Slap. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the chamber? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):
Thank you, Madam President. I also rise in support of the amendment, particularly the positive fiscal note is always a good thing to see, and I do commend Senator Slap for looking at ways to leverage federal dollars in this regard. It's -- it's a process where we're going to look at vendors and subcontractors, both registries in state and out-of-state, depending upon when the person moved to the state and whether or not they had residency outside of the state. I think this was a -- a smart choice for DCF and a prudent approach and would urge the circle's adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just a quick question. In recent history, we've seen great difficulty in trying to get background checks done, particularly through State Police Department and so on because of the backlog. Is there a defined process for the background checks?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

I have not -- I have not learned of a new process, but I know that DCF is confident that they can expedite those background checks in order to secure that funding.
Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Through you, Madam President, I would assume that a person probably can begin their employment without the finalized background check, as they do in other aspects of DCF.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

I'm sorry, Senator, could you repeat the question?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Let me put it in a statement. You can start work today, request to go in and try to get your fingerprints, get your background check done, and five months later get it back, and if it's bad news there a problem. You've been there for five months, you're a great employee, but what do we do? I've seen that happen, specifically happen in daycare, so that scares me. The mandated reporter, I think is a great idea, but I am concerned -- I'm concerned for many of the businesses that are hands on that require people to have personal care options, obligations, and so on, starting with infant
children up through seniors, and we require background checks routinely, but we don't do background checks routinely. And in some of these areas, we don't even allow anyone but the State Police to do that. They are overwhelmed by it, and so unless something dramatically has changed, I just see the problem continuing and I hope something's done about it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Yeah, I would just add that it's not the FBI background checks, but I do appreciate my good colleague's concerns and his comments.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Slap. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? 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. ["Aye" in background] Opposed? The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would ask the Clerk to call LCO 8446 please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, we've had issues before regarding DCF, and I will say that I think this commissioner currently has already performed a terrific job at DCF, especially in relationship to the last commissioner. I think this commissioner -- who I met with again today -- really has made a significant change over at DCF, but what this does is say that if a DCF employee does not comply with the rules or regulations, it shall be a Class E felony if such a failure results in the death or serious injury of a child in the care and custody of the DCF. And the reason why I put that bill together and have submitted this is, if you saw over the last several years we have had issues where DCF workers haven't checked on a child who is starved to death, or checked on a child who has been put in a bed and the husband or significant other
has a drug problem and through a drug frenzy the baby had died, and that's because nobody did the proper background checks. Or a situation where we saw that there was significant injuries to a child that was ignored by DCF, and ultimately that child died.

Madam President, there's been times when some workers didn't even check on a child, and there's been no accountability to anybody -- not to the family that lost that child, not to us as legislators, and not to the state of Connecticut. Madam President, this has been a problem that has plagued DCF Commission for a number of years. We need accountability. We need accountability.

Madam President, I have a list that I keep on my computer of the number of these tragic events that have happened particularly over the last six years of kids dying, of children who are severely injured to the point -- to the point of near death. There was an incident where this baby who was put near death and a DCF worker thought it was appropriate for this two-year-old child to be placed in a taxi to be sent to a doctor's office who had asthma, and they put the inhaler next to the baby, buckled the baby into the taxi, sent the taxi to the doctor's office. The doctor's office took the baby out, examined the baby, put the baby back in the taxi, and sent him back home. I don't know -- that just sounds crazy to me, but that's what happened. And as I mentioned, there was that baby in New London. That DCF worker for at least three weeks failed to check on the baby, and when the baby was finally brought to a foster parent, immediately that parent brought the baby down to the hospital, and the doctor said this is the worst neglect I've ever seen.
near starvation. No accountability. Not one. Not one person was called to task. Yeah, we're gonna investigate it. Yeah, we're gonna look at it. There's gotta be some accountability. These are kids.

I always say there's core functions of government that we have -- healthcare, protecting the elderly, protecting the disadvantaged, and protecting children, and we decide we're gonna be a guardian by virtue of DCF, by God we have an obligation to make sure that we protect these kids at all costs. And when there's no accountability, and they say, yeah, we looked at it, oops, and we move on, that's just not right. How many times have we read about a parent who's neglected a child and we see 'em on -- (rightfully so) being arrested and held.

