CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Thursday, May 30, 2019

The Senate was called to order at 4:27 o'clock p.m., the President in the Chair.

DEPUTY CHAPLAIN MONSIGNOR GERARD G. SCHMITZ:

Let us pray. Gracious God, Creator and Provider of all good things, be with us this day as our Senate -- State Senate convenes.

We give you thanks for the efforts of our Senators and their staffs and for the long days and nights they give in fulfilling their oath of office. Guide the members of this assembly as they deliberate on issues that are critical for our State of Connecticut and its citizens, especially those who are living on the margins of life and society.

As our Nation observed Memorial Day earlier this week, we are mindful of all who have served our country as well as those currently serving to protect the freedom we enjoy. May those who have passed, rest in peace. May the living enjoy good health and the freedom they vowed to protect, and may those currently serving be safe from all harm and return to their homes in safety. We give you thanks, gracious God, for the many blessings that we have in the State of Connecticut.
and for our beautiful natural resources which so many of us will enjoy in the months of summer. With your guidance, help us to be mindful of our responsibility to care for the earth which you created.

Bless and protect us this day, watch over our coming and our going, and give us the grace to fulfill our tasks to the honor and glory of your name, you, who live and reign forever and ever. Amen.

THE CHAIR:

All right. Thank you so much, Monsignor.

DEPUTY CHAPLAIN MONSIGNOR GERARD G. SCHMITZ:

Thank you so much for having me.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Monsignor. We call forward now our Majority Leader, Senator Duff, to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

[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:

Good afternoon, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Good afternoon, Madam President. We will get moving, and momentarily, just stand at ease for a moment, please.

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. 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 30th 2019.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move all items on Senate Agenda No. 1 dated Thursday, May 30th 2019, to be acted upon as indicated and that the agenda be incorporated by reference into the Senate Journal and Senate transcripts.

THE CHAIR:
So noted and so ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President for our markings for today.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 62, Calendar 202, Senate Bill 164, go. On Calendar Page 47, Calendar 560, Senate Bill 1127, go. On Calendar Page 47, Calendar 567, Senate Bill 1123, go. On Calendar Page 48, Calendar 568, Senate Bill 1125, go. On Calendar Page 48, Calendar 569, Senate Bill 1125, go. On Calendar Page 48, Calendar 570, Senate Bill 1128, go. On Calendar Page 5, Calendar 114, Senate Bill 459 -- oh, 469, I'm sorry, go. On Calendar Page 9, Calendar 188, Senate Bill 960, go. On Calendar Page 21, Calendar 352, Senate Bill 1010, go. On Calendar Page 62, Calendar 172, Senate Bill 978, go. On Calendar Page 64, Calendar 287, Senate Bill 647, go. On Calendar Page 46, Calendar 551, Senate Bill 1130, go. On Calendar Page 1, Calendar 63, Senate Bill 848, go. On Calendar Page 21, Calendar 348, Senate Bill 548, go. On Calendar Page 23, Calendar 369, Senate Bill 1110, go. On Calendar Page 65, Calendar 317, Senate Bill 393, go. On Calendar Page 18, Calendar 318, Senate Bill 588, go. On Calendar Page 65, Calendar 337, Senate Bill 1046, go. On Calendar Page 19, Calendar 320, Senate Bill 1062, go. On Calendar Page 12, Calendar 222, Senate Bill 698, go. On Calendar Page, 64, Calendar 253,

And Madam President, if I can go back to an item I marked earlier, on Calendar Page 46, Calendar 551, Senate Bill 1130, I'd like to mark that PT, please.

THE CHAIR:

So noted, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 62, Calendar No. 202, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 164, AN ACT INCLUDING CERTAIN MENTAL OR EMOTIONAL IMPAIRMENT WITHIN THE DEFINITION "PERSONAL INJURY" UNDER THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION STATUTE. As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A", LCO 8127.

THE CHAIR:
Good afternoon, Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I believe the Clerk has an Amendment, LCO No. 10183. Will the Clerk please call the Amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10183, Senate Schedule "C" -- sorry Senate Schedule "D".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Madam President, I move the adoption of the Amendment. I move to waive the reading. I would seek leave of the Chamber to summarize.
Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment would create a section that would strike Section 11 in its entirety and replace it with Section 11 cited in this Amendment. This Amendment creates the opportunity for the Labor and Public Employees Committee to examine the feasibility of expanding the availability of benefits for PTSD pursuant to the Section 2 of the Bill, it -- it gives us the opportunity to extend those benefits to emergency medical services personnel who are not already covered under the act and Department of Correction Employees.

And so, I think that, this is a great opportunity for us to look to include individuals who have previously not had -- would not be covered by this Bill that we are adopting today. It also provides protection that if there was a qualifying event that occurred on or after July 1st, 2019, that should the legislature include the DOC and EMS workers for legislation next session, that they would have coverage if it's feasible during that period.

So, I think that this was a really great effort to bring together the Chamber and really put forward a very strong Amendment that will extend benefits and protections to even more workers. And, you know, I really appreciate the opportunity to do this, having served working people so many years, it's -- it's really I think a great honor to be in this position. I would like to yield the floor to Senator Miner for
further comment.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Miner. Do you accept the yield?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Yes, Madam President, I do. Thank you. And I thank the coach here for the opportunity to speak on the Amendment which is a bipartisan Amendment. And I do thank all the individuals that worked collectively to try and put this together. I think it recognizes the fact that, again, by omission, not intentional, that there is part of EMS group that still is not in this Bill, still will respond to calls, and that's why the language is included, which says that, if there is a causal event occurring on or after July 1st of this year, those individuals would be eligible, as I understand it, at such time as the work of the committee is complete.

And so, on line 5 of the Amendment it says, the Labor and Public Employees Committee shall complete an examination of the feasibility. And so, clearly this establishes a pathway to include those individuals, not only in the EMS community but those that I think, some individuals on the Labor Committee, have heard testimony about within the Department of Corrections. And I thank the individuals that have worked on this and for the opportunity to speak again. Thank you, Madam Chairman --

THE CHAIR:
Thank you --

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

-- Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

-- Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I, too, would like to rise and thank everybody that was involved this, including those that are in the gallery. This is an important step forward for those that we call to help us, we now turn to help them. So, thank you everyone.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Great to see you this afternoon. I also stand in support of the study -- possible inclusion of the First Responders. As I had indicated yesterday, my late brother, Michael, was a First Responder and we never know what they're going to encounter, and certainly very fruitful area.

I'd also like to commend Senator Osten for her
daughter's efforts on behalf of folks in the Department of Corrections, especially the correctional officers, the boots on the ground. As folks in the Circle know, I have six correctional facilities, used to have seven, but more than any other state Senator here in the Circle.

Just a few weeks ago, we had an opportunity to have a very fruitful meeting with various representatives of the Department of Corrections, Commissioner Cook and folks from Office of Policy and Management and, at that time, that meeting took place at Osbourn and Summers. And then, following that, we took a tour of the facility. I'm happy to report that having toured many of the correctional facilities, not only all of them in my District but several outside of my District very recently, there aren't that many incidences of violent attacks of correctional officers. But certainly it can be a grueling job, and if someone is shanked or someone has to extricate an inmate from a cell that doesn't want to be extricated, certainly bad things can happen in these facilities. and they could result in the exact same post -- post-traumatic stress -- distress as other First Responders outside of correctional facilities.

So, I think this an excellent, ambitious move to go forward to see if we can build them into our system and look forward to the results in the not too distant future. And again it would also be remiss of me if I didn't commend Senators Kushner and -- and Miner for their hard work on moving this Bill forward on a path that should eventually lead to this Bill's passage, not only in this Chamber but in the House, and then signed into law by Governor Lamont. Thank you very, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Thank you. I rise in support of the Amendment as well and I would echo some of the words that have already been spoken by Senator Champagne and Senator Kissel. I think this is a -- a -- a good compromise for what we -- some of us thought should've been included in the Bill and this gets us at least on the correct path and I'd like to thank Senator Kushner and Senator Miner as well, for putting their heads together collectively and bringing forth a good Amendment that can be added to a otherwise very good Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before us? Will you remark further? Senator Looney, good afternoon.

SENATOR LOONEY

Good afternoon, Madam President. Speaking in support of the Amendment, obviously this is a consensus Amendment. It is sponsored by all 36 members of this body which is certainly a gratifying thing to see. And it does recognize that -- that EMTs and correction workers often experience the same kinds of on the job trauma that is experienced by -- by police and -- and fire officers and
probably safety officers in the performance of -- of their duty. So, I strongly support the Amendment and pleased that we have reached this consensus resolution. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before us? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of adopting the Amendment, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Osten, good afternoon.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. It's good to see you this evening as we get later in the day. I just -- this Bill has been for me, sort of a labor of love, to provide people with some help for an injury they receive on the job, that is not only a physical injury but an injury to the mind and heart and soul. And I say that and I -- and while today, we are working for police and firefighters and parole officers, I have to say for the record, that I think all workers should be covered for all workers' compensation issues. And I think that this is finally starting to provide parity for mental health in our workers' compensation statutes.
Back in 1994, there was a decision made that cut workers out in regards to mental health issues. And I am very pleased to see us move on the issue and recognize, for the first time in more than 20 years, that mental health is an important part of a human being and an important part of keeping people healthy on the job.

My cousin was one of the -- my cousin's son was one of the First Responders that -- one of the first people to enter Sandy Hook. I had the widow of a East Hartford Police Officer, Paul Buchanan, here. Trish is a wonderful advocate, and they are not the only people -- each and every one of us can, in a day's time meet someone suffering from post-traumatic stress, would ask you to drop the disorder when you're talking about it, because it's a trauma-related situation that happens. And I think that -- that will also go a long way to bringing parity for mental health finally being recognized.

I'm happy that we're making a first step and I look forward to future steps to getting everybody covered for mental health under the workers' compensation statutes, and finally recognizing parity for mental health across every spectrum of our healthcare systems.

Thank you very much, Madam President. I want to thank Senator Looney and Senator Duff and Senator Miner and Senator Kushner on the Labor Committee for allowing this to move forward. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark further?
Thank you, Madam President. I guess there's a little housekeeping that still remains unfinished and that would be for me to withdraw Senate Amendment "C," as I understand it. So, I'd like to do that, at this time, if I might, please?

Thank you, sir. And the transcript will reflect that. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Looney. Opps -- Senator Duff to be followed by Senator Looney. Senator Duff.

Thank you, Madam President. I would not want to go out of protocol there. So, thank you Senator Looney. Madam President, I rise to support the Bill as amended that we have here today. Madam President, this has been the work of many -- many years with a lot of people who've -- who've toiled tirelessly to bring us to this point today. We've had -- first and foremost I -- I want to thank Senator Osten for her work over the last many years of just her persistence of continuing to bring this Bill up and raise this issue amongst colleagues and -- and everybody in this building, whether you're inside the Circle or downstairs or outside the Chamber. This has truly been an issue that she has worn on her sleeve for a number of years.

And in addition to that, I think many of us have
seen in our communities, how PTSD is affecting our First Responders. It is truly an issue that is high time that, here in the state of Connecticut, we address. And thanks to her efforts over the years, we have been moving slowly, but surely to this point today.

Certainly, I want to thank those in the police and fire community for their advocacy and their work on this Bill, as well. Without their strong support over the years, we would not be here today. Also, again, I want to thank Senator Kushner for her effort leading the charge and Representative Porter in the Labor Committee and, of course, the bipartisan work with Senator Miner and -- and others in the House, as well, and the legislative leaders in the building. If you look at the -- the actual strike-all Amendment on this Bill, it has all six legislative leaders. It has the Chairs, the Ranking Members, and the Vice-Chairs of the Labor Committee, Public Safety, and the Judiciary Committee. So, it shows how much this issue has really come together for -- for many folks. I think for many years we all have shared in the desire to do something. And it has been an effort to try and figure out what that is to -- to best address this while also understanding the -- the concerns that some of our towns and cities have.

So, there has been a number of people who we need to thank for bringing us here today. And again, I -- I do want to thank Senator Kushner for her service in this -- in this effort this year because it's been extremely important. Again, we wouldn't be here without Senator Looney and his steadfast support, as well, because we had a -- a few fits and starts here, and he has made sure that we were standing
here today to get this done. So, everybody around
the Circle has had some input on this, and it's
certainly appreciated.

I'll just only speak to the fact that in Norwalk,
where I live, that we have -- a few years ago we had
a police officer who committed suicide. And we
believe that it was through -- was because of PTSD.
And so, we need to recognize that this is an issue
that we must address. And as Senator Osten has said
many times, if somebody has a broken leg or a broken
arm, we see that injury. We may not see the injury
that somebody may have if they experience PTSD. So,
it's important for us to recognize that, be able to
deal with that issue, work collaboratively together
to address that for our First Responders.

We all know that PTSD is not just limited, though,
to police and fire. So, we have to ensure that
we -- we do think about our Emergency Medical
Service folks. We do think about Department of
Corrections. And maybe, in the future, we think
even about our -- about teachers, as well or others
who experience some of these types of things in
their -- in the workplace.

So, Madam President, I think that we have -- we have
started on this road. I think this is a -- a good
compromise. I also want to just take a moment to
thank Mayor O'Leary from Waterbury, CCM. Again,
some of our friends in Labor who have worked
tirelessly on this because this is a big step. This
is a big step for us here in the state of
Connecticut. And again, without the leadership of
the Labor Committee and others, Senator Osten,
Senator Looney, and many others here in the Circle,
and again Senator Fasano who has been really a
sovereign on this, as well as Senator Witkos, we would not be standing here today.

So, this is -- I look forward to voting on this and bringing this downstairs where it -- it has enjoyed support with our Speaker, our House Majority Leader, our House Minority Leader, as well. And again, we can -- we can -- we can pass this Bill in the Senate and in the House, have the Governor sign it, and celebrate in the fact that we've taken a very -- very important step today in helping our First Responders deal with an issue that has long been swept under the rug, has long harmed the victims themselves, they are victims, and that it will put them on a path to recovery, and allow them the help that they need in order to live a full and meaningful life and be able to do their job at that same time.

So, again I would urge adoption and support of this very -- very important Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Speaking, obviously in support of the Bill as -- as amended, this is a very important Bill because begins the correction of a grave error that was made in 1993 when this category of injury was excluded from our -- our Workers' Compensation Act. And in each of the years since then, it has become even more
clear, that was an error because, clearly, now medical science leads us to understand, without question, that psychologic injuries and emotional injuries are clear impairments and can occur with great severity, even independent of any -- any physical injury. So, the requirement that there be a physical injury as a -- a -- as a precursor condition to any claim, really is unrealistic and flies in the face of -- of medical evidence. And -- and that evidence becomes more and more clear every year.

I'd like to begin by -- by thanking Senator Duff, our Majority Leader who did such a great job this year in convening groups to meet on this issue, meetings with municipal leaders and municipal representatives, as well as heads of police and fire organizations around the state to come close to finally hammer out what had been a -- a -- a bone of contention for -- for many -- many years.

Senator Osten, as the Majority Leader said, has been a champion on this issue for many years, bringing up in our caucus regularly the -- the injustice of the situation we had and the need to do the mental -- mental Bill, as she has constantly reminded us as a matter of equity.

This year, of course, Senator Kushner and her great work as -- as Chair of the Labor Committee shepherding this Bill through the process and getting it to us. Senator Miner with his hard work in helping to find a way toward -- toward compromise, as well.

I'd also like to -- to mention, Madam President, that the -- the need for this Bill was compellingly
brought to the attention of this Chamber in the debate last evening. I -- I think that the -- the statements made by Senator Champagne and Senator Witkos and -- and others, were two of the most compelling statements, witness and personal experience and courage that I have heard in this Chamber. And their statements, alone, without further debate, made the case for this Bill and why it is so necessary.

So, I am -- I'm hopeful that we will now adopt the Bill as amended, reflecting the consensus here and that it will speedily be enacted in the House of Representatives. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would please announce the Roll Call 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 164 as amended by Senate "A", "B", and "D". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 164 as amended by Senate "A", "B", and "D". 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 Bill 164 as amended by Senate "A", "B", and "D". Immediate Roll Call Vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 164 as amended by Senate "A", "B", and "D".
THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 164 as amended by Senate "A", "B", and "D".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move for suspension in order, so that we can immediately transmit this to the House of Representatives.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will come back to order. Senator Duff.
Clerk please return to the call of business.

CLERK:

Page 47, Calendar No. 560, Senate Bill No. 1127, AN ACT CONCERNING THE REPEAL OF A CONVEYANCE OF A PARCEL OF STATE LAND TO THE TOWN OF NORWALK.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer, you have the floor, Madam.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good evening, nice to see you up there.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening. Good afternoon, yes. Whatever. [laughter]

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Motion is acceptance and passage. Will you remark, Madam?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, just for a point of introduction on this Bill and
the next several Bills that we'll be doing, in light of the Constitutional Amendment that the people of Connecticut passed last year, there's been a change in the traditional conveyance process that this General Assembly usually engages in.

Now, each conveyance item will be debated in an individual Bill, and we'll be debating a few of those Senate Bills in the coming moments. And the Bill that is before us is a Bill that actually repeals a -- a previous conveyance of state land to the city -- or the town of Norwalk, and it repeals that conveyance. And I hope that my colleagues will support this Bill, as they did in a bipartisan fashion, in our committee. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further? Senator Sampson you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Nice to see you up there.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon to you.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

I stand also in support of the conveyance before us. This conveyance passed out of the GAE Committee unanimously. OPM gave testimony in support. It is for fair market value. And I encourage my
colleagues to support it also. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If -- Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered, Madam. Mr. Clerk, if you will return to the call.