DCF is nothing more than a parent of that child, governed by us, and if we're not gonna set the standard here in this Senate, in this state, who is going to do it? Who is going to do it? I've been watching this for years, and those veterans around this circle know how I fought Commissioner Katz every single year with Toni Walker downstairs in making changes and how we were dismissed by the former administration and by Commissioner Katz. Although this commissioner's much different, I agree -- the bill is still necessary. This commissioner's not gonna be around forever. Accountability is required. Accountability is required.

So, Madam President, I just think it's time. I think it's time that we hold people to standards that we hold everybody else who has a child in their care. So, Madam President, I seek approval of this amendment. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Duff, our Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I'd like to put this item, and if we can -- I'd like to put this item and the next item, and if we can now go to Calendar page -- actually, if we could stand at ease for a moment please.

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, if the Clerk can now call Calendar Page 38, Calendar 445, Senate Bill 1098. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 38, Calendar No. 445, substitute for Senate Bill Number 1098, AN ACT CONCERNING THE TESTIMONY OF JAILHOUSE WITNESSES. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):
Yes, good late evening, Mr. President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The motion has been made for passage. Will you remark, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. This bill comes to us through Judiciary. It allows a defendant to ask the prosecutor in their case in writing if they plan to introduce jailhouse witness testimony. The prosecutor would have 45 days to respond to that. The prosecutor responds if they are planning to use that sort of testimony. The would have to provide certain information, including the criminal history of the individual, the pending charges that may be against that individual, charges that have been reduced in an agreement that the individual had. If this potentially could put the individual who is the jailhouse witness into the peril of bodily harm, then the individual themselves who was putting forward the request would not be able to view this information -- their counsel would be.

The bill also has tracking requirements for the state's attorneys. Those include the substance of the testimony of the jailhouse witnesses that are defined in the bill, any of the agreements, much of the stuff that I was just talking about. This information would be kept within OPM. It's a very good bill, and I would urge passage. And now I would yield to Senator Kissel for an amendment.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel, will you accept the yield?

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Yes, I would. Thank you, Mr. President. Great to see you up there this evening.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

First of all, I'd like to be associated with the remarks of Senator Winfield. Before I get to the amendment, I just wanna stress that I support this bill. It is brought to our attention by the Innocence Project, which has done great work, not only in Connecticut but in other states across the country. Fundamentally, the way I look at this is it's an extra hurdle when a state is using a jailhouse witness, but I don't feel that it is so out of the ordinary so as to be suspect. For example, if you're going to bring a medical malpractice claim, you have to have that certificate by a similarly situated physician that states that in his or her opinion there was medical malpractice. And unless you have that certificate, you cannot move forward with that civil action. Likewise, if you're introducing expert testimony in a case, it's my understanding that that expert is examined regarding their credentials before that testimony is allowed to move forward in a case.
And so what this does is it creates an essential review by the court of the jailhouse witness prior to that individual being allowed to move forward before a jury and presenting his or her testimony. Why is that important? Well, if someone's in prison doing serious time, there's a built-in interest by that individual to try to shave that time off, cut a deal with the state's attorney, and sometimes that can lead to individuals, if not outright fabricating accusations, shadowing the truth or bending the truth or not being forthright.

And again, we're dealing with individuals that are being brought forward as witnesses that are incarcerated -- that's what we're talking about -- and so they have already been found guilty of doing something that landed them in prison. So, to my mind, just having that initial in-camera review by a judge just to get the baseline to allow that individual to go forward and give their testimony, to my mind while cumbersome and maybe some state's attorneys would not be desirous of that, to me it's a small extra step. And the individual, if allowed to go forward because they would have that base review of credibility, the credibility is then subject to the jury's review. And maybe the jury would say, yeah, they passed that first test of in-camera, but we don't believe him or her, or we look at the testimony differently. And that's why I support the bill.

At this time, Madam President, the Clerk should be in possession of an amendment, LCO No. 9623, and I would ask the Clerk to please call that amendment.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9623, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I move adoption of the amendment, waive reading, and ask leave to summarize. The question is on adoption. Please do summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Madam President. This very modest amendment to me fills a gap. One of the things that the underlying bill does, as Senator Winfield had indicated, is that the state's attorney's Office Division of Criminal Justice is charged with maintaining a list of these jailhouse witnesses, and that list is to be maintained by the Office of Policy and Management -- Mr. -- Attorney Pelka is in charge of that -- and that would be used for data purposes. And several of us could see that if that list was somehow subject to the Freedom of Information Act that it would have a chilling effect on those jailhouse witnesses that are being completely truthful, that have important information, that could be utilized to bring justice in another case. The thought being is that, hey, if I'm in prison and I want -- and I wanna cooperate with the State's Attorney's Office and yet my name
is being put on some list that gets out to the public, there could be a target on my back. I could be -- if I get released, some other gang or some other individuals may wanna take out retribution, and it would have a chilling effect.