CLERK:

Page 47, Calendar No. 567, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1123, AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PARCELS OF STATE LAND IN THE TOWN OF CHESHIRE.

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:
Motion is acceptance and passage. Will you remark, Madam?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Bill before us, takes some properties that are currently under the authority of the Department of Transportation and gives them to the town of Cheshire. I urge my colleagues to support this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? Seeing no one. Senator Flexer, you have the floor, Madam.

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:

Without objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 48, Calendar No. 568, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1125, AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONVEYANCE OF A PARCEL OF STATE LAND IN THE CITY OF NEW HAVEN.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Flexer, you have the floor, Madam.

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:

Motion is acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Bill before us is about conveying a parcel of state land that's currently controlled by the Commissioner -- or excuse me the Department of Transportation and giving it to the city of New Haven and the New Haven Port Authority. I urge my colleagues to support this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.
SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

And motion is acceptance and passage. Will you remark please?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes, Madam President. Madam President, the Bill before us conveys a parcel of state land that is currently controlled by the Department of Administrative Services and conveys that piece of land to the town of Hamden. I urge my colleagues to support this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Senator Sampson, you have the floor.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I stand in opposition to the conveyance before us. The testimony from OBM expresses dissatisfaction with the terms of the conveyance, basically that they think that the property which is, I believe a little over 50 acres, is worth $6 million 353 thousand dollars [phonetic] and this conveyance is only for a little over $1.5 million dollars -- $1.7 million dollars. That would mean a loss to the state of Connecticut's assets of a significant amount. And I encourage my colleagues to vote in opposition. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I stand in support and favor this Bill and I urge my colleagues to the same. This is a -- one of vital priorities for the town of Hamden, and the town expects to utilize the property for the benefit of the community. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Logan. Will you remark further? Senator Witkos, you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

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

Please frame your question, sir.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President, I -- I just heard a conversation from two very well-respected senators, one that spoke about the difference between what the market value of the property is and what it is being sold for, and another that said that it'd be a great benefit to the community. And through you, Madam President, to whoever would like to choose to answer the question is, have -- has the town of Hamden identified specifically what they want to do with the parcel land? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. To Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Bill that is before us, due to the new process that we have for conveyances, had a public hearing specifically on this Bill and this conveyance and the town of Hamden and the Mayor -- Mayor's Office did submit testimony saying that this piece of land would be used for numerous opportunities for economic and environmental development. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. You have the floor, sir.
SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If I might, I -- I can just supplement the answer from Senator Witkos. My understanding, through recent conversations with the Mayor’s Office in -- in Hamden, is that there -- what they envision is a -- is a subdivision of the property for mixed use development, mixed income residential, some affordable, some market rate, also a commercial component, as well and -- and office space. It is located near State Street and Hartford Turnpike, two major thoroughfares in -- in that area, and think it would be highly appropriate for a -- a major piece of what Hamden is hoping will be growing economic development in -- in -- in years into the future to try to improve their economic base, because they are currently one of the highest mill rate communities in the state.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. You have the floor, Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate the answers from Senator Flexer and Senator Looney. And to me, I'm glad to hear that it's a wide use of --
of the property for -- not only for housing, both affordable and market rate, but for economic development, you're going to see some commercial opportunities in that area. So, I -- I thank the good Senator for -- for that definition. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, will the Clerk please announce a pendency of a Roll Call Vote?

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered 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 1126. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1126. Immediate Roll Call Vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 1126.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Please check the roll call machine to make sure your vote is properly recorded. If so, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1126.

Total number voting 35
Those voting Yea: 32
Those voting Nay: 3
Absent and not voting: 1

THE CHAIR:

Bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please return to the call?

CLERK:

Page 48, Calendar No. 570, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1128, AN ACT AMENDING THE CONVEYANCE OF A PARCEL OF STATE LAND IN THE TOWN OF FARMINGTON.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer, you have the floor, Madam.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Motion is acceptance and passage, Madam. Will you remark?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Bill before us amends a conveyance of state land that's currently in the control of the Department of Transportation to the town of Farmington. I encourage my colleagues to support this Bill. Thank
Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further? Senator Bizzarro, you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR BIZZARRO (6TH):

Thank you. Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of this Bill. I'd like to start by thanking the good Chair of the GAE Committee, the Ranking Member of the Committee, and also my colleague, Senator Slap and my colleagues, Representatives Demicco and Exum in the House for their help in getting this legislation moved forward. Madam President, this actually -- this conveyance had been approved a couple of years ago.

At the Committee, we had representatives from the town of Farmington who testified that they want the property, they've been negotiating with DOT, but they ran into a roadblock -- an unexpected roadblock, and that is in that in the way that language had been had approved during the special session a few years ago, the town and the DOT were unable to negotiate the fair market value of the property. The property is contaminated. And the way the Bill had been written, they're not allowed to negotiate the sales price. So, all this will do is revert to our statutes which permit DOT and the municipalities to negotiate in good faith. And that's what we're seeking to do with this conveyance and this Bill, and I urge support. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Bizzarro. Will you remark further? Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Afternoon to you, sir.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

I just want to rise and really affirm the remarks of my colleagues, Senator Bizzarro and thank him for his partnership in this effort. It was a bicameral effort and as the good Senator mentioned, and a bipartisan one to work with the town. And I just to really add that this piece of -- of land for the town of Farmington is very important. It's on Route 4. For those of you who have driven through Farmington, you know that Route 4 is a very strategic location. It's really at the -- at the beginning of the town. There's a lot of history to Route 4 in terms of the Underground Railroad, the Omestod [phonetic], and the Freedom Trail. So, it -- it really presents great opportunities for the town of Farmington. And it's going to be up to the community to decide the best use of this land. But we're very excited about how the chance -- the town is going to put this use. And again, really this effort, I think is bipartisan government at its best.

So, thank you very much. I want to thank Senator Flexer and Representative Sampson for their help in this effort. Thank you.
The Chair:

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

Senator Flexer (29th):

Madam President, if there’s no objection I move we place this Bill on our Consent Calendar.

The Chair:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Will the Clerk please return to the call?

Clerk:

Page 5, Calendar No. 114 Senate Bill 469, An Act Requiring the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority to Establish Performance Standards and Minimum Staffing and Equipment Levels for Electric Distribution Companies.

The Chair:

Senator Witkos, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

Senator Witkos (8th):

Thank you, Madam President. Pursuant to Rule 15 for a potential conflict of interest, I ask for recusal from the Chamber.

The Chair:

So noted. Thank you, Senator. Senator Kissel.
SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

I also rise under Rule 15 for recusal, to avoid a possible potential conflict of interest.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. So noted.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Madam President, pursuant to Rule 15, I wish to recuse myself from debate and consideration of this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. So noted, Senator Logan. And if we have tended to that business, Senator Needleman, you have the floor.
Thank you, Madam President. Very nice to see you up there. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report on passage of the Bill.

Motion is acceptance and passage. Will you remark, Senator?

So, Madam President, the Clerk is possession of an Amendment, LCO 9084. I would ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment.

The Clerk is possession of an Amendment. Will the Clerk please call?

LCO 9084, Senate Schedule "A".

Senator Needleman, you have the floor, sir.

Yeah. Thank you, Madam President. So, this Bill is a request to do a study on staffing levels for -- move the Amendment -- sorry.
Motion is adoption, sir.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Motion to adopt the Amendment. Sorry.

THE CHAIR:

So -- so noted. Motion is adoption. Proceed.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. This Bill is about staffing levels for Eversource in doing a study to make sure that they have adequate staffing in case of storms and can manage the amount of infrastructure. I'd just like to speak to the fact that I have been a First Selectman for a while, a Selectman for a while, and a large customer of the utility, and found that, in many cases, their performance was substandard, found that they did not have adequate in-house staff to manage serious events and relied too much on contractors and out-of-state -- out-of-state mutual aid.

I just think that it's time that we study the impact of the change in their staffing in both energy distribution companies to make sure that they are hiring enough people and have adequate staff to do the job that they're richly paid to do in the state of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Formica, you have the floor.
SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

And good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

I rise for a few comments.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I, too, served as a First Selectman during a -- a couple of those major hurricanes and had many concerns with the -- with the results of restoring and keeping electricity moving during those -- during those storms and during the aftermath of those storms. This Amendment would seek to look at an industrywide situation and have a study to figure out the more specific and acceptable standard performances for the electric companies, not only in terms of staffing, but in terms of equipment that they must have, and it would customize their particular needs for the state of Connecticut.

As the good Senator mentioned, there are often times when storms come up the east coast or they travel from west to east, staffing is deployed from state to state. And often times, it gets caught in the storm's fury, if you will, and are -- are -- and are
unable to -- to get to the state, you know, in a timely fashion.

So, I think this is a good study to get going and see where we're -- where we need to end up so that we can move acceptable standards and keep our electricity running for the people here in the state of Connecticut. So I urge adoption. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor please indicate by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the Bill as now amended? Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

I'd like to move to put this on --

THE CHAIR:

Oh -- excuse me, Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH)
Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 9792, and I would ask that he call that Amendment please.

THE CHAIR:

Clerk is in possession of LCO 9792. If the Clerk would please call?

CLERK:

LCO 9792, Senate Schedule "B".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Somers, you have the floor.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes. I asked that I move the reading and seek to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is adoption, Madam. You move adoption?

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, I move adoption of the Amendment. And this Amendment has to do with utility companies. And this Amendment is something that I would like to be added to this Bill which has to do with our Municipal Electric Cooperatives called CMEEC. And as many of you may recall, this was a Bill that we dealt with in the last session having to do with a Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative that was
originally setup with seven of the most distressed communities to provide the lowest power cost to these communities. And what we had found, between last year and today, is that our Bill that we passed previously which required forensic audits of activity, etcetera has resulted in five FBI indictments with charges ranging anywhere from 50 to 100 years in prison.

And this Amendment seeks that, should those folks who are part of a quasi-public organization that was established by this legislature in Section 7 of the statutes which falls under municipalities, that if they are found guilty of these crimes, that they would be required to repay the charges that are accumulating and being paid right now by the rate payers of those municipalities.

The estimated legal fees are upwards of $800 thousand dollars to date. And again, these are being paid with rate payer dollars. And I ask that people support this Amendment because this, again, was setup as a cooperative in the '70s to provide the lowest power cost for seven most distressed communities, and they have lost their way. They were using rate payer money to go on junkets that I'm sure we've all heard about, the Kentucky Derby, and it only -- is only suiting that, if they're found guilty, they should repay the rate payers. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further? Senator Formica, you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I rise for a few comments on the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The intent of this legislation, as the good Senator indicated, is just to ensure that the legal fees are returned, should convictions appear, which would, in fact, codify the bylaws of CMEEC. So, we just -- the Amendment just seeks to make sure that should bylaws be changed, that this provision remains intact and those that are subject to the indictment and -- would have to -- would have to be responsible for their legal -- legal fees. So, I urge adoption. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Needleman, you have the --

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Yeah. Thank you --

THE CHAIR:

-- floor.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):
--- Madam President. I rise in opposition to the Amendment. I'd like to call a Roll Call Vote.

THE CHAIR:

A Roll Call Vote has been requested and at the time of vote, we will be voting by roll call. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, will the Clerk please announce a pendency of a Roll Call Vote?

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been -- Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment "B".

THE CHAIR:

Please check the Roll Call Vote to see if your vote is properly recorded. Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If so, the machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 469, Senate Amendment "B", LCO 9792.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:
Amendment fails. [Gavel] Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I move that we put the Amendment on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

The request is to place the -- the Bill on the Consent Calendar.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

[inaudible - 01:11:47].

THE CHAIR:

I think we will have a Roll Call Vote if --

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

No, I -- I'm sorry. I've been told, we have to do a Roll Call Vote.

THE CHAIR:

Yeah.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Sorry about that.

THE CHAIR:

I thought so. [laughter] If -- Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, we do need to have a Roll Call Vote on this Bill. Before we get to that, I just want to ensure that there's nobody else who wanted to speak on the -- on the Bill before us? Okay.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Let's have a vote.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no further remarks, will the Clerk please announce a pendency of a Roll Call Vote? Thank you.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 469 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 469 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on 469 -- Senate Bill 469 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 469 as amended by Senate "A".

THE CHAIR:
Have all the members voted? Please check the roll call machine to see that your vote has properly cast. And if so, the machine will be closed and the Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 4569, as amended by Senate "A".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

Bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the next item, Calendar page 9, Calendar 188, Senate Bill 960, I'd like to mark that item PT, and have the Clerk call the next Bill on the agenda. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will the Clerk please return to the call?

CLERK:

Page 21, Calendar No. 352, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1010, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DISCLOSURE OF DAMS AND SIMILAR STRUCTURES BY OWNERS OF REAL PROPERTY.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano, you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It's good to see you there.

THE CHAIR:

And good to see you, always.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

This is a very specific Bill. The first section in fact --

THE CHAIR:

Move -- are you going to --

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:

-- move the Bill, sir?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Move adoption of the Bill and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:
The motion is acceptance and passage. Please remark, sir.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

This involves the disclosure of dams on -- on property. It's a strike-all of the whole first section of the Amendment, and really focuses on this transfer of property from a seller to a buyer. Many times, people are selling properties with knowledge of the existence of a dam on the particular property, and they do not disclose that. Those dams, over time, can need repair, services, and so on which become, in many cases, a -- a severe financial burden for the new property owner.

So, what the Amendment does is, it requires a disclosure, that if you have any awareness whatsoever, you must, in fact, clarify that as to what -- what your knowledge is on the existence of the dam. There is a form that is filled out in a transfer of property, and on that form, there are a bunch of things that you, as a seller, have to identify as the conditions of the property, this would simply add the question is -- are there any dams on this particular property? And if so, then you would fill that out in good faith.

And so, I would move adoption that this is a good protection for somebody. And if you live in an area, more rural area and so on, there are dams like this. There are many that we don't even know that are on our own properties, but this the beginning of a protection process.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will -- yes, you have the floor.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Hold on, I understand, is there an Amendment?

THE CHAIR:

We'll stand at ease please.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

I'm sorry -- the Amendment is -- is striking Section 1. All right. For the record, LCO --

THE CHAIR:

The Chamber will come back to order. Senator Cassano. You have an Amendment to call, sir.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, I am sorry, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Yeah.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

I had mentioned that the strike-all but that is in the form of an Amendment LCO 8236 to Senate Bill 1010, AN ACT CONCERNING DISCLOSURE OF DAMS AND SIMILAR SUTURECTURES BY OWNERS. This section is entirely struck and --
THE CHAIR:

The Clerk is in possession of LCO 8236. I ask that the Clerk please call and the Senator has requested leave to summarize. Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 8236, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano, you have the floor.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Move to adoption.

THE CHAIR:

And the motion is adoption, sir. And will you remark further?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Very simply to remove Section 1 of the entire Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor of please indicate by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.
Those opposed? The ayes have it. The Amendment [gavel] is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill, sir, as now amended?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

There are no further remarks. Are there any further questions? Seeing none, I would ask it be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos, you -- seeing no objection, the request -- oh. Oh. The question is --

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Question.

THE CHAIR:

-- for a Roll call vote. Senator Hwang, you have the floor.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

I am not objecting to possible consent. But I just have some questions for the proponent of the Bill on this.

THE CHAIR:

Please frame your question, sir.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):
Thank you very much. It's interesting when we talk about the dam, there's a high hazard and a low hazard. Through you, Madam President, what if it's a nature made dam by beavers that have kind of accumulated in someone's backyard that's unbeknownst to them, where would that be classified from a residential real estate disclosure? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you for that question, Senator. That was something that was discussed in Committee and -- and of great concern, because those are things that we can't control, those as we say, that's an act of mother nature and that exists because of mother nature. So, it is not a manmade dam and it should be exempt.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. You have the floor, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And -- and that's important for legislative intent. But should there be a high hazard or low hazard in regards to a -- a manmade dam and there is a need to remove it? Who would be liable for the cost of that removal? Would it be the town entity? Would it be the property owner? Would it be DEEP? Through you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you. Well, there's two answers to that question. If we are in the process of the sale of the property, the form that is required to be filled out would have to identify that, what the cost would be, the extent of that, and that would be up to the seller to make the determination whether he wants to pursue that.

The other end of that, is the seller still has the responsibility if he doesn't sell it, so either way he's fiscally -- he or she is fiscally responsible for that dam if, in fact, there is work that has to be down. And there's a whole checklist of requirements that you have to look at involving these dams and the repairs of the dams.