So, substantively, what the amendment does is it says the list of names of jailhouse witnesses are not subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, as defined in Section 1-200 of the General Statutes, and I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye. ["Aye" in background] Opposed? The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I'd ask that it be voted on by roll.

THE CHAIR:

A roll call vote has been requested. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Bizzarro.

SENATOR BIZZARRO (6TH):

Thank you. Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I'm gonna rise in opposition to this bill
for a couple reasons. First of all, Madam President, I think it's the core function of a jury in criminal cases to listen to all of the evidence and to make a determination as to the credibility of witnesses. And every time we take a little bit of that responsibility away from the jury, I think we're doing a great disservice, and we are undermining the foundation of our criminal justice system. So, I'm very concerned about that aspect of it, Madam President.

Further, I think -- I was listening to my colleague the good senator from the 7th, but I think it's actually gonna have the opposite effect. You know, I'd be concerned. I'm reading the language of this bill, and it says very clearly that the jailhouse witness is gonna be subject to a court hearing during which the judge is going to determine whether the testimony is reliable and admissible. Now, I believe in the ability of jurors to be impartial and to weigh evidence and to listen to a judge's charge, but jurors are human beings and there's going to be a natural predisposition, in my opinion, Madam President, for people to just automatically assume that a judge has already assessed the credibility of a particular jailhouse witness. So, I'd like, you know, to emphasize that point.

I mean, I think of this as a situation that's very similar to when you have police officers testifying in a criminal trial. And typically my understanding is that you might have a jury charge -- a special charge to the jury regarding the -- the credibility and the weight of the testimony that should be attributed to police officers and that police officers should be considered just like any other fact witness. And that's important, and that's
because people will just have a natural tendency to believe -- at least the fear is that people might have a tendency to give more weight to a law enforcement officer's testimony. And I kinda think that this is just setting up the same type of situation. So, I don't think that it helps. I think, in fact, it hurts defendants. It's also my understanding in a criminal case, Madam President, that any defense attorney, typically as part of a case, a criminal case, will cross examine a jailhouse witness with respect to all of the items that are already contained -- that are contained in this bill. So, for instance, a defense lawyer typically will walk through any sort of agreement that a jailhouse lawyer has made with a prosecutor. So, all of those things are elicited at trial in any event. And for all of these reasons, Madam President, I'm gonna oppose this bill, and I would urge opposition. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Bizzarro. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I wanna echo some of the concerns raised by Senator Bizzarro and say this -- that, you know, the judicial system has this whole effort where you bring up someone and two well-educated, talented lawyers will go through and do the cross examination. And to have a judge predetermine the credibility before the witness testifies usurps some of the very reasons why our jurisprudence has the ability to do examination and cross examination.
But I'll tell you which gives me more trouble. What gives me more trouble is this. We've had a series of events in our Judiciary Committee, particularly with issues of family judges, where judges who did family court were coming in front of Judiciary, another party was there bringing out all sorts of allegations regarding this judge's behavior on the bench relative to their case. And when you listen to them, some of the evidence may or may not be admissible. It's hearsay, it's whatever, but they challenge this judge, and the Judiciary gets into this while the people are all upset. And judges -- we can't find judges to sit on our family courts because everything they do is second guessed, and we don't know the whole history of the file. We don't know as we sit around this circle, we don't know what's going on in that case. The judge can't really defend him or herself because it's duty-bound with respect to certain information, and we second guess everything that family judge does because there's this outcry.

Now some of that has gone too far over the edge that it's backfired in some of those organizations, and we've seen those websites, and we've discussed that in this room and in this building. Now we're gonna let a judge make a decision on the credibility of a witness who is a jailhouse inmate who is saying something relative to a criminal case, and a judge is gonna determine whether that comes in or not. And when I -- as I stand here now, I know that that judge is gonna be second guessed should he believe a witness, and have that witness testify, and -- fallible as people may be -- finds out that probably wasn't the truth by that witness. Now that judge is making a factual determination for which his career rests on it. It's not his job.
The credibility of a witness is the credibility of the juror. The essence of a jury is the meaning of truth. That's where the jury word comes from -- truth. And what we're doing is we're putting a judge as a jury is to a witness, and unfortunately, in this building, they get a second look on whether or not they made a right determination. I see nothing but problems procedurally in this building, and what I mean by that is the example of the family law courts -- those judges -- will now make its way to our criminal courts. And we all know because we all hear it that judges do not wanna sit as family judges or family magistrates because they don't wanna go through this. They don't wanna see their name and their families name plastered all over the internet second guessing a case on the facts presented, not as the facts recounted. And I'm afraid with these judges, we're putting 'em in that spot when we have a system now that allows talented lawyers to cross examine in a jury pool to make a determination of the credibility of the person before them.

So, I'm gonna vote no. I know it's well-intentioned. I do believe that. But I'm gonna vote no on this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, speaking in support of the bill, I certainly share
some of the concerns in terms of a process and additional burden on the -- the judge provided for by this bill, but I think it is an important protection in some ways because the most important issue regarding a jailhouse witness is his or her credibility and does he or she have an incentive to give testimony in this case. That's a key question. And there was a case not very long ago in the New Haven judicial district where a jailhouse witness was asked by the defense counsel where he had been given any inducements regarding his own case, and so the kind of question that any responsible defense attorney would ask. The answer was no. It turns out that he had. The prosecutor made no effort to correct that statement, and it was only found out later in the appeal process that this had happened, and the defense was -- or the prosecutor who tried the case said he was not the one involved in pretrial discussions and negotiations and interviews with that jailhouse witness and was not aware of the inducements that had been offered by another prosecutor in the same office. Now the court found that not to be a reasonable excuse on the grounds that the presumption is that the prosecution is a single office and that everyone in that office who deals with a certain case is assumed to have knowledge and will cooperate and inform each other. It turned out it was not the case here.

So, in terms of assessing credibility, you know, clearly that is the function of the jury, but if there is a lie told that there is no way to -- to correct just in terms of questioning, and if the prosecutor is silent, either through lack of knowledge or through misconduct, there may be no way to uncover this kind of thing prior to the witness going forward. And the process that is outlined in
this bill, I think, drawing additional attention, putting additional light on it, providing additional steps, requiring the judge to conduct this -- this process to determine credibility would be more likely to reveal this kind of situation that occurred in that case, where there was not a finding until after the fact about the witness making that statement and it not being corrected on the record by the prosecutor. So, Madam President, for the sake of those additional protections, I will support this bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the role, and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1098 as amended by Senate A. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1098 as amended by Senate A. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate. Senate Bill 1098 as amended by Senate A. [Background talking]

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, if you would please announce the tally.

CLERK:
Senate Bill 1098 as amended by Senate A.

Total number voting 36
Total number voting Yea 23
Total voting Nay 13
Absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk. Oh, pardon me, Senator Duff, good evening.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good evening. Madam President, can we go back to the item I just marked PT, which is Calendar page 5, Calendar 90, Senate Bill 929.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk -- or that would be Senator Slap. [Background talking] You are on deck, sir.

CLERK:

Page 5, Calendar 90, substitute for Senate Bill Number 929, AN ACT CONCERNING THE INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL MANDATED REPORTERS, THE DURATION OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT INVESTIGATION, AND THE REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):
Yes, I do wanna remind the circle, I believe that the bill was amended with LCO No. 9364 before it was PT'd, and I do wanna yield to my friend and colleague, Senator Fasano.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I thank Senator Slap for the yield. I had called LCO 83 -- nope -- I had called 8446 as an amendment. Madam President, I would like to withdraw that amendment. Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Just a couple of comments on the bill as amended, and I know we've heard in the circle a couple of days ago that we don't wanna let the perfect be the enemy of the good, but there are some things, while I think on the whole as amended with the -- I'm gonna say the Abuse and Neglect Registry addition -- that there was still a concern in the bill when we allow DCF to re -- I'm gonna say investigate from 45 calendar days to 33 business days. Actually it lengthens the time when DCF has to investigate a complaint. And I think when you are dealing with the state of
Connecticut, we should move as fast as possible. And I understand there are times when the calendar might not be conducive for state employees because of holidays and paid days off, but when we're talkin' about kids in the state of Connecticut, we must keep them foremost. And so while I think on the whole the bill is good, that issue is one that I'd like to see corrected in the future. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the vote and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. [Ringing]

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

I, if there is no objection, would like to move this item to the Consent Calendar please.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection? [Ringing]

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

I can withdraw that if we wanna just continue.
I think since we already have ten senators that have voted that we should just continue with the voting on the machine, Senator Slap.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 929 as amended by Senate A. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 929 as amended by Senate A.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, if you could please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 929 as amended by Senate A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Page 6 -- [Background talking]

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Clerk now please call Calendar page 21, Calendar 287, Senate Bill 647.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara, good evening.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Good evening, Madam President. Good to see you at this late hour.