THE CHAIR:

To -- to you, you have the floor, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I -- I appreciate the proponent's answer, because it's -- it's kind of important for the seller and the property owner. It -- it could be an individual that is a longtime owner of that property, hundreds of years handed down, and should they make a sale and not realizing upon this, is there a -- any liability protection for individuals through an error of omission and -- and not recognized that these dams exists, because
they have been so etched into the landscape. But should after the transaction, the property owner says, whoa, I have a dam. Is there is any liability or emission protection to the seller of this? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Through you, Madam President. No, there is not. The only possible way of dealing with that situation is, in fact, filling out the form, it's a pre-sale form that goes along with the sale of the property in some cases where you identify, you know, questions. Do you have underground tanks, as an example, that's a liability and -- and those types of things that would be added to the process? But if five years from now, you -- you -- now, if I have sold you this property and this dam pops up, you end up with that responsibly, unfortunately?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. To you, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And -- and the reason I rise that, is obviously I -- I -- I do support the merits of this Bill and the public safety concerns of these long-neglected dams that have been throughout our waterways and put -- and pose dangerous hazards. But I hope in this question and -- and outlining the legislative intent, we are
able to share with potential sellers or potential property owners that live nearby waterway -- adjoining waterways, that they should do such investigatory work and ensure that no such dam exist. So, I -- I thank the proponent for his answers and thank him for his good work. Thank you, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Champagne, you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just want to make a comment. What I learned during this process is, as somebody reached out, and I learned that in -- in the 50s, UConn came through, because there was a draught and helped farmers build many ponds on their property, in fact, thousands of these ponds and it involved a dam. And many people didn't know about that. And the concern was, if I didn't know about the dam, how do I deal with that?

And there is on that form, if you don't know there's a dam on your property, you can say unknown. And -- and that does cover that portion it. But -- and I can see this problem, especially with these ponds that were built to help hydrate -- to help provide water to the fields. But I -- I think this covers that. And I think, if you're walking away from a -- a property with a known deficient dam, leaving it to the next homeowner, I think that does create a problem. And it should be addressed to prior to and this definitely should be disclosed. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further? If not, senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

If not, I'd ask that it'd be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

If the Clerk will return to the call. Senator Witkos, for what --

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Yeah. For a point of order -- I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Yes.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

I asked that this not be on Consent and a Roll Call --
THE CHAIR:

Oh, I'm so --

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

-- Vote be taken.

THE CHAIR:

Sorry, sir. I -- I missed that. My apologies. And so, with objection, we will have a Roll Call Vote, if the Clerk could announce a pendency of a roll call? The machine will be open and the Clerk will announce Roll Call Vote.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1010 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate [laughter] on Senate Bill 1010 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the members voted? Senator Formica. You -- have all the members voted? If so, please check the roll call machine that your vote is properly recorded. And the machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1010, as amended by Senate "A".
Total number voting 35
Those voting Yea 31
Those voting Nay 4
Absent and not voting 1

THE CHAIR:

Bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Will the Clerk kindly return to the call?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I'd like to mark the next item PT, and if we can move on to the item following that.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority leader. Will the Clerk please call Senate Bill 647?

CLERK:

Page 64, Calendar No. 287, Substitute for Senate Bill 647, AN ACT STREAMLINING THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A". That would be LCO 9541.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):
Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara, you have the floor.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Good evening.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening to you, sir.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Good to see you this evening. Madam President --

THE CHAIR:

Likewise.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

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

THE CHAIR:

Motion is acceptance and passage. Will you remark please?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Yes, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO 9541. May he please call it and I leave to summarize?
Clerk is in possession of LCO 9541. The Senator has asked for summarization.

LCO 9541, Senate Schedule "B".

Senator Fonfara.

Madam President, may we stand at ease?

Chamber will stand at ease.

Madam President.

Chamber will come back to order.

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would like to correct myself that the Amendment had already been called and adopted at a previous session. And I'd like to move that -- that the Bill be -- I move the Bill in -- well as previously adopted.
THE CHAIR:

And so, we are on the Bill as now amended. Will remark, sir?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Yes, Madam President. Madam President, this Bill seeks to produce some significant changes in the highly regulated industry. Regulated heavily nationally and in Connecticut by the Liquor Control Commission. And this Bill would be the first significant overhaul of our liquor laws since prohibition.

I'd like to recognize, before I begin my brief remarks, and then yield to my good friend, Senator Witkos. The work of my Co-Chair, Representative D'Agostino, and as I mentioned, Ranking Member Senator Witkos, the amount of detail that goes into the work that is exhibited in this Bill before us, I don't think will ever be appreciated by most, hopefully they'll enjoy the results, but in terms of the -- I would consider excruciating, at times, work to weave their way through many different interests in this longstanding interest, embedded interest in our economy and in our communities, but they've accomplished it. And I wanted to recognize them for that work here, Madam President.

Fundamentally, this Bill recognizes the changing preferences of consumers in this state, which is driving demand in this service industry. The traditional model of buying and taking home beer or wine or spirits in one place and drinking it at another is changing dramatically. But our laws and our regulations have not. This Bill recognizes
those changes and seeks to support consumers' changing attitudes.

In addition, the Bill is supported by -- supports the growth of the industry. It supports and encourage an entrepreneurship in the -- in this industry. It takes a highly regulated and stratified system that restricts entrepreneurs in Connecticut business to one that creates a fertile environment for new businesses to start up while helping exciting businesses to benefit from increased interest in the new products.

It reduces the number of permits from 42 to 12, a significant achievement. It allows beer manufacturers, through increases in off-premise sale of -- from nine to nine -- nine liters to nine gallons, and excise tax paid on beer served from a taproom after the first 15 barrels. It allows for wine, cider, mead, and -- and allows for tastings by the glass for cider. It authorizes the sale of mead in Connecticut for the first time.

It creates a craft -- Connecticut craft cafe permit. It allows the holder of a liquor permit to obtain a craft cafe permit, which would allow for cross sales of other Connecticut made products in their tasting rooms.

It allows for beer to be sold in a gift basket which is currently prohibited. It allows for out-of-state retail wine to be shipped into Connecticut, enabling consumers in Connecticut to obtain a product that currently is very difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, and this would for the first time enable that to happen but consistent with Connecticut's laws and it's three tier system and it protecting,
establishes -- established business in Connecticut currently.

Madam President, I'd like to yield to my good friend, Senator Witkos, and thank him for -- along with my Co-Chair, Representative D'Agostino, for all the work that they've done in getting this Bill to where it is today.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Senator Witkos, do you except the yield, sir?

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, I do. I'd also like to thank several people. First and foremost, Senator Fonfara is the Chairman of the General Law Committee, Liz Keys [phonetic], who participated in many of the conversations that we had along the way, Representative D'Agostino, the House Democratic Chair, DJ Magnoli [phonetic], who was involved in a lot of the meetings that we had, Representative Rutigliano, Representative Cheeseman, Casey Larkins from the House Republican side and James Rocco and Tim Waldron from the Senate Republican side. Then our non-partisan staff from the Office of Fiscal Analysis and Legislative Commissioner's Office and OLR, Duke Chin [phonetic], Rich Hanratty, Michael Erickson, and Julia Bonsal. And last, but certainly not least, Leslie O'Brien from DCP. And I'll say the man of the hour, Jack Sutchi [phonetic], who, if you have a permit here in Connecticut, you know that name, because he has been the -- really the -- one of the folks that leaned upon when we came up with this legislation to make sure, as the controlling
agent in the Liquor Control Commission, that it was something that the agency could live with and work with and move forward.

I'm very proud that this piece of legislation is before us today. This has been the -- the goal of the General Law Committee for a number of years. When we first had conversations with this little company out in Manchester named, Onyx, who was selling spirits and was looking to open up a taste room and, you know, when you're talking about something that's a very highly regulated industry, you tend to move very slowly. Not a surprise in government that we move slowly.

And so, we've progressed, baby steps, in all of the industries from creating farm wineries to opening up distilleries to allowing brew pubs and farm breweries to allow them to have taprooms and tasting rooms. But we've limited what they've be able to do. But even under that limitation, I've got to share with you, the economic impact and the job growth that we're seeing, I'll -- I'll give you an example, just from the beer industry itself, in 2012. there were approximately 650 people employed in the beer industry in 21 breweries. In 2019, over 5,000 jobs, a 669 percent return or not return but an increase in those -- those jobs, those manufacturing jobs. The number of breweries have increased to 90 breweries, a 328 percent increase, all have a direct impact on our economy.

As a matter of fact, the economic impact alone in a five-year period went from $132 million dollars to $745 million dollars, a 464 percent increase. That's something every member of this General Assembly should be proud of, because you all have
played a part in allowing this industry to thrive. And this Bill puts that -- that thriving on acceleration.

As the good Senator said, we've allowed some things that a heavily -- heavily negotiated Bill where all of the participants came to the table multiple times, many numerous drafts, and were able to draft a piece of legislation, and I think everybody walked away with very happy.

And I'm just going to just highlight some of the things to pick up where Senator Fonfara left off. We do have -- we did reduce our number of permits in our state from 44 permits to 12. Again, providing a more leaner, efficient, less confusing government that, if somebody wants to open up a business in our state, it's very easy to determine what you have to do. Some of those things we allowed for to address what's happening today and anticipating what's going to happen tomorrow, while learning from the past.

Our -- I'll speak specifically to our -- our beer manufacturer and our breweries. They said to us, nine liters, are you kidding me? When have customers out the door asking, we want to buy your product and take it home, but you're only allowing us to basically take home three six packs of 16-ounce cans. That doesn't even fill up a full flat. Recognizing that and seeing that and -- and understanding the economic impact that it has, not only for the grower, the brewers that are here today but those that are looking at opening up a -- a business in Connecticut tomorrow.

The Committee decided that through negotiations, nine gallons will be the target that folks who
purchase can bring home from those specific breweries. Nine gallons, if you want to do a quick math, it's three cases of -- three full cases of 16-ounce beers or four cases of 12-ounce cans of beer. That is phenomenal. And also to appease the other side of the -- of the -- the industry, because everybody has to hold a permit, the Restaurant Association said, well, wait a minute now. We're a little concerned because the -- the breweries have an advantage over the bars because they don't pay any excise tax, if somebody's purchasing alcohol in their facility. So, that's not fair. So, the brewery stepped up to the plate and they said, you know what, you're right. We've had the ability not to pay an excise tax for these number of years, and we're willing to do that. And we believe that if -- if an entrepreneur wants to start and open up a business, they need a little bit of a cushion in order to get their business up and running, so after the 15th barrel of -- of beer sold in the taproom, an excise tax will be paid by the brewery.

Additionally, if you've never been to a Connecticut brewery, I urge you to go visit them. Not only is it a great time and you get to enjoy the fruits or the hops, I'll say of their -- of their passion, but the folks are Connecticut residents. And listen to their stories, they're fascinating stories. The hard work that they've done. The number of employees that they -- that they employ, the benefits they want to provide to their employees, where they see their business going, how they contribute to Connecticut's economy, and the tourism of the -- of the state of Connecticut, with the creation of the -- the -- the beer passport.

I had the opportunity this past weekend to go on
a -- a very short brewery tour and I only got to go
to three of them. I wish I could've gone more, but
enjoyed so much time at each of them, that before I
knew it, the day was over. But I plan on visiting a
lot more. And I -- and I -- I will say to those
folks, I'll be visiting you soon.

But the thing that I -- I'm surprised by -- not
really surprised, but I've noticed was that in a
brewery, there's often times a food truck parked
outside. And one of the things that was concerning,
through the discussions, was that okay, well, they
get to have a -- a food truck parked outside and
they can sell cider inside their place, but not
everybody can do that. And why is that? The
wineries were saying, well, that's not fair. If the
brew pubs get to sell our product, why can't we sell
their product?

So, as a product of negotiations, we created for the
first time ever, a Connecticut craft cafe permit
which allows all the holders of a manufacturers
permit to sell each other's Connecticut made
product. How great is that where -- where -- where
they want to sell the product that's made and sold
in Connecticut in their facility? One would say, if
you're a winery, why do you want to sell beer in
your facility? Because they want to work together.

Because as you've heard the expression, when the
tide rises, all boats go up or something like that,
I don't remember exactly what the expression is. I
don't like those -- those like those, but it seemed
appropriate at the time.

You know, I -- I'll say a better one, when a -- when
a -- when a -- a beer mug is filled and they go up a
toast, if you're sitting around, you're going to pick your beer mug -- mug up and toast as well.

So, the Connecticut Craft Cafe permit is something that everybody has asked for. It allows each of the individual industries to showcase each other's product. But there's a limit on that, in the Bill, it says you can't -- you can't sell more than 20 percent of somebody else's product in your tap room. But of course, that's a no brainer, because why would anybody want to do that, because that's a really bad business model if you're selling more of somebody else's product than your own. So, again that was an agreed upon piece of legislation.

One of the things that we were contemplating at the time, was to create a one permit for wine, cider and mead, and eliminate the farm winery permit. But then it came to the Committee's attention that certain towns in Connecticut adopted a farm winery permit regulation or they adopted their zoning regulations based on the permit requirements here in the state. So, we said we can't touch that and we didn't.

The farm winery permit, as it stands currently in the state of Connecticut, remains as is in the state of Connecticut. There is no change in the Bill that pertains to farm wineries. There has been, I think, some misconception, some miscommunication from folks that didn't understand, maybe what is currently in statute, and so I want to address that at this time.

Folks are saying that they are -- if they're a farm winery. They want to reject a business that can come in and sell wine that doesn't own any land in Connecticut and may not use any grapes from
Connecticut. Ladies and gentlemen that is already allowed under Connecticut state statute. In fact, there are ten facilities in Connecticut that operate under that model right now, ten facilities. So, I think it's more of somebody not knowing the law, because they're busy in their own practices. But if they would have called the Liquor Control Commission and asked them, they would be -- it would be confirmed to them that that is, in fact, the case. We don't -- we don't change the requirements for Connecticut grown or Connecticut wine product or Connecticut farm wine. In fact, we enhance that and make it even better, because we've gotten the Department of Agriculture involved now.

So, if you are operating under current Connecticut farm winery permit, you have to be on at least five acres of land and at least 25 percent of your product must be manufactured by grapes grown in Connecticut. And if you want to get that Connecticut grown product, you got to hit 51 percent and now that product labelling is overseen by Department of Ag, who has the ability to go out and conduct audits on those wineries that say that or asking for that permit. If they're found to be in fault, Department of Agriculture can report that to the DCP and the permit can be pulled. So, there is an ability for enforcement there, as well.

Some of the other things in the Bill that are -- are contemplated here that you may not be aware of because they're significant, but every little thing you do in the liquor industry is significant to somebody.

I wouldn't've thought it was such a big deal at some point to say, well, if you want to buy one bottle
just buy a bottle. Believe it or not, we have a law that says you have to sell it in a full case with the same size bottle. But there are some liquors that sell for $4 thousand dollars a bottle. You'll never find that on the shelf at my house, but some people want to purchase that item. And currently under the law, it says that DCP can authorize a shipper four times a year to sell that out on a one item number. Well, we increased that to eight. That's important to some people.

We also allowed a -- a -- a large distillery in our state, Patrick Degiao [phonetic], you might have heard of that, down in the Norwalk area. I had a -- a fun time with them during the public hearing because they had said they want the ability to mix and match in a case, the products that they sell because currently, in our law, we don't allow that. Can you imagine that? We don't allow you to mix and match your own products in a case? So under this piece of legislation, I call it a summer fun pack. If I want to take it to the beach and mix up a couple different drinks that you make, I have the ability to do that. Well, now we can do that. And we worked it out because the supply -- the manufacturers said we'll package it up, or we'll hire somebody to package it up. Then we'll send it to the distributor. And then they can send it down to the package stores. Again, we found compromise amongst the three-tiered system.

If you haven't had a chance to drive down 91 South in the south end of Hartford and look over to the right to the old Dillon Stadium which is the new home of the Hartford Athletic Soccer Club, I urge you to do so. This legislation addresses some of their concerns because the definition that we had of
coliseum didn't quite fit what they wanted to be able to do. That's addressed in this Bill.

It also addresses the fact that liquor or alcohol be -- can be sold in certain parts of the facility, not restricted to this one little tiny corner. As the good Senator Fonfara said, we reduced the number permits from 42 or 44 to 12. And part of that is in coliseum permit.

And can you imagine, if you're going with your significant other, you're both of age, and one says could you go up and get me a drink and you -- I have to use the restroom. So you go up, you wait in this long line and you get to the counter and say, I'd like to have, you know, two glasses of wine or two beers, please. And then the current law it said, sorry, can only sell you one. So, well here's my -- my significant other's ID, you know, they're in the restroom. They'll be right out. Sorry, can't do that. Under this law, they can. They're allowed to sell now two, which is really customary. You can do that in a bar and a restaurant, so why wouldn't we allow that in any of our liquor -- liquor permitties?

The last thing I want to mention is that -- Senator Fonfara had mentioned that we created a wine, cider, mead permit, and currently mead is not allowed in Connecticut. In fact, I didn't even know what it was in the public hearing. And mead is fermented honey. And apparently, it was back in the old days, like in the Medieval times, that's what folks drank in the form of alcoholic liquor. I'd like to try it at some point, because just curious. But we do allow that for sale in Connecticut. And there are some folks in Connecticut that are making it now and
they would like to be able to start a business and see where that takes them.

There's also another facility down here in Hartford called Hartford Flavors and they -- they suggested to us that we're harmed by the restrictions you placed upon us in the Bill -- or prior to the Bill. And we heard their concerns and we addressed those concerns and what they're allowed to do is before we allowed them to buy -- only sell 1.5 liters, if -- if they had a tourist come in and try their samples to go. We've doubled that in the Bill. We've allowed them to provide non-alcoholic mixers to the -- the tastings that they have. That was so important to that industry. And we also increased the amount that they're allowed to produce and self-distribute, we doubled that amount.

That has also been another concern of some folks from the distillery world, one in particular, who, under the current guidelines in Connecticut, you can produce 25 thousand gallons of spirits and self-distribute, 25 thousand and one you must go through a distributor. This particular facility testified that they were generating approximately 11 thousand gallons of spirits in Connecticut and would like to see an increase. So, the Committee recognized that it was a business model they were looking to expand, and so, we increased that 50 thousand gallons, 100 percent increase under what is currently allowed under law. And -- so that should address all of the things in the very near future that they would be looking at.

And the Committee is also -- again looking to reconsider next year in the public hearing maybe some more suggestions from the industry as we flush
this out. So the -- to wrap up on the Bill the -- the sale of -- an increase at your facility is in effect upon passage, when the Governor signs it. The taxing of the excise tax goes into effect January 1 of 2020.

And the permitting of all the new facilities would be available July 1, 2020. Nobody would lose their right to operate under their existing permit. The permits would change upon renewal, if you renew prior to July 1, 2020 you'll stay on your existing permit until you come up for a regular renewal at that time.

And, Madam President, I -- I -- I kind of glanced over this way, and wanted to -- I saw Senator Cassano sit -- sitting here and I wanted to thank him for his constituent who stated that, you know, the gift basket idea is really good, and we did that in Connecticut a few years ago and allowed wine to be sold in gift baskets. But why not allow beer to be sold in those wine baskets as -- as well.

And again we're prompting another Connecticut made product, most likely. So, I thank you, Senator Cassano, for bringing that idea forward. That's also contained in the Bill.

It's been, Madam President, a pleasure to work with Senator Fonfara on this Committee. I'm glad he came to General Law this year. I hope he stays on General Law. And I'll yield back to Senator Fonfara. Thank you, Madam President. And I urge --

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.
SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

-- passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And thank you to both Senators Fonfara and Senator Witkos. As you have just heard the -- from the comments and from the explanation of the Bill, what the impact of this industry can have on manufacturing and on jobs here in Connecticut. As Senator Witkos indicated, the changing preferences of the Connecticut marketplace has really evolved and that is so aptly exhibited by what we see in the craft beer area.

I can remember back in 2012, when we first started to look in this field, and in my District we are home to Two Roads Brewing among others, but back then, it was Two Roads who approached myself and the town of Stratford and other representatives in the 21st Senate District. And we worked with them to make changes and modifications to our liquor laws that made a significant and important improvement as was indicated. We went from literally 650 employees in 21 breweries to now 5,000 employees with over 90 breweries, and now they're throughout all areas of our great state and in very many different neighborhoods.

And it really shows a number of different things.
It once again, shows Connecticut ingenuity and innovation. It shows the evolution of the Connecticut marketplace and I think at least, you know, I like to say in Stratford that it has a lot to do with the Stratford water but it's a very good product that's created. And it -- not only is it creating jobs, it's also a destination. People from other locations, whether it's the state of Connecticut or outside of our state driving along 95, they stop in.

And while I could go to almost any establishment in my District and know someone when I do go to Two Roads, I am impressed by the fact that while it's, you know, within my neighborhood, it's not that populated -- populated by people form Stratford. And that's a good thing, because what it shows is that we're bringing people from other locations to come to Connecticut and to buy our goods, services and products.

That's what these types of initiatives are aimed at doing, to try to make a positive impact. And to that end, you know, I believe that both Senator Fonfara and Senator Witkos, who have worked very hard on this Bill and I commend them for their efforts, are endeavoring to make sure that our liquor industry and -- which is, you know, improves. And the thing about it is, when you do go into these establishments, they're manufacturing jobs. And this is what I think sets it apart many times is, it's a good manufacturing job, it pays a good wage and it really helps our -- our local -- not only our local economy but our -- our quality of life too.

So, in that regard I -- I like what's going on. And looking back at 2012 when we were in this situation,
that whole craft beer industry was something that was brand new. It had never really been here, didn't really take hold. But it was with the aid and assistance of the changes that we made here in Hartford, that that industry was allowed to grow. So, in effect there really weren't any other entities or individuals occupying the field at the time. And so, there was nobody getting displaced, if you will, with the changes that we were making. It was all positive. It was all good and -- and everybody saw the benefits. Here, too, like I have said, there are numerous benefits.

I heard Senator Witkos talk about the mead permit. I have had the opportunity to travel to England and have mead. Sounds interesting. I didn't find it as -- as good, I have no hankering to have any more mead, but it's an option. It's an option that other individuals could have. Somebody's going to like it. It's just like the sour beer. I don't quite get it. But it's a growing market and it's something that produces jobs and a good product here in the state of Connecticut to sell to others.

So, it's all about variety. It's all about options. It's all about choice. And -- and that's what makes -- when we look at certain areas, the opportunity to do that wherever we can.

So, when we look at these permit, the one thing that I do want to bring to light is, we heard a lot of the benefits around enabling different entities to have options, to make products, to sell products, their opportunity to -- to take their product to market, and to give more choice to individuals in our state.
But there's another component to this Bill that I think we need to look at. And that happens to be, not so much directly tied to liquor, but it has to do with the farm industry in the state of Connecticut. Because when we initially created that farm winery permit, part of it had a -- a liquor component to it.

But there was another, equally as important and bonafide, purpose for it, and that was to give Connecticut agriculture the opportunity to utilize their property, so that they could remain a going concern, and in that way we would do a number of things. We would help Connecticut agriculture, we could create Connecticut jobs, we would improve Connecticut produce, but we also create open space.

And the way -- way we would create the open space is because we would make it possible for Connecticut farms to -- to succeed and survive. It's that aspect that we created the farm winery permit to begin with. And I know in my District, we are home to the Jones Family Farms, a six-generation family that has worked the land in Shelton on Israel Hill and they've done a great job. And each generation looks at different types of innovation to make the farm work. Currently they do have a winery, and that works because they have the farm wine permit.

So, what we have in the Bill maintains that farm wine permit. But it also extends the same benefit to manufacturer permit for farm winery, which means that they don't have that same requirement to own a farm in the state of Connecticut to have a farm winery permit. Why is that substantial and significant? It's substantial and significant because if you're a farm winery in Connecticut you
have to grow 25 percent of the produce that you have in your wine, and that's a requirement that the farmer -- the Connecticut farmer has, in addition to the obligation of maintaining a farm, making sure it's used, and making sure that you can make it economically feasible to keep it as open space.

On the other hand, if you have the manufacturer permit, you don't have the same requirement. You have the requirement that you have to have 25 percent grape, but you can get that anywhere in the state of Connecticut. So, that manufacturer has the opportunity to shop for the lower priced produce that the farm -- farmer of Connecticut doesn't have that same opportunity.

So, it -- it's working in -- in adverse situation against our famers who we want to have maintain and work open space. So, you look at this and you think to yourself, I mean one of the family traditions that we have is every weekend after Thanksgiving we take a family ride whether it's Friday, Saturday, or Sunday up to Jones Farm to chop down our Christmas tree and you walk all over the place, sometimes it's cold and the walk is shorter. Other times, it's not so cold, and it's an afternoon. But the thing that's impressive is that the cars in the parking lot are from Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania who come to Jones Farm not only to get a high quality tree in Connecticut, New England but also because it's open space. It's the bucolic environment that we love about Connecticut.

I mean we hear about how the millennials want to move to urban more city centered living environments. But the fact remains, Connecticut is one of the greatest and most beautiful states in our
country. And while I've gone various places throughout our country and the world, I think Connecticut right here has some outstanding natural beauty, whether it's Long Island Sound to the Housatonic River, to our forests, it's beautiful. And it's beautiful because we've kept it quaint New England and we've allowed the Connecticut farmer to survive.

This Bill, the way it's drafted, creates a circumstance that may change that business model for farms and create a situation where, while they still maintain the farm winery permit like they did in the old Bill that was prior to this, they now have new participants that are gonna occupy that same footprint that don't have the burdens of maintaining the family farm. They don't have the costs of maintaining that family farm. And that puts an unfair disadvantage to the Connecticut farmer, who we should be trying to encourage and help so that they can survive and our state remain the beautiful environmental gem that it is.

I get the point about we want to create jobs and manufacturing jobs, those are good, don't get me wrong. But we also have a Connecticut that is very rural. And agriculture is just as important and those jobs are just as good as manufacturing jobs. And we can't lose that when we start to sit down and look at -- look at some incentives that we -- we move forward here at the Capitol. I represent a -- a District that is both urban and rural. So, I have the interest of urban manufacturing and Two Roads sat right nicely in that. There was an industrial area on the border between Stratford and Bridgeport, an old factory, and when Two Roads was looking for a location, they found a factory to manufacture beer
and to rehab a -- a factory.

On the other hand, we also have Jones' Winery. And because of that, I think we need to make sure that we protect those interests when we are looking at moving legislation forward.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff, you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to mark this Bill PT please.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to yield to Senator Haskell for a point of personal privilege, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell, do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

I did -- I do, Madam President. Thank you very much. Come on up. Madam -- Madam President, I -- I rise for a point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:
Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I have here with me Juliette Arencibia from Ridgefield. She goes to Scotland Elementary School. And I just wanted to introduce her briefly to the Chamber. This is a young woman who was recently named Ms. President in Ridgefield. She participated in this non-profit, non-partisan program that encourages young woman to get involved in civic service and it's really a wonderful program. I've had the opportunity to get to know many of the students across the 26 District who participate, but Juliette is -- is really remarkable. She made the trip up to Hartford today to talk about an issue she cares very passionately about, something that she spoke to her peers about that, and that is the malnutrition crisis in Venezuela. She is such an inspiring young person.

She reminds me why I decided to run for this office, why we spend the late nights up in this Chamber. She tells me that she has aspirations to run for office soon herself at -- she's going to go to law school, which is something that I'd like to do eventually, too, so maybe I'll see her there. But I am just really inspired by Juliette, and am thrilled to be joined by Representative Frey in presenting an official citation, thanking her for her service to the state of Connecticut and for being a leader among her peers in Ridgefield. So, I hope the Chamber will join me in giving her a very warm welcome. [Applause]

THE CHAIR:
Juliette, so I, the Chair, and the rest of the Chamber do want to tip our hat to you. I've had the pleasure of visiting the Ms. President program in Ridgefield, and I know how rigorous the process is, so that you have really excelled to be here and representing the organization as you have. So thank you for what you have done, you've many years to go in terms of sharing all of your mentorship and bringing people along, but congratulations to you. Thank you. [Applause] Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to mark an item as go as our next order of business, please.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, sir. Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 24, Calendar 370, Senate Bill 1115 is our next order. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority leader. Will the Clerk please call Senate Bill 1115?

CLERK:

Page 24, Calendar No. 370, Senate Bill 1115, AN ACT CONCERNING A STUDY OF THE STATE'S CIVIL LAWS.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Winfield, you have the --

CLERK:

There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

You have the floor, sir.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Yes. The motion is acceptance and passage, sir.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. There's a -- an Amendment on this Bill. It's LCO 10226, it's a strike-all. I'd ask the Clerk call it and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

The Clerk is in possession of LCO 1022, the senator has asked to have it called and be granted summarization. Please proceed.

CLERK:

LCO 10226 Senate Schedule "A".
Thank you, Madam President. This is an Amendment that amends a Bill we did the other night was -- it's referred to as a Trust Act. What this Bill -- what this Amendment that would become the Bill before us does, is it defines the Bail Commissioner or Intake Bail Commissioner and it also -- the other night when explaining the Bill, we did not allow for the arrest or detainment of an individual, but this is going to allow for that to happen if the individual has an A or B felony, is an individual who's in the Terrorist Screening Database or similar database. Also, we did not allow for interviews of people who are just, as I described, A or B felony, who are in the Terrorist -- federal Terrorist Screening Database, that would be allowed under this Amendment.

In addition, if the person was subject to a Court Order that's issued under Section 8 of the United States Code Section 8 1225(d)(4)(B), the release date was going to be let out but if -- I'm sorry -- I'm trying to read quickly -- the individual -- the other night we talked about their attorney or their representative getting certain information if we were going to allow for -- if we were going to respond to a civil immigration detainer, this makes a slight change to that, there wouldn't have to be contact with the attorney. But if they had a Representative, then it be a good faith effort made to contact that individual. We talked the other night about disclosure under FOI. This makes clear
that we're not violating the FOI laws we have. And then, there was a report that would be made by municipalities on this subject monthly, that is moved to a six-month period. I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is adoption. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. We had an extended multi-hour debate on this Trust Act Bill, just about a week and a half ago. And I -- I voted in opposition to that because I felt that, clearly the ultimate result of passage of that act, was that Connecticut is essentially a sanctuary state and -- A, and B it -- it essentially prohibited our local law enforcement from contacting ICE, working with ICE, for categories of individuals that had quite serious criminal transgressions that I just felt that ICE should be contacted and should be afforded an opportunity to interview these individuals.

As Senator Winfield points out this brings back a couple of those groups, folks that have been convicted of A or B felonies, those are the most
severe felonies that we have in the state of Connecticut, and also folks that are on the Terrorist Watch List. And actually, I, myself brought an Amendment out regarding the Terrorist Watch List. If someone's on the Terrorist Watch List, I don't think that you get on there by accident, clearly that there's potentiality for some extreme harm to be done. And if that's not the case, the only way to find that out that is if Immigrations and Customs Enforcement are brought in to interview the individual in a full and fair manner.

I also understand that this Amendment changes municipal reporting requirements from one month to six months. And makes some other changes that might assuage some folks concerns regarding the underlaying Bill. Nonetheless, it's not my job and my belief to take a bad public policy and trim around the edges to maybe accommodate some folks that might feel more comfortable with the Bill. We debated this Bill fully and fairly in its original form for many -- many hours and we all voted accordingly.

While I appreciate the direction that this Amendment goes, and ultimately, it's my understanding that the underlaying Bill will then be taken up and finalized in the House, this Bill will be taken up finalized in the House, and that there's an agreement that Governor Lamont will sign both Bills, thereby incorporating these changes into the underlaying policy.

I still think the underlying policy undermines the health and public safety of the people of the state of Connecticut. I think it's a wrong-minded policy,
and may be a bighearted policy for some individuals here in the Circle. But I think public safety should be number one when it comes to these issues.

So, while I appreciate the direction this Amendment is going, I'll be voting no, once again, because I don't believe Connecticut should be a sanctuary state. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, I will try your minds.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Madam President. Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Yes. Senate --

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Roll call, please.

THE CHAIR:

The request is a Roll Call Vote. And so, when the vote is taken, it will be taken by roll call. Are there further -- we'll stand at ease.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

The chamber will come back to order. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Okay. Now that I got the -- the road map, it's okay. I withdraw my request for a roll call on the Amendment being assured, that at some point later this evening, we will have a roll call on the underlying Bill. But again I still stand in opposition to the Amendment which will become the Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

It -- thank you, Senator Kissel. And if so, I will try your minds. All those in favor of the Amendment please indicate by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Those opposed?

THE CHAIR:

The ayes have it. [Gavel] The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Winfield, you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):
Madam, can we stand at ease for a moment?

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will stand at ease. Senator Duff, you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, we're going to just mark this item as PT, please.

THE CHAIR:

So noted.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. We have -- I will now yield to members who have points of personal privilege or announcements.

THE CHAIR:

Are there points of personal privilege? Yes, Senator Kushner, you have the floor.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would like to introduce to the Chamber, one of our Danbury students who is a sixth grader at St. Peter's School and Kylie Macancela has won an amazing award. She has -- she has become Ms. President US from Danbury. She did that by competing with a essay that she read and she was selected from many students. And so, we're so honored to have her here in the Chamber.
And I'd like to ask all of the members here to congratulate her and join me in thanking her for coming up here and serving as our US President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kushner. [Applause]

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

And that will be in the record now. [laughter]

THE CHAIR:

And the Chair would also like to offer congratulations to you, Kylie. This is an exciting day, because we have some folks from the Ms. President organization. It is an amazing process that you go through and you have distinguished your among your peers. I have no doubt, you will continue to do that. Congratulations to you. Thanks for being with us today.

Are there further points of personal privilege? Yes, Senator Logan. You have the floor.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I, too, here have a Ms. President US from Hamden, Connecticut, Gopika Sheth, thank you for being here with us today. Ms. President US is a non-partisan, non-profit community-based initiative dedicated to inspiring and preparing girls to aim for the highest civic leadership positions and they know that they can achieve them. So, thank you for being here. And well, if everyone could please give her the
recognition that she needs here today -- today, that'd be greatly appreciated. Thank you. [Applause]

THE CHAIR:

Oh, Gopika, we would like to congratulate you, as well. This has been an exciting day for us to be able to meet all the respective Ms. Presidents. It's an amazing process and you have totally distinguished yourself. We look forward to all of your contributions, not the least of which, will be civic as you go on. Congratulations to you. [Applause]

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Much appreciated.

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will come back to order. [laughter] Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Will the Senate stand at ease for a moment? THE CHAIR:

Chamber will stand at ease.

Senator -- the Chamber will come back to order. Senator Duff. You have the floor, sir. 

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if we can now go to the next Bill, which is Calendar Page 1, Calendar 63, Senate Bill 848.

THE CHAIR:

Will the Clerk please call?

CLERK:

Page 1, Calendar 63, Senate Bill No. 848, AN CONCERNING FUNERAL SERVICE CONTRACTS AND CEMETERIES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara you have the floor, sir.

CLERK:

There is an Amendment.

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:

Motion is acceptance and passage, sir. Will you remark?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Yes, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO 10111. May he please call and I be
permitted to summarize?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, the Senator has asked to call LCO 10111 and requests a summarization. Will the Clerk please call?

CLERK:

LCO No. 10111 Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

You have the floor, Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President, very much. Madam President, I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Question is adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Yes, Madam President. Quite simply, this Amendment does two things. It's a strike-all, by the way. It removes the prohibition that currently exists in Connecticut law of operators of cemeteries from preselling crypts or niches in mausoleums or columbariums in the state of Connecticut.

And it secondly increases the -- the Amendment increases the limit in which individuals seeking to put into an irrevocable trust for various funeral
services from $8 thousand dollars, which is in current law to $10 thousand dollars. I urge passage of the Amendment, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I also urge adoption of the Amendment. I think that this compromise language in the Amendment gets to the point where the folks in the industry want it to be. And I think it's received no opposition; it's been around for a couple years. And I -- I'd like to see the Amendment adopted. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

SENATORS:
Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Those opposed? The ayes have it. [Gavel] The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as now amended? Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):
Madam President, unless there's objection, I request that this be placed on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if we can PT the next two items. And --

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And go to Calendar page 65, Calendar 317, Senate Bill 393.

THE CHAIR:

Will the Clerk please call?

CLERK:

Page 65, Calendar No. 317, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 393, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES' LEVEL OF NEED ASSESSMENT. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams, you have the floor, madam.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is acceptance and passage. Will you remark, madam?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Unfortunately, we have a situation where there are differing views regarding the effectiveness as it's being implemented of the Department of Developmental Services' level of needs assessment. And this Bill is an effort to address that situation. The -- Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of a strike all Amendment, LCO 10218. I would ask the Clerk please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Clerk is in possession of LCO 10218. Will the Clerk please call? The Senator has asked for summarization.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10218 Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):
Thank you. I move adoption of the Amendment and ask that its reading be --

THE CHAIR:

Question --

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

-- waived and seek leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

The question is adoption. Please proceed.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you. This Amendment brings together various stakeholders in a ten-member taskforce to study the instrument -- the level of needs assessment instrument policies, procedure, training, education, materials related to the Department's level of need assessment system and the diverse behavior and medical issues assessed by such system and to develop recommendations for the improvement and greater consistency of administration and results. The task force is scheduled to put in a report by February, 2020, so before the next session begins.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):
Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the Amendment and the underlaying Bill. This is something that is desperately needed because the level of need has changed in the definition since this was first instituted. And we need to be able to establish a -- a new level of need and also some of the clients that are in the system, their -- their needs change as they process through the system. So, we're hoping that we can bring all the different parties together, put everybody in one room, have them understand that instead of trying to work against each other, that they can together and we can come up with a solution that benefits all of the people that have disabilities. And we hope to bring that forward shortly. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not -- Senator Formica. If not, then I will try your minds. All those in favor of Senate Amendment "A", please indicate by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Sorry for the confusion
there but --

THE CHAIR:

Not at all.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

And thank you, Senator. I rise in support of -- of the Amendment, which is now the Bill, to -- this is a very important opportunity for people to come together and really look at this complex issue that -- that has been simmering for a long time. So, we have to move forward. I think this Bill does that. I'd like to thank everybody involved that -- that got us to this point. It was a number of conversations, a number of compromises. And I appreciate the opportunity to stand here in support. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the Bill as now amended? Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection, I would ask that the Bill placed on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing none, so ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, we're going to stand at ease for a few minutes.

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will stand at ease.

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will come back to order. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if we can go back to the Judiciary Committee Bill that was marked PT, that were under debate before, this Calendar Page 24, Calendar 370, Senate Bill 1115.

THE CHAIR:

Will the Clerk please call?

CLERK:

Page 24, Calendar No. 370, Senate Bill No. 1115, AN ACT CONCERNING A STUDY OF THE STATE'S CIVIL LAWS --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield --

CLERK:

-- as adopt -- as amended.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Winfield, you have the floor.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I have no further comments. We can moved that Amended Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you, very much Madam President. As I indicated the Bill that is as now amended, I still stridently oppose and would ask for a Roll Call Vote. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The Senator has asked for a Roll Call Vote. When the vote is taken, it will be taken by roll call. Is there further remarks? Are there further remarks? If not, will the Clerk please announce a pendency of a Roll Call Vote?

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1115 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1115 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1115 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been
ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1115 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the members voted? Please check the roll call machine to make sure your vote is properly recorded. If so, the machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1115, as amended by Senate "A".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

Bill as amended is passed. [Gavel] Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President move for suspension of our rules and immediately transmit this Bill previously passed down to the House of Representatives, please.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if we can now go back to Calendar Page 64, Calendar 287, Senate Bill 647.

THE CHAIR:

Will the Clerk please call? Thank you.

CLERK:

Page 64, Calendar No. 287, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 647, AN ACT STREAMLINING THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 9541. There are additional Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We will stand at ease.

Senator Fonfara -- Chamber will come back to order. Senator Fonfara, you have the floor, sir.

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 as amended.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is acceptance and passage as amended. Will you remark? Senator Fonfara?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Madam President, we were in the midst of discussion
by Senator Kelly. I don't know if he wants the floor again but --

THE CHAIR:

Are you yielding, sir? [laughter]

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

I will yield to Senator Kelly.

THE CHAIR:

We -- Senator Kelly, do you accept the yield? Have you concluded your remark, Senator?

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I have not concluded my remarks. We were waiting for an Amendment at the time. It has not yet hit the Senate Calendar. I'm looking for a third. So, we have two but not the third.

THE CHAIR:

We will stand at ease. Chamber will come back to order and Senator Kelly, do you have the LCO No. that are we hoping to call?

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Madam President, the third Amendment has been released. We're just waiting on a Senator's signature for that Amendment.

THE CHAIR:
So, I -- I'm being informed we are not in possession of the Amendment.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

The third Amendment, correct. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

You -- you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you. The last I was here I was -- when last I had the floor, we were talking about the importance of making sure that the -- in the process of amending our -- and streamlining our Liquor Control Act for the benefit of various sectors of our Connecticut economy, we wanted to be mindful of Connecticut farmers. And to that end, Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 10232. I ask the Clerk please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Clerk is in possession of LCO 10232. Senator has requested that you call the Amendment and he be granted leave to summarize.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10232 Senate Schedule "B".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.
SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Basically, what this Amendment will do is it will protect the Connecticut farm winery industry and, in particular, Connecticut farmers, because it will leave the -- the permit as it was before or as it is today. And also, make sure that the field that they occupy remains intact. It would also change under the -- in the underlying Bill the manufacture permit for farm winery, so that there is a clear distinction between the two, so as to once again protect the Connecticut farmer, but also allow others in the field to still participate, but there would be a difference. I think this is a smart way to proceed so that we can obviously all enjoy the good work that the Committee did in the underlying Bill, but at the same time, protect the Connecticut farm. So, I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

You move -- you move --

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

And I do --

THE CHAIR:

-- the Amendment.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

I do move the Amendment and would appreciate a Roll Call Vote when that time comes. Thank you.
Question is adoption. Will you remark further? Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Amendment. The good gentleman's intentions are -- are -- are sincere in representing the interest of his constituency and that of others who are similarly affected. But I believe, Madam President, this is -- this effort has struck an important, an intricate balance in getting us to where we are today. No one gets 100 percent, as usually is the case in this institution, but I believe everyone comes out far ahead of where they were. So, I'd hope the Chamber would vote this Amendment down. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Please frame your question, sir.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. I was -- in the explanation of the Amendment, it was to
preserve the existence of the farm winery permit, does the Amendment go on -- go beyond anything other than that? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly, to you, sir.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Yes, Madam President. It does a couple of things. Number one, there was a conforming, as I understand it, a conforming change from six percent to seven percent alcohol by volume. I believe that's consistent with other sections of the Liquor Act. It removed the apple wine classification. And I believe the -- there's the maintenance of the 25 and 51 percent of the product have to be Connecticut grown designation when advertising or prompting the -- the product. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos, you have the floor.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. If I was to overlay this Amendment on top of the Bill as amended, I -- everything that you've just described what this Amendment does, is done in the Bill as amended. So what particular changes would I -- would I find in this specific Amendment? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
To you, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Well, one of the changes here is that you do have the manufacturers permit for farm winery and there's a requirement for the 25 percent. There's also the requirement in the farm winery permit for 25 percent but that 25 percent in a farm winery has to come from the property that the farmer owns. So, it puts the farm winery permit at a -- a different perspective, because they have that requirement that they have to grow and work their own land to get the product that the manufacturer doesn't.

And so, what we're -- the -- the Amendment is attempting to do is to protect that farm winery footprint and the -- the -- I'm going to say the -- in -- in prior years when this was initially adopted to -- to allow that protection for the farm winery industry so that they can continue to compete and -- and operate and preserve and protect open space. So, I think that's the difference here is that the new manufacture permit doesn't -- doesn't get to encroach on that aspect of the farm winery permit. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. To you, Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. Does the Amendment address the manufacturing wine permit? Through you, Madam President. And if so, how?
THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

I think the way that the manufacturer permit is changed is, that we've taken away that designation that you aren't going to have a manufacturer permit for wine -- for -- for farm wine and we're going to just leave the manufacturer permit as current law allows. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. To you, Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank Senator Kelly for those answers. I have no further questions. Ladies and gentlemen, I would urge rejection of the Amendment. If this Amendment is adopted, we're basically -- we're eliminating choice of a business to operate in the state of Connecticut. That's simply what it does. We just heard under the testimony of Senator Kelly that we want to preserve the Farm Winery Act but we want to eliminate the wine manufacturing permit because it's deemed to be not fair. Would it be fair to the ten current businesses operating in the state of Connecticut that this body chose to close them down? Because we want to stifle competition. When all we hear is we want to grow our economy, we want to grow jobs.

If I had enough time I would've investigated to see how many jobs would've been lost, because of an
arbitrary decision by this body, to close a business, a legitimate business that is operating here in the state of Connecticut. We shouldn't be picking winners or losers. It's about competition. It's about the free market. That's what the underlying Bill does. That's what the underlying Bill provides.

The farm wineries were right. They said we want to be able to preserve the intention and the -- the austerity of owning our farm, working our farms, growing our grapes and the product that we provide in our taste rooms can be seen right here on our lands. That doesn't change under this Bill, everything stays the same. The -- the acreage requirements, the 25 percent designation. The only thing that's being changed and proposed to be changed in this Amendment is to eliminate ten legitimate businesses in the state of Connecticut. Madam President, I urge rejection of the Amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I would be remise if I did not point out that, and to -- to just bring the focus back onto what my answer was. Those ten manufacturers still get an opportunity to sell their product. They still get an opportunity to compete. That's not removed. It's just they aren't going to be elevated to the same place as the Connecticut farmer who has the obligations and burdens of
protecting our farmland for open space that these other manufacturers of liquor do not have.

This isn't about picking winners and losers. This is about choice of the type of community in which we choose to live. Do we want our farmers to have to make a choice, a business decision to determine whether we wanna work the land and make a product and keep our communities beautiful or are we gonna start to sell off the farmland?

The choice before this Bill came up, when we created the farm winery in the first place, was that latter concept, was to enable our farmers to compete and to keep open space and to make sure that Connecticut remains the beautiful state that we all love. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you for the second time, Madam President. I just wanted to clarify something that I -- I didn't understand in the remarks. When you -- to you -- through you, Madam President, to Senator Kelly, when you said, we wanted to elevate to the same place, a wine manufacturer, a farm winery, what did he mean by that? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Kelly.
SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

With the manufacturer permit for farm winery, they're going to be occupying the same space in the -- in the liquor industry. So, we aren't putting any of the manufacturer permit participants out of business. They're not allowed to compete. They're just not going to be considered farm wineries because they don't own a farm. Yes, they will buy product from a Connecticut farm, but they don't have the obligation and the responsibility to work that land. And that's a significant distinction. So, they're going to be able to exist with -- if this Amendment passes, they continue to exist. The question is just whether or not they're going to exist with the same benefits that farms do in Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I -- I guess I'll just respectfully disagree with my -- my colleague. Under the farm winery permit, they will continue to thrive and exist with the passage of this Bill, hopefully it becomes law. Because they have niche market. Folks can go up and visit and look at the sprawling hills and walk amongst the grapevines and go into the tasting rooms. That's something that those ten businesses that I spoke about, they don't have. There was already a niche market then. They have the right and -- and the honor of calling themselves a farm winery, where those other ten
businesses are prohibited from doing that under current law, and will remain that way. They have a right to participate in the wine trail and passports, where those other wineries won't have the ability to do that. And actually, they have the right and the awesome honor of being supported by state government in the fact that we're promoting the wine trail in Connecticut, where those other facilities will not.

So, I think that we've placed the farm wineries on a higher tier already because of the generally family run farms that have been in the families for generations. We applaud the work that they do. We heard loud and clear of things they would like to do. They wanted to be able to sell some Connecticut made beer on their property for their non-wine drinkers. We accommodated that request. They are so far ahead with all the other provisions in this Bill. To me, it seems nitpicky that, at the last minute, after the heavily negotiated Bill by all the parties involved, that they're trying to do reduce the ability of an existing company to operate in the state of Connecticut. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Cassano, good evening, sir.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Good evening, Madam President. It's nice to see you. I just want to make a comment really as Chairman of Planning and Development. One of my fears over these last eight years as the Chair is, of course, the farming industry. We work closely
with the Department of Ag and so on. And we're talking here and Senator Kelly has raised the concern about the farmers, themselves, and the issues that they face. And, you know, what will they do if we make this kind of change and that kind of change.

I look at this Bill as being a very progressive change. When I read this Bill, I said, my God, this is a 21st century Bill. We don't do a lot of things like that in this party, quite honestly. It was that kind of a change.

The other 21st century change comes back to the farmer, themselves. They're going to make decisions. They may want to continue to do what they do. They may want to change and get into something like this. Or they may want to become a solar farmer. And I've always -- I've said many, many times in Committee, my worst nightmare is flying into Bradley and driving past solar farms instead of tobacco fields. Those are decisions that farmers will make and those are decisions that we need to be thinking about. And we need to make sure that we preserve what we have in a positive way. And here they brought various aspects of farming together in a collective way. And I think that's exciting. Congratulations on that effort. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you please open the machines and announce the vote?
CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. An Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 6474 as amended by Senate "A". 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. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 647, Senate Amendment "B", LCO No. 10232.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Amendment fails. Will you remark further on the Bill that is before us? Will you remark further? Oh, Senator Miner, good evening, sir.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Good evening, Madam President. So, continuing with the public family discourse, I would ask the Clerk to call Senate Amendment 10243, and I be allowed to summarize please.
THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10243, LCO -- Senate Schedule "C".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And Madam President, simply what this Amendment proposes to do is to increase the amount of product that can be produced at a spirits manufacturer from 25 thousand under the current law to 100 thousand, if this Amendment passes. And I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank -- thank you, Madam President. And so, Madam President, similar to the wine conversation that just occurred, my interest in the distillery industry is less associated with the products that they make and more associated with the opportunity, the agricultural opportunity that I think they produce by making that product here. All across the country, there are distilled spirits. So, anyone who makes distilled spirits here compete, not with
other people necessarily in the state of Connecticut, but more importantly people in Kentucky and Tennessee, people down south.

And so, when they're competing against other individuals that don't have an upside limit and they are a well-known product, my constituent, Litchfield Distillery, that was here the other day, is concerned that their ability to grow their business, increase capital expenditure, mortgage building additions is somewhat limited, if they have to keep coming back to the legislature for incremental changes. Now, I'm sure we're going to hear that they will not exceed the 50 thousand gallons in the Bill between now and next year. And certainly, the offer is made for them to come back. But this is as much about capitalization, this is as much about business growth, as it is anything else.

Unlike the wine industry, this product has to go into the three tier system. Every tax that's required to be paid on anything that comes into the state is required to be paid on this. So, they don't -- the only thing they get to do is have a tasting room. But Madam President, every other manufacturer in the country, no matter where they come from, has a tasting room. Seventy percent of the people that go into this facility, and it's not a large one, 70 percent are first time visitors. That's the only way they can market. They cannot compete on the airwaves with some of the large producers. They can't afford it. And so they've got to give it away by the glass. They have got to meet people. They've got to talk about their product. They've got to talk about the process.

If you go into the distillery, you will see a glass
tube with grain, with corn, with other grain. I don't know what those numbers come out to. I don't know what the quantities make, but they do. This is as much about chemistry. It's as much about art as it about anything. But Madam President, if we don't give them an opportunity to compete nationally, they're never going to grow to a point where they can actually look at a huge facility.

I heard Senator Witkos talk about job creation. My constituent wants to create jobs. And he appreciates the fact that we went from 25 thousand gallons to 50 thousand gallons. But in the time that this legislature has been having the conversation about that bump, they now offer liquor products in cans, premixed. And so, when you think about all these different products that they are trying to compete with nationally, I don't know when they hit the ceiling. And I don't want to put them in a position a year from now or two years from now where they have to make a decision to close the tasting room because they've exceeded the limit. And if that occurs in August, we're not in session until next year.

So, Madam -- Madam President, I don't want to cause a problem with this Bill. To the extent that I've been chasing the language, to the extent that we've been having the conversation, it has been the same issue for me. The same issue. If the competition nationwide has no upside limit, why would we put one on here.

I don't know whether he would ever grow out of a 100 thousand gallons. I'd like to think he'd grow out of that in two years, three years. But he's currently -- he's currently got an application for
an addition on the building. He's currently in negotiation to buy more grain and more corn from farmers in the state of Connecticut. I think they're doing everything right.

Madam President, this state has the ability, I think to go to the next level. We have certainly taken steps with beer. We have been involved for the last 25 years with farm wineries. It is a difficult business. We know that agriculture land is best protected by crops and not by stewardship. It is terribly expensive for people to buy property, farmland, hold it and maintain it and protect it. It’s much less expensive to do it through the agricultural process.

I agree with Senator Cassano. The last thing I want to see are solar farms on farmland. I understand that's a good energy move that is not a good agricultural move. This country, this state was almost deforested 200 hundred years ago because we had so much agriculture. People told me you could stand in the middle of Litchfield and see Bantam. I'm not saying that's where we should go back to.

I'm just saying that this conversation, when it was at a public hearing, it's my understanding the number was 100 thousand gallons. My constituent was happy at 100 thousand. He is appreciative at 50 thousand. But going to 100 thousand is not going to impact any other business in the state of Connecticut. It's only going to make us stronger. And so I would ask, respectfully, that the Bill -- the underlying Bill that we're debating here tonight be amended only to change that one number 50 thousand to 100 thousand. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? Senator Fonfara, good evening.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Good evening, Madam President. Good to see you this evening. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the Amendment. Again, I recognize the sincere efforts on the part of Senator Miner in this case to represent the interests that he, must and should, and does very well every day in this Chamber. But with respect to this provision -- this Bill before us, the underlying Bill, as I said earlier, it is an intricate balance that has been struck. In -- in an industry that has many entrench forces, it's very difficult to bring about the kinds of changes that this language presents for us tonight.

And while we can all point to something that might be different, which is just about every piece of legislation that ever comes before us, once you start to unravel that, probably doesn't end anywhere good. So, I ask the Chamber to vote down this Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I echo the comments of my -- my Chair, Senator Fonfara in rejection of the Amendment. And ever since prohibition, we've had
the three-tiered system here in Connecticut. And no -- no branch of the three tier, shall comingle or jump over each other or coexist. It should -- it should be vertically aligned and it's worked well for our state, for our industry. We don't have the problems that a lot of other states do.

And when Senator Miner's constituent came and spoke before the General Law Committee regarding this Bill, he had said that he needed an increase because he felt that, he wanted to expand his business and that the current limit of 25 thousand dollars -- 25 thousand gallons wouldn't get him there. And I want -- so folks, if you're not familiar with the liquor industry, to understand that at 25 thousand gallons doesn't mean you out of business or you're prohibited from making anymore. What that means is that's the trigger where you have to enter into the three-tiered system. Because up to 25 thousand gallons, you can sell it yourself, you can deliver it to package stores, deliver it to restaurants, you have the right to do that. But once you hit the 25 thousand -- 25 thousand gallon limit, you're considerate a -- a big boy, if you will, and if you have to use the three-tiered system. You have a distributor that would come and market your product for you, bring it to the package stores, bring it to the restaurants, you have salespeople. But some people don't want to enter that three-tiered system at the 25 thousand gallon mark.

In this case, Litchfield Distillery, which is Senator Miner's constituent. So, he made a case for himself, said, you know, my business model is working quite well, I'd like to maintain that business model and we're looking at expansion. So, the Committee, after much deliberation and
consultation with all of the stakeholders, remember, all three parts of the three-tiered system felt if doubling the gallonage from 25 thousand dollar -- I keep saying dollars, 25 thousand gallons to 50 thousand gallons, was more than adequate. And we actually said to the constituent, you know what, come back to us in a couple years and tell us where you are in your gallonage. Where are you -- where are you in your business plan? We can always modify that.

Maybe we'll have a discussion about excluding out-of-state gallons, not -- not to account of your aggregate amount. But we didn't have a public hearing on that portion of it. So, it wasn't fair to just automatically do that, because we want everybody to weigh in. Similar to this Bill, we wanted all of the stakeholders to weigh in. That's why we reached resounding agreement. We'd be more than happy to work with anybody in the future, irrespective of what permit you hold, let's bring the ideas in.

But I -- I don't want the perfect to be the enemy of the good. I think this Bill has been extremely well negotiated. It compromises on all parties involved. And at this time, we just can't accept any changes to the Bill. So, I'd urge rejection. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I request that when the roll is taken that it be taken by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

It will be taken by roll. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before us? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for a few questions, I'm just not sure of whom to ask. With regard to the tier system and the 25 thousand gallons moving to 50 in the Bill, and the quest for the Amendment is to move to 100, my question is the number of bottles that I'm seeing now is about at a quart each, is a little over six thousand. I'm not sure what lateral effect increasing it and honoring this Amendment would have on the rest of the Bill that -- that's in front of us. I'm -- I'm not sure that I understand that portion of it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I thank the gentleman for his question. First of all, I have been told that they are not a self-distributor and that they currently are in the three-tiered system. I specifically ask that question. They pay the same taxes to the state and federal government and the same cost for delivery as everybody else that
distributes liquor in the state. They may have an option below 50 thousand gallons, but they are not a self-distributor.

I'm not aware that this change in number will negatively impact anyone else in the state of Connecticut because there just aren't that many people making spirits. And that's the reason to go up. The reason to go up is that other people can look at Connecticut just like they have for wine and just like they have had for beer and can look at all the capitalized costs that are necessary, look at what it's going to cost to go to the bank and borrow money. And at 100 thousand gallons, people can look at a business model and know that it will survive.

So again, I think they're in the -- almost positive, they're in the three-tiered system. They told me that they pay the same taxes and that they're in it. Through you --

THE CHAIR:

Thank you --

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

-- Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Miner. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator for -- for that answer. And I know that Senator Witkos and Senator Fonfara worked incredibly hard on
this legislation. Probably more like a Rubik's cube than -- than any other piece of legislation that we're probably looking at. I don't want to do anything to do that, to -- to create any issues with that.

I just think it seems like an easy fix -- that this Amendment seems like an easy fix to raise it to 75 thousand or 100 thousand, I'm not sure the trickle effect for the rest of the Bill. And maybe it's something I'm not seeing. Maybe it's something I'm not understanding about the three-tiered system. But it would seem to me, on the surface, that this would not be something that would impact everything else and this would take care of a business that is operating here in the state of Connecticut. So, thank you very much, Madam President. And I appreciate any clarification that I might be able to get on that.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just for clarification point, although Senator Miner's constituent is in the three-tiered system, that was by choice of business model. The statute says that once you hit that cap amount, you must go into the three-tiered system. So, under current law, if you produce more than 25 thousand gallons of spirits, you have to -- if you're distributing that, you can no longer self-distribute, you must go into the three-tiered system. We moved that number up to 50 thousand
There was a draft that was floated around right after the public hearing which it was 100 thousand gallons in that. However, the -- the wine, the wholesalers and the distributors of the spirits said, that is way too much for people to self-distribute. We won't agree to that. We'll agree to the 50 thousand gallons, which is doubling what is currently on the law. And that's how we got to the 50 thousand gallon mark. So, it was a compromise with all the parties involved. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, kindly 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. Senate Bill 647, Senate Amendment "C", LCO No. 10243. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Amendment "C", LCO No. 10243. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. 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. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:
Senate Bill 647, Senate Amendment "C", LCO 10243.

Total number voting 36
Those voting Yea 9
Those voting Nay 27
Absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Amendment fails. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the legislation before the Chamber? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly announce the vote. The machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 647 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 647 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote in the Senate. Senate Bill 647 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 647 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 647 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

The machine will be locked since all the Senators have voted. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:
Senate Bill 647, as amended by Senate "A".

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

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I would like to yield to Senator Maroney for a point of personal privilege, please.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Maroney. Please proceed.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Good evening. Thank you, Madam President. And I rise for appoint of personal privilege. I would like to thank all of the members of the Circle and everyone at the Capitol today for their kind donations to the Save-a-Suit charity. With me is Tim Buckley [phonetic] from the -- Vice-President of the Max Cares Foundation. We had an extremely successful Save-a-Suit fund drive today. We collected over two thousand articles of professional clothing. And to put that in perspective, this is the fourth year of the event, and they averaged 700 pieces of clothing a year for the first three years. So, today we collected almost as much as we have in the previous three years.
So, I want to thank you for that and thank Max Cares in addition to making a generous donation of $25 hundred dollars, which will go towards dry cleaning all of those suits. They also collected suits at the Max Restaurants, at their restaurants and they collected 223 suits, as well, that they brought up here today. This is the first year that Save-a-Suite Foundation received funding for the private sector and we are very appreciative of that, as it costs $50 dollars per suit to dry clean them and get them repurposed for veterans, for their job interviews, again, to help them dress for success.

And if you did have the opportunity to go down there, they had great photos of some of the veterans in their fatigues and then in the suits looking ready for their professional interviews. So, I want to -- if we can give him a warm welcome and a round of applause for Tim Buckley and Max Cares. Thank you, Madam President. [Applause]

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Maroney. And Tim Buckley, so nice to see you. One of West Hartford's finest. Thanks for comin'. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just to remark some things go. Madam President, if the next item can be Calendar Page 62, Calendar 172, Senate Bill 978. Followed by Calendar Page 21, Calendar 348, Senate Bill 548. Followed by Calendar Page 18, Calendar 318, Senate Bill 588. Followed by Calendar Page 23, Calendar 369, Senate Bill 1110. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill.

CLERK:

Page 62, Calendar No. 172, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 987, AN ACT CONCERNING TEACHERS' RETIREMENT SYSTEM CONTRIBUTIONS. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Lesser.

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:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of Amendment, LCO 9494. I ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and grant leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:
LCO No. 9494, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to summarize, Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. I thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this Bill is intended to help a small number of teachers in the state of Connecticut who are caught in a sticky situation. They are state employees and they require to pay contributions for retiree healthcare to both the Teachers' Retirement System and to the State Employee Retirement System. But they only are eligible to collect one of those. And it says that, after January 1st of next year, if they -- if they are vested and they do not participate in the Teachers' Retirement System they only have to pay into the State Employees -- towards the State Employee health benefits. This is -- this limited to health benefits. Madam President, I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Amendment?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Madam -- Madam President, the Chamber will -- will stand at ease please for a second.

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will stand at ease. Senator Lesser.
SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Madam President, I'd like to yield to Senator Kelly.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Kelly. Do you accept the yield?

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Yes, Madam President. And thank you, Senator Lesser for the yield and for your work on this Bill. This was a -- a concept that was brought to us. It was a fix that I think is long overdue for teachers. It makes abundant sense so that they make one contribution, rather than two. And to that end, I stand in full support of this. I think its smart legislation and would urge adoption. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment please signify by saying "aye".

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark
further on the legislation as adopted? Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, Madam President. If there's no objection, I would like to place this item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 21, Calendar No. 348, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 548, AN ACT CONCERNING COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT AND NEIGHBORHOOD ASSISTANCE. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill and waive its reading.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):
Yes. I would like to take a brief hold. I believe Senator Fasano was going to speak on this particular Bill.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease, sir.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

If somebody could find the good Senator?

THE CHAIR:

Senate will come to order. Senator Cassano, will you remark?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Senator Fasano, I have yielded to you. This is a Bill that you proposed to the PND Committee. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano, good evening. Will you accept the yield?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Thank you and thank you, Senator Cassano for the yield. Yes, I accept the yield. Madam President, what this Bill proposes to do, is to create a community investment board -- community investment board. And the idea is that in that community money that goes to the townhalls generally do not reach the people or the community.
What this Bill does is take the money and brings it to the community. We set up a community organization of folks that represent the area and that we invest the money in that community. That community then determines what is the best way of spending this money. In some communities, it's a work adult training center. In other communities, it's a police station. In other communities, it could be a playground. In other communities, it could be adult education centers. The point is, that each community is different.

And I take the belief that, when monies start going through the townhalls and to the communities, they don't reach the actual needs within that community. Some communities don't get as much as they should, because maybe they're not as politically as active. Some communities don't get it in the right area for the development, because the townhall doesn't understand the needs of that neighborhood. You can't be every place. But I'll tell you who does, pastors, ministers, activists in the community. They know within that community if the problem is afterschool programs or more policing because of drug issues.

The way it would work is 35 percent of the grant would be identified through these communities. Another 35 percent would be the legislative body the town council. And a final 35 percent would be by the municipality. So, status quo with respect to that, Madam President.

Madam President, Office of Policy Management would then follow along and give a report on how this is going. And then, what I propose is a task force.
And what the task force would do, is be able to look at how our not-for-profit providers in our communities do the work. And they would look at it and look at what -- how they do it, the compliance work. It's made up of the typical task force people we see predominantly in this General Assembly that we appoint. They will then make a report on January 1st, 2020 identifying the shortfalls and the needs of the not-for-profits in these communities, so, we as legislature, can determine what's the best way of amplifying our not-for-profits.

Madam President, in this Bill, the original Bill, there was an issue which was somewhat surprising to me, which is, there was also going to be a website in which the community can write into this website and not only with the folks that we appoint to this Board be able to tell how to invest the money into the community, but general population could write in and give suggestions. Madam President, apparently OFA said that that website would cost $40 thousand dollars. We are told in this building never to question OFA because they are who they are. So, in that case, I would ask to call LCO 7326.

THE CHAIR:

Okay. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7326, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.
SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move the Amendment and request permission to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to summarize, sir.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It still leaves the whole website in there, but just says within available appropriations. Because I think you could do a website within available appropriations. So, with that, summarizing this Bill, essentially what it does, it puts the power in the people. It puts the power in the community, at least to the point of one-third, where they can determine what's best for their neighborhoods; not dependent upon bureaucracy, not dependent upon politics, not dependent upon a system that may or may -- may or may not know the needs of a community, but directly invest in those pastors, ministers, activists, community leaders who understand the granular part of their neighborhood, who understand the real deficiencies and can use that money.

I might add, this is for a population of 65 thousand and above, in terms of where this Bill would be applicable. Because if we're going to change our cities, the change must come within. I believe the strength of our state depends upon the strength of our cities. I have said that forever and I still believe that. And if we're going to do it, we got to let people who are in our cities determine how to make that change and become invested in that change.
If they suggest that this is going to be good and they get the money, they're going to be invested in making sure that works as opposed to getting money from a townhall that says take this program, we're telling you it's good, whether you have a buy-in or not, we're telling you it's good, and trust us. I don't think that results happened.

We should try something new. When we say what do you need, here you go, tell us how it's working, if not we'll change something else. But they're invested, they're going to make it work. Madam President, I know this is a unique idea. And I know that some folks it's difficult in a state of city habits to wake up and say, let the people have a right. But this is let the people have a right, not 100 percent; 35 percent. The other 70 -- 65 percent is still done in some traditional manner. Why not give it a shot? Why not let the people determine what's right for their neighborhoods, not politics, not bureaucracy, not theorists.

Madam President, I would ask that we have a vote on the -- I would move the Amendment. I guess, I have to do that first before I get to the vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The Amendment has been moved. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? And with that, will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:
Aye.

THE CHAIR:

All those opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the amended legislation?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Now, that we're halfway there, Madam President, I would hope that we can get all the way there. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise to speak against the -- the Bill. You know, this past winter, we heard a lot about regionalization and about forest regionalization. That became a term that was kind of ubiquitous, certainly out on the campaign trail, I can tell you, but at the capitol as well. And I heard from a lot of constituents in towns that, you know, they wanted home rule. That the --- they took great pride in how their municipality was governed and their democracy in their town was working just fine. And they did not want Hartford meddling further in -- in how their town worked. And I thought a lot of their arguments were actually fairly persuasive.

So, I'm scratching my head a little bit with this Bill that home rule is fine for a municipality with
59,999 people but with 60 thousand, it's not. And now, we have -- if this Bill were to pass, additional levels of bureaucracy. In my hometown of West Hartford, population around 68 thousand, we would have neighborhoods competing against neighborhoods with these mandate -- mandated community investment boards. We would be telling, essentially, our Mayor and Town Council that they're not component enough to -- to manage the town themselves.

And I would say, if you look at the track record, and this is not just about West Hartford, but I am very proud of my hometown, I would say our -- our Mayor was recently named one -- the best community leader in the state of Connecticut, according to one -- one magazine. We have a AAA bond rating. We have two of the best high schools in the state of Connecticut. We're continually ranked one -- one of the best places to live, not only in the state of Connecticut but in the entire country. Money Magazine ranked us 15 one year, 48 another. Livability, we just came in number 68 in the entire country.

So, I think our Town Council and the Mayor are doing a heck of a job in West Hartford. Per people spending $16 thousand dollars, a little bit more, below the state average, and our DURG by about a thousand dollars, 21 percent free and reduced lunch. Some of the best public schools in the state of Connecticut. Yet, we're going to micromanage the town of West Hartford.

And as I said, it's not just about West Hartford. But it's about all these other towns and these cities, and we're going to say, you know what, we're
going to bring in this new level of bureaucracy and we're going to force these boards in here and we're gonna at some -- at some point negotiate how MERSA money is -- is divvied up. And at some point, if there can't be an agreement, maybe that they would actually lose the funding all together. It makes absolutely no sense to me if -- if home rule and respect for governance is good enough for a small town, it's good enough for West Hartford, it's good enough for our larger towns. I think we should have faith in our Town Council. I certainly do. And faith in our Mayor. And I urge my colleagues to vote against this Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Slap. Will you remark further on the Bill that is amended? Will you remark further? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate the comments by Senator Slap. The only thing I would say is competition is healthy and competition is good. Any grants that are competitive, which we do have in the state of Connecticut, always yield the best product. It breeds innovation. It breeds excitement. It breeds support. Telling people what to do is the mandate that hasn't worked. I'm not saying it's the panache by any stretch of the imagination.

But what I have seen are things that haven't worked. And there's nothing more bureaucratic than going through the townhalls. Nothing is more bureaucratic. Because then, you have to placate to
power. You have to speak to power. You have to yield to power. You have to beg to power. This says, no, compete and let's do what's best for the community.

I appreciate Senator Slap's comments. I do not come from a District that has that many. Although I do come for the District that has the best two high schools, I will take issue with that. But -- but I will tell you that Madam President, I believe this is the right way to go. But I appreciate the Senator's comments. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes. I -- Madam President, I would like to make a few comments on the Bill. It's ironic, when I first came here, Senator Fasano and I were partners, as -- as Ranking Member and Chairman. I used to, every time somebody would say anything, I'd say Ino, if it was good, I thought it was me, if it was bad I thought it was Flynn. [laughter] Cassano and Fasano really get mixed up in PND.

I -- I rise in an unusual position to introduce this but vote against it. And I -- coming from the role, not so much as serving here in the state Senate for my ninth year, but serving as a Mayor or Deputy Mayor for 28 years, during that period of time, many of the types of projects that Senator Fasano was talked about here, we routinely did. But we did it with the people of the community. As an example,
community development block grants, we have always had a citizens' committee every year that I can remember that would get together and make recommendations, suggestions for the distribution of those funds for the town of Manchester.

I've been long gone in that position but they still have done the same thing. We have one of the largest parcels of land east of the river that's been vacant for a couple of years. And now, they've taken, instead of using contractors and going out to get professionals to sell it, the community has taken a different approach. The Mayor, again, has gone to the community and the community has put together a committee and that committee has done a lot of work to come up with ideas, and now have four perspective buyers in less than three months looking at the property. People want to be part of the process.

Outside of the process itself, is the process of honesty, temptation, and so on. And those are things we have to deal with in municipal government. It's ironic that I was saying to Senator Slap a little while ago, we talked about town managers, and I can't tell you, and I if somebody could tell me, I'd be surprised, of a scandal in any town that's been led by a town manager here in the state of Connecticut. State of Connecticut is -- is known throughout the country for its -- its leadership ability, its communities, and so on.

And as a Mayor with a town manager form of government, you learn from experts. You work with the community. You're also sworn in under an oath. You are protected as -- as far as funding, so that in -- in case there are errors and so on, you're
protected as an official of the town of Manchester. I don't believe any of that would be extended to a Citizens' Committee, quite honestly, because how do you define that Citizens' Committee.

So, I just think it adds a layer of government that we don't need. If communities are not reaching out to the same people that Senator Fasano was talking about in this Bill, then they're missing out on what they should be doing. Invite them and they will come. And I hope that they do in these communities that have not responded. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further on the Bill that is before us? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, please announce the vote. 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 548 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 548 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 548 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 548 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 548 as amended by Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:
Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? If so, the machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 548, as amended by Senate "A".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Legislation fails. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 18. Calendar No. 318, Substitute for Senate Bill 588, AN ACT PROHIBITING OFF-SHORE DRILLING FOR OIL AND GAS IN CONNECTICUT. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, 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 COHEN (12TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This Bill would prohibit drilling for oil or gas in the waters of our state. It also prohibits seismic mapping for the purposes of oil and gas exploration. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO 8000. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 8000, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to summarize.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment is simply a small technical fix that replaces the word territorial with the word coastal with respect to
waters.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Pretty sneaky, somebody unplugged the mic. All right. So, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I just wanted to clarify a few things under the Bill as drafted, if I might, through you to the Chairman of the Environment Committee, please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed. Senator Cohen, prepare yourself.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I remember during the public hearing and then during the meeting that followed when we voted on this
language, there was some conversation about whether seismic testing that we were going to restrict might be used for other purposes. Am I correct, that the seismic testing that might be used for determining a surface hardness, let's say for a bridge repair or some other structure that might be built in Long Island Sound, that's not for one of these purposes, let's say associated with either oil or gas, would still be permitted in the state of Connecticut? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, yes. That is correct. The only seismic mapping that would be prohibited for the purposes of this Bill would be for oil and gas exploration.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Oh, and Senator Miner, before you proceed, I would like to welcome our guests in the gallery and ask that they please follow the rules, which prohibit taking photos. We welcome you here. You are welcome to observe. But please do not take photos,
as the Senate rules do prohibit that. Please proceed, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank -- thank you, Madam President. And so, I'm remembering that, when there was a conversation about the blue plan, I think we've had conversation with regard to perhaps agricultural purposes, again with permitting structures that may be associated with those seismic testing that might be used in those regards, would also still be permitted. Is that correct? Through you --

THE CHAIR:

Senator --

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

-- Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, yes. That is correct. Blue plan mapping would still be allowed under this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):
And lastly, as amended, the language would be limited to the state of Connecticut water. This wouldn't really effect the jurisdiction in New York, if I understand it correctly, with the Amendment. Is that correct? Through you --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

-- Madam President.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, yes. That is correct.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I join the Chair in asking that the Chamber support the language. I'm not aware that anyone has contemplated doing any gas or oil exploration, but I guess we can never be too cautious. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? If -- will -- Senator Cohen.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection, I would ask that the Bill be placed on Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk can return to the Call of the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 23, Calendar No. 369, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1110, AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO RECORDS BY PERSONS WHO ARE INJURED WHILE IN THE CUSTODY OF THE COMMISSIONER OF CORRECTION.

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:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, there's a strike-all Amendment, LCO 10229. I'd ask that to be called and I be granted leave of the Chambers to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10229, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This strike-all Amendment that is before us deals with an issue that came to the Judiciary Committee of Inmates who may have, unfortunately, experienced a fatal injury or a
permanent disability while they were incarcerated, and the family is trying to find out a little bit about what happened and not being able to necessarily access records. And so, what it does is it allows the inmate, their legal representative, a representative of the estate to provide written requests to the Department for documents and the -- the -- the documents would be provided by the Department. The materials and documents would be provided by the document. The Department of Corrections would be establishing regulations around the disputes that might arise naturally from the requests. And also would be putting forward regulations about the --

THE CHAIR:

Pardon me, Senator. It is getting rather loud in here and difficult to hear you. So, I would just ask our staff and guests in the Chamber to please keep it a little quiet so that we can hear the debate. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And also would be -- the Department would also be putting forward regulations around the delineation of fees. In the second section of the Bill, the Department of Corrections is required to post on its website or on its internet website, the information about the inmates -- I'm sorry, I said that wrong. Give me one second, Madam President. It's required to post notice informing the inmate that they are required to sign a Release of Information if they want a family member to have access to that medical information. I urge adoption.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel, good evening.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good evening. Thank you very much, Madam President. Just a couple of questions to create some legislative history. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

First of all, I have a little bit of a concern. It says in here that the Department of Corrections would have to provide the records within 60 days unless one of three things took place. It's a violation of common law privilege prohibited by state or federal law. But the first sort of delineation is, could pose a risk to safety and security. And I'm just wondering what that means from Senator Winfield's perspective. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President, that's a very good question. I -- I'm not sure that I could lay out
exactly what safety -- let's see the term, safety and security actually would mean in the context of the Department of Corrections. I think that's also why we wanted to make sure that this is not completely subjective on their part and that they would be required to have those regulations that would allow for a process to dispute -- a process of resolving any of the disputes that might arise. So, I would imagine that in the Department's mind, there are clear guidelines to what is a risk to safety or security, but in the minds of a prisoner, they're not. And under the process that would be created, we would be able to find resolution. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank -- thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. So, if somebody submitted a request, 60 days go by, nothing happens, there's a follow up, and the Department says it's a risk to safety and security, and more time goes on, and -- and they say it's an ongoing investigation, and it's just being dragged out, sort of the safety valve is this dispute resolution mechanism where the Department, itself, has to create a dispute resolution process. And is it anticipated since Section 1 is to go into effect by October 1st, 2019, that -- well -- well, actually when would this dispute system regulations be -- be -- have to be put into effect? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. The Bill doesn't lay out that date. But I would point that, also in the section where that is number -- the first part of the section and item number three on line 29, it also talks about the Department would have to lay out the circumstances under which the deadline for production of documents may be extended beyond 60 days. So, that -- there would be a process to dispute any claims that the Department wasn't doing what it was supposed to do. But there would also be clear guidelines upon which they could extend beyond 60 days. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Well, I think this is a little amorphous at this point in time, but it's a strong step in the right direction. My last question is that the Department itself would establish fees. I sort of, in my gut, have an idea of what's an appropriate fee and what's an inappropriate fee. Would there be an opportunity for the legislature to review this? For example, something being a dollar a page doesn't seem to me outrageous, something being $10 dollars a page, I think it would be outrageous. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, Madam President. While the Bill does not say that, we always have, I think some people think too much, but we always have the ability to come back and make a change in the law. I also have been in conversation about what we are attempting to do here and have been assured that the Department wants to work with us so that we do not do that sort of thing. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I have no more questions for Senator Winfield. I would say that the Department has a -- has a history of being cooperative. I also feel that, my recent experiences with Commissioner Cook and -- and others, has been very positive.

In support of the Amendment that becomes the Bill, I distinctly remember the day where the Judiciary Committee heard public testimony regarding this, and it was quite moving. And it was way more than one case. I mean, there was a case where a young lady was incarcerated for one day and then found dead. And her family members, I think until -- until the time of the hearing, still hadn't gotten a resolution as to what did or did not take place.
As -- as a dad with two sons, if I lost a child who was just incarcerated for a day, I -- I would be heartbroken and would not tolerate not being able to find out what did or did not take place, whether to pursue legal proceedings or at least obtain some sort of closure.

There were others were there was injuries, and again, it took a prolonged period of time. And I -- I just don't get it. So, something needs to be done. I am very hopeful that something positive will come out of all of this. I think if it was this kind of time delay with a private entity, we wouldn't tolerate it for a second. And my heart went out to each and every one of those family members that came and took the time and waited patiently and testified about a loved one who was either seriously injured, because as the Amendment and the underlying Bill states, this is in death cases or cases where there's permanent injury. And so, those are serious, by their very nature.

So, I would urge my colleagues to support the Amendment that becomes the Bill. And I -- I would think that the Judiciary Committee, knock on wood, God willing, we're all alive and back on that Committee next February, would be able to circle back and see how this is working out. And -- and if needs any further revisions, I'm sure that will be part of one of the issues that we will continue to look into.

And again, I would like to thank Senator Winfield for bringing all the parties around the table, working with Corrections to try and iron this issue out. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Hartley. Actually, we are still on the Amendment. Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I rise in support of the Amendment and in recognition of the leadership of the Judiciary Committee and Senator Winfield and the members of that Committee regarding the issue that this Amendment seeks to correct. Part of the genesis of this Amendment was actually the fatal story which occurred and happened with a constituent of mine, whose son had been incarcerated for a period of two years. And very, very close to the time that he was to complete his term, his mom was informed that he had passed away. Not being aware of any of the circumstances that led up to this and, in fact, not even knowing that his health might have been in jeopardy in any way, it was a complete and utter shock to her and the family. He had a young daughter, two years old. But -- but then the situation got totally exasperated as it went on for almost three years, during which his mom tried to understand what had happened and, in fact, what was his cause of death, and could not get any information at all.

And just picture, you have the death of your child, as tragic as that is, but you don't know and they're in the custody, by the way, of the state of Connecticut, and -- and you cannot find out for almost three years that one, their health was in -- in a compromised way and continued to be worse, and two, that they had expired.
So, I cannot commend the work of the Judiciary Committee and Senator Winfield and I wholeheartedly support this as a very, very meager step in trying to address what those families have gone through. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the amended legislation before us? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I -- I just want to make a couple of brief comments. So, the piece of legislation before us and all of the things that the Judiciary Committee was doing just had not made it to on the list. And then, I listened to someone tell a story about their son and it moved me, like a lot of the things that we hear.

And I want to thank Senator Kissel, Representative Stafstrom, and Representative Rebimbas, because in a meeting -- in a meeting, I -- in a meeting that we
had, I requested that this get put on the list and we try to do things by a vote of all of the leadership of the Committee, and they hadn't necessarily sat there and heard the story, but agreed that we should put it on the list. And when we put it on the list and we talked to the attorney who was representing the family, all they actually wanted us to do was to allow them to get a chance to be heard. They did not expect that the Bill would be sitting here on this evening. They just wanted to be heard. And because of the fact that the Committee worked so well together, they got a chance to be heard, they got a chance to move the Committee, and we're here today. And I think we're going to have a good vote on this. And I think that's a very good thing. And I just wanted to put that on the record. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. -- Senator Duff.

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

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Clerk now please call Calendar Page 20?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR DUFF:

Calendar Page 20, Calendar 339, Senate Bill 1095.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 20, Calendar No. 339, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1095, AN ACT CONCERNING MUNICIPAL ETHICS. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I
move for 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 FLEXER (29TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Bill before us comes from the Office of State Ethics. It is an effort to extend some of the provisions of our state ethic's codes that apply to various state officials -- two officials in our municipalities. The -- the Bill was debated in the Government Administration Elections Committee and had a lot of conversations and the Office of State Ethics has been working diligently with advocates from the Connecticut conference and municipalities and the Council of Small Towns and other interested parties that work with municipalities to try to find some consensus around basic standards. For ethics in our municipalities currently, some municipalities in our state, have ethics codes, but the vast majority of municipalities do not. And so, this Bill seeks to remedy that and ensure that all -- all towns have a basic level of -- of ethics.

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO No. 9869. If the Clerk would please call the Amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:
LCO No. 9869, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to summarize, Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move adoption and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please do proceed.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Amendment before us is a strike-all Amendment. It makes the Bill much narrower than the original Bill that was debated in our Committee, and again, what is in this Amendment, represents the good work of the Office of State Ethics, the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities, and the Connecticut Council of Small Towns. They've worked to find consensus on how to make sure our municipalities do have some basic minimum standards and codes of ethics in all towns and cities in our state. And I'm hopeful that my colleagues in the Senate will agree with the consensus that those three organizations have come to and support this Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Good evening,
SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I just -- I'm going to get up only one time. I will support the Amendment and assume that the Amendment will be adopted and then support the Bill which will be the Amendment once it's adopted. The Chairman is absolutely correct. When this Bill came to the Committee, I was one of the folks that objected to the language that was placed before us, not because we don't believe that the individual municipalities across our state should have an ethics code for their individual towns, but because the example that was given to us in the Bill that came before the Committee was very broadly written and it would have imposed a lot of essentially mandates on those individual towns.

The Amendment improves the Bill significantly. I'm very pleased that the Office of State Ethics communicated with CCM and cost and managed to develop some legislation that I think everyone can live with. It is still a very minor mandate in which it is going to require every municipality in our state to adopt a code of ethics by a date certain, which is January 15th of 2021. But essentially, they are left -- testing. There you are. [Laughter] I lost the mic for a moment. They will be left to their own devices to decide exactly what that ethics code will be. I think it is an excellent compromise.

I -- I appreciate the -- we'll try this microphone instead. Thank you, Madam President. If anyone was watching, we were just losing the mic in and out a
couple of times. So, I will just close by saying that the Amendment is a very good Amendment. It improves the Bill dramatically. It's a great compromise. All of the parties have been involved in the discussion and I encourage the support of the Amendment and assuming that Amendment is adopted, passage of the Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment that is before the Chamber, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? And the Amendment is adopted overwhelmingly. With that, will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if there is no objection, I move that we place this Bill in our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection to placing this on Consent? Seeing none, it is so ordered. Senator Sampson, do
you object? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Madam President, forgive me, I don't know that we voted on the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

We did. We did.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Oh, it was a very brief vote that I must have missed.

THE CHAIR:

It -- it was. We did --

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

So, the Amendment --

THE CHAIR:

-- the Amendment was --

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

-- was adopted?

THE CHAIR:

-- adopted overwhelming.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):
Very good. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

All right. Thank you very much, sir. Okay. With that, seeing no objection, the item goes on the Consent Calendar. Mr. Clerk. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would the Clerk now please call Calendar Page 12, Calendar 222, Senate Bill 698?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 12, Calendar No. 222, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 698, AN ACT CONCERNING COMLAINTS OF WORKPLACE VIOLENCE OR ABUSIVE CONDUCT INVOLVING STATE EMPLOYEES. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill as -- as amended.

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

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Yes, Madam President. This is a Bill, AN ACT CONCERNING COMPLAINTS OF WORKPLACE VIOLENCE OR ABUSIVE CONDUCT INVOLVING STATE EMPLOYEES. And it would require that annually, starting February 1st, 2020, the Commissioner of Administrative Services shall submit a report to the General Assembly and the Committees having cognizance of these matters, a summary of the number of complaints of workplace violence or abusive conduct involving state employees, and the outcomes of such complaints for the preceding year, also, recommendations for administrative or legislative action related to such complaints and any additional information or recommendations deemed necessary and relevant regarding the reporting. And there is an Amendment I would like to ask the -- that the Amendment, LCO No. 7808 be called.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7808, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark, Senator Kushner?

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Amendment calls for
in line 3, after shall insert within available appropriations. So, that would be applied to this Bill so that we are requesting that the Commissioner do this within available appropriations. So, I -- I believe this is a Bill that will help us to track any workplace violence issues that are occurring within the state. And I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I also rise in support of the Bill as amended. I just wanted to be sure that this reporting requirement isn't necessarily limited to employee versus employee violence. That there may be some settings where the public may actually be part of the violence. And so, am I correct, I'm trying to remember back to the public hearing, that it is specific only to
employees or does it include the possibility that there may be violent occurrences that would also be collected in terms of the data? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Through you, Madam President. I don't see any restriction on this that says anything about it being only related to employee on employee and, you know, I think it is broad in saying a number of the complaints of workplace violence or abusive conduct. And I think we would want to be made aware of all such cases.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would agree with the Co-Chair of the Labor Committee that it is important to collect all the data. I can remember, at times, when employees in the Motor Vehicle Department felt that there was some level of possible violence there. I'm sure there are other state employees that feel, from time to time, that they have been either verbally abused or physically abused. And so, I think it's important for us to collect all of that data. And so, I urge my colleagues to support the Bill as amended. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the legislation as amended? Will you remark further? Senator Somers, good evening.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes. Sorry. Yes, Madam President. The -- the Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 7759.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

I was hoping that you could call that Amendment, please.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7759, Senate Schedule "B".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I waive the reading and seek the opportunity to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.
SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Thank you. This Amendment would, after the last section, add some additional language, which has to do with any state employee that is convicted or pleads guilty to any crime which is a felony related to the state employee's care or treatment of a person in a state operated facility, as defined by Section 17(a)458, that the Attorney General should be able to apply to the Superior Court in order to provoke or reduce the pension in any kind to which this public official or state municipal employee was otherwise entitled to. And this has to do with, again, what we have seen within our state facilities by state employees committing crimes against those are in their care.

And the severity of the crime related to the care or treatment of the -- by the state employee of the person in the state operated facility, for which the state employee has been convicted to or which the state employee has plead guilty to, would determine, in the Attorney Generals purview, as to what type of action he or she at the time would like to take.

And I believe that this would add great confidence going forward for those who have not only been the victim of perhaps this situation but others that have had to work with the state employees that have partaken or, unfortunately, chose to partake in this type of behavior. And I seek the Circle's support in amending this Bill to make sure this goes forward. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff. Thank you, Senator Somers. Senator
Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to mark this item as PT and move to the next item, which is Calendar 253.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 64, Calendar No. 253, Senate Bill No. 765, AN ACT ENSURING FAIR AND EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

I'm sorry, can we stand at ease for a moment?

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease. Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. 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 KUSHNER (24TH):

Yes, Madam President. This is a Bill that will -- would amend the current -- that add on to the current statute regarding equal -- ensuring fair and equal pay for equal work. And there is an Amendment I would like to call LCO No. -- hold on a second. What was it? 9581.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9581, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The -- this is a -- an Amendment that would strike Section 1 in its entirety and renumber the entire proposed Bill. And this proposed Bill allows that, when there's a seniority study that has been done to demonstrate that there's not a differential in pay, that the seniority system cannot -- must exclude any time that had been spent by an employee on leave due to a pregnancy-related condition or protected Family and Medical Leave, and that would not be considered as having reduced seniority. And that's the essence of this -- this proposed Bill. And I would urge my
colleagues to adopt it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kushner. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I support the Amendment. I think reserving an individual's position in seniority, whether they're male or female, related to an absent -- an absence due to -- due to -- due to pregnancy or some other type of protected Family and Medical Leave is important. And I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I'll be very brief. I want to say first off, that I'm pleased that the Amendment passed. Because I think the first section of the Bill was the more onerous piece, and I'm glad that it was taken out. And what we're left with is a very modest change in the current law regarding seniority being preserved if someone is out on leave. The reason I'm getting up is for two -- to make two very simple points.

First off, this type of policy is something that I object to, just on philosophical grounds. I know that we live in a world where there is a constant desire to create equity where equity does not exist. Every individual has advantages and disadvantages, and that is not based on their race or their gender or age or any of the other qualifiers that seem to be present in the political realm these days. Employers hire people and pay them based on their value to them. Much like the conversation that we had about the minimum wage. People pay a wage based on the value of the job that person's doing, not something reflective of the person, themselves.

I think it's a mistake, when we continue to try and categorize people in certain ways to make them equal. Two people who may do the same job, don't necessarily deserve the same pay. One of them may have more value to the employer. He might trust one of those employees more than the other. So, that if he was ever in a situation where he had to choose one over the other, he would pick the one he trusts more. And therefore, he might be willing to pay that person more. That's a value that is added to that person that cannot be reflected in the notion of equal pay for equal work.
And that brings me to why I'm standing here. Which is simply because of the title of this Bill. The title of the Bill offends me. I'll just be honest about that. I have been the recipient of political attack after political attack because, I supposedly, do not believe in equal pay for women or equal rights women because of the titles of Bills that have been before this legislature. And that's obviously untrue. I treat people as individuals. I do not categorize them by race or gender or anything else. I, like many other famous people in our history including Martin Luther King, Jr., I like to categorize people based on merit and merit alone. I don't pay attention to what color they are, their age, or their gender. And when we write laws like this, that's exactly what we are doing.

This Bill, Madam President, is a modest change. It is not a big deal. It probably is not going to affect anyone adversely. But I fear that the reason why it is here, is simply because it is a title that can be used against political candidates in the future, depending on how they vote. I think that's disgraceful. I don't think it belongs in this Chamber or in this building ever. And I'm going to vote no on the Bill, because I'm not afraid of that. Because I'm more than happy to stand up and explain to people that I believe in the principles that made this country great, which is freedom and opportunity and that means for people to achieve greatness no matter who they are and it also means that businesses should be able to choose how they're going to pay their people based on the value of those employees to them.

I will just close by reminding everyone that that relationship between employer and employee is a
voluntary one on both sides. They both get to choose whether that's a good situation, and that's what makes our country great. Madam President, thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I just rise as a -- a point of order, because of the fact, when we debate issues, we do not debate people's motivations. And to say that it's -- a Bill is designed for political opportunity or political malar or some sort of a political issue, is not in line with the rules of our Senate and the body and in the -- and in what we do here as a Circle. So, I'd just like to raise that issue and urge members to be careful and to stay within the boundaries of the rules that we have, and not to call out individual motivations. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? If not, Mr. Clerk, kindly call the vote. 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 765 as amended by
Senate "A". Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 765 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 is locked. Mr. Clerk kindly announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 765, as amended by Senate "A".

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

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] And the measure is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, will the Clerk now please call Calendar Page 60, Calendar 51, Senate Bill 753?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 60, Calendar No. 51, Substitute for Senate Bill
No. 753, AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATEWIDE BAN ON FRACKING WASTE. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This Bill will ban the storage, disposal, handling, and use of hydraulic fracking waste in the state of Connecticut. There has been many concerns, both health and environmental concerns, as far as the risk factors go with fracking waste. So far, 58 towns across the state of Connecticut have a fracking ban in place and Connecticut would join Vermont, as well as many other New York counties, I believe 15 it's up to at this point, in a statewide ban.

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of a -- of an Amendment, LCO 9936. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9936, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Yes. Please proceed to summarize.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So, this Bill -- this Amendment rather, adds on to the Bill a preemption clause so that there can be one uniform statewide fracking waste ban. So, that is what the Amendment does. And I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds. All -- all in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying aye.
SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Good evening, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I, too, rise in support of the Bill as amended. We've heard a fracking Bill as I recall in the Environment Committee probably for the last six years, and every year we hear this issue. We hear from very passionate individuals that are concerned that some of these products may find their way into the state. And we've heard testimony about using them as deicers, we've heard fill material. We've heard all sorts of things.

What has been most difficult, I think, for the Committee is to try and resolve these 58 different ordinance decisions. And so, this year we tried to take probably the most consistent combined comments and put them into a Bill. And I think the important part of the Amendment that we passed is that next time, if someone wants to add something, at least we'll do it at the state level. And we're not going to have this patchwork of ordinances.

So, I do support the Bill. I'm happy that we passed the Amendment. And I would urge the Chamber to join me in supporting it. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the amended Bill. When I was serving as the Mayor of the town of South Windsor, our town was one of the first towns in the state which actually did agree and -- and passionately, almost unanimously supported protecting our citizens. We felt that it's important.

If you look at the -- the risks that are -- that people get exposed to with some of the materials, that actually can result in -- most of these are carcinogens, well-documented by data. Yale University has done some of the most good work on the -- the chemicals and exposures that result in -- in neoplastic or cancerous process development in individuals.

I would urge people to -- all my colleagues to support this. We have a responsibility to protect our citizens for the state of Connecticut. I know that some of our towns have much more stronger ordinances. I -- I wish we would protect those ordinances that people have chosen to be stronger than the one that we have right now. But we need to, as a state, come together on this very important issue. So, with that, thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you Senator Anwar. Will you remark further? Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of this Bill. In 2014, I worked -- I tried to pass a Bill like this working with former state Representative James Albis and we failed. We tried. We were able to get a moratorium that exists to this day but it's the -- through the tenacity of folks like Senator Cohen that we're actually at the -- we're almost to the point of being able to pass this into a permanent statewide ban.

But I do want to speak to one element of this Bill, which is the preemption question. Because I know it's something that is a sensitive question. But over the last few years what has changed in 2014 is exactly what Senator Miner discussed a few minutes ago, which is the efforts of grass-roots activists all around the state to talk about this as a local issue and organized at a local level. But that work is not for nothing.

It is what's changed that has given us the -- in this Chamber the impetus to turn that temporary moratorium -- the moratorium into a permanent ban. I think that is finally pushing us to that this night and I strongly support the Bill. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? If not, Mr. Clerk, kindly call
the roll and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call Vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 753 as amended by Senate "A".

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 753, as amended by Senate "A".

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those 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. For the purposes of markings, if the Clerk will now please call -- if the marker goes, on Calendar Page, let's see here, on Calendar Page 22. Oh, Senate stand at ease for a moment, please?

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if the Clerk would now please call Calendar Page 40, Calendar 510, House Bill 6754.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 40, Calendar No. 510, Substitute for House Bill No. 6754, AN ACT CONCERNING REIMBURSEMENT FOR THE PURCHASE OF BODY-WORN ELECTRONIC RECORDING EQUIPMENT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano, good evening.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, good evening, Madam President. I'd like to take a temporary hold for a second.

THE CHAIR:
Senate will stand at ease.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Madam President, I will defer to the Senate Leader.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would like to move this Bill, House Bill 6754 to the Consent Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

So noted.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if the Clerk would now please call Calendar Page 64, Calendar 284, Senate Bill 957.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 64, Calendar No. 284, Senate Bill 957, AN ACT CONCERNING THE INCLUSION OF COMPUTER SCIENCE INSTRUCTION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL CURRICULUM, PROGRAMS OF TEACHER PREPARATION AND ALTERNATE ROUTE TO CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS. AND THE CREATION OF AN
ADJUNCT COMPUTER SCIENCE INSTRUCTOR PERMIT AND A COMPUTER SCIENCE ENDORSEMENT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR McCRODY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam. Can we stand at ease for a second?

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would the Clerk please call Calendar Page 53, Calendar 59? I'd like to PT this item until it comes up or do we have it up now? We have it up. We'll continue on this Bill then. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Senator Maroney or wait -- Senator McCrory. Senator McCrory.

SENATOR McCRODY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'm going to yield 957 to Senator Maroney. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Senator Maroney, do you
accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Yes, I do, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO 10260. I would ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

And sir, do you move adoption?

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Yes, I do, Madam President. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10260, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the Amendment. I ask that it's reading be waived and seek leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please do proceed to summarize, sir.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This Bill is, in effect, aimed at becoming similar to the CS for Rhode Island's initiative but a computer science for Connecticut initiative with the goal of eventually having every state -- every school in the state of Connecticut teaching computer science. Currently, less than 30 percent of our schools in the state of Connecticut are teaching computer coding.

I initially became interested in computer programming about five years when I heard from the Yale Entrepreneur Institute that when their companies received venture funding that they were told that they had to leave the state of Connecticut. And the reason they were told they had to leave, was because there wasn't enough entry level computer coding talent at -- at that time. I worked with Senator -- then Senator Slossberg who had put in a Bill to require every middle school and high school in the state to offer exposure to computer coding.

So, this Bill builds upon that effort. I would like to thank Senator McCrory for his work on this Bill, as well as Senator Fonfara and Senator Witkos. Senator Witkos and I had actually attended a conference back in December -- November or December
and he's been to several conferences on the computer coding. And he will be speaking on this Bill.

In essence, there are a number of sections to the Bill, so I'll just go over the highlight. We'll become the first state in the country to require computer coding to preservice teachers. Again, there is sometimes schools have difficulty finding computer science teachers. So, we will require exposure to all of the teachers in the teacher certification programs to have some exposure. Again, and what's important to remember is we're not teaching them to become computer scientists, we're teaching them to become computer science teachers and to be able to inspire that in students.

We are requiring the Department of Education to come up with an endorsement for computer science teachers so it'll be a separate endorsement that they can earn. We are asking the Office of Higher Education to create an alternate route to certification for computer science teachers, again, to help mid-career professionals become computer science teachers -- endorsement.

And then, we are also -- so, we're looking at this in a two-prong effort. One, within five years, there are expected to be two and a half million open computer coding jobs in the United States. And this is a critical skill for our students to have. In fact, Code.org has shown that students who take the -- take place in computer coding classes actually improve their scores on both their reading and math assessments.

So, what I've gone through now is how we're going to try to attack this for the K-12 students to help,
you know, improve the opportunities available to them for the rest of their lives. But currently, we have almost six thousand open computer coding jobs in the state of Connecticut. So, we also have an immediate need to fill those. We are adding into the early college high school preparation for computer coding for career opportunities.

We are having the DECD conduct a workforce study to analyze the workforce and our needs across the state and then work across Departments to determine a plan for meeting those workforce needs. We're also asking the Department of Economic and Community Development to develop a model internship program to distribute to companies. And the reason is, we've heard from companies that many of them don't know how to run their own internship program. And so, this will be an internship in a box for them. And part of the reason behind this is that Yale Entrepreneur Institute did another survey of 45 businesses that were started, half of them left the state, half of them stayed. Of the half that stayed, the number one reason was that they formed a relationship beyond the college campus.

And so, one of the goals here is to help facilitate relationships for students beyond the college campus with the hopes that they will stay in our state and grow businesses and add to our -- our workforce and formulate those important relationships. And then, we created a non-lapsing account for companies to make donations. There are a lot of foundations that will donate towards computer science education.

And then in the last, we also asked that when sixth grade they're developing the student success plans for the students, that they mention to them about
the careers of STEM related fields and computer science. This is a -- a strike-all Amendment with bipartisan support.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Maroney. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Good evening, Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good evening, Madam President. Thank you. Madam President, I rise in strong support as Ranking Member of the Education Committee on this proposed legislation. I think this is a -- a really great Bill that will set Connecticut as a leader in offering this type of curriculum. It's an important piece of what, I think, the future is made of for what we should be doing in our public schools in preparing our youth for -- for the world that we are constantly evolving in.

So, I do rise in strong support. And Madam President, at this point in time I would like to yield to Senator Witkos.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Berthel. Do you accept the yield, Senator Witkos?

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, I do. I'd like to first thank the leadership of the Education Committee for bringing the Bill forward. But more
importantly I want to thank Senator Maroney for his very extensive and thorough description of the Bill and all of the -- the fantastic attributes that are contained within it. I think it really sets our state up to prepare our next generation of leaders to meet our workforce demands.

As the Senator had mentioned, he and I had attended a conference together last year and I was a little embarrassed when they were talking about the different states and where they ranked in computer coding, and Arkansas was ranked as number one. I don't have anything against Arkansas, but we always pride ourselves, here in Connecticut, that we have a highly educated workforce, and we were kind of down on the list as far as computer coding goes and computer science. And I think, you know, this Bill goes a long way in preparing the teachers for what they can include and incorporate within their curriculum that is taught within the classroom.

An example was shared with us that one teacher was a little apprehensive about well I'm an art teacher, why do I need to do know about computer science and coding. But she went to a preparatory class and learned that through the computer and creating algorithms and really mathematic equations, you can make these really intricate -- intricate designs on your computer and they're like works of art. And she -- from that point on, she was sold on it and, you know, went forward and highly adopted it.

I think that this Bill sets us up for these fantastic things that are going to be happening to our state. Under Government Lamont, Lieutenant Governor Bysiewicz's leadership, we have Infosys coming to Connecticut. I think this will train that
workforce. We have Seven Stars Cloud coming into Connecticut over at the old UConn West Hartford branch. They're going to be looking for these types of students, the workforces. We are really setting the stage for prepping them. And not only that, but setting them up for high quality good paying jobs.

This is a win all the way around. I -- I -- I'm so proud to stand and work with everybody on the Circle on this Bill. We are going to notch ourselves up, as Senator Maroney said, we