CLERK:

Page 21, Calendar No. 287, substitute for Senate Bill Number 647, AN ACT STREAMLINING THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT. There is an amendment.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

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 FONFARA (1ST):

Yes, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 9541, may he please call it and I seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:
LCO No. 9541, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

I move adoption, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark further? And would you -- would you like to summarize, sir?

Senate will stand at ease.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President?

THE CHAIR:
Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to refer this item to the Finance Committee please.

THE CHAIR:

The item -- Senator Witkos?

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President, for a point of order.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, sir.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

We hadn't voted affirmatively to accept the amendment yet before we refer.

THE CHAIR:

That is an excellent point, Senator Witkos. So, back to Senator Fonfara. The amendment has been moved and called, and you are in the process of summarizing.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Madam President, the amendment before us becomes the bill, and I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Fonfara. All in favor of the amendment -- well, before that, let me ask if anyone would like to remark further on the amendment that is before the body? 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. ["Aye" in background] Opposed? The amendment is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and thank you to Senator Witkos for that and Senator Fonfara as well. Madam President, I move this item -- I'd like to refer this item to the Finance Committee please.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and if the Clerk will now please call Calendar page 60, Calendar 127, Senate Bill 47 please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

[Background talking] Page 60, Calendar No. 127, substitute for Senate Bill Number 47, AN ACT PROHIBITING THE SALE OF GOODS AND USE OF BUILDING MATERIALS CONTAINING ASBESTOS. There are amendments.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams, good evening.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I'm going to yield to my good colleague, Senator Lesser.

THE CHAIR:

Do you accept the yield, Senator Lesser?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

I do, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Please proceed.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. 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 LESSER (9TH):

Yes, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 9632. I ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and I be granted leave of the chamber to summarize.
THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9632, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this bill attempts to prevent 15 formerly approved uses of asbestos-containing products from being reintroduced into the stream of commerce. Those are -- there are all currently prohibited from being sold in the United States by the EPA. However, a new final rule adopted by the EPA this year could theoretically allow them to be reintroduced pursuant to further action by the Environmental Protection Administration. This would protect the public health in Connecticut and our environment, and I urge adoption. And, Madam President, I ask -- I don't ask anything.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further on the bill? Pardon me, we do have an amendment before us, so the question is on the amendment. Will you remark further? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):
Yes, thank you, Madam President. Through you, I would just like to ask the proponent of the bill to confirm that the amendment does refer to the EPA regs -- I believe it's Section 40, Subsection 763?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, the amendment does refer to that section of the Code of Federal Regulations. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Thank you very much. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? 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. ["Aye" in background] Opposed? The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):
Yes, Madam President. Madam President, if there is no objection, I'd like to place this on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I believe that we should have a vote on the Consent Calendar, and if the Clerk can call the items on the Consent Calendar please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. [Background talking]

CLERK:


THE CHAIR:

And Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the Consent Calendar vote, and the machine will be open.

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 in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1.

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Consent Calendar No. 1. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, if you would please announce the tally. [Background talking]

CLERK:

Consent -- Consent Calendar No. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, can we have order in the chamber, please.

THE CHAIR:
[Gavel] Could we please have quiet for the last few minutes, hopefully. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President -- hopefully. I'd like to mark an item for referral please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar page 60, Calendar 138, Senate Bill 70. I'd like to refer that item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, that concludes our business for today. I will yield to any points of personal privilege or announcements. [Crosstalk]

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, it is our intention to come in on Tuesday for a Democratic Caucus at 11 o'clock and session at noon, East Coast time, and [laughing] I would like to take this opportunity to wish all members and staff and everybody who's been workin' so hard to have a safe weekend, to get some rest, spend some time with their families, hopefully get a little bit of sun
and fresh air, and certainly remember those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice and to remember those as well while we're spending time with our families and having barbeques.

And, with that, Madam President, I would like to adjourn subject to call of the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. We are adjourned, everyone have a --

On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 11:07 p.m. adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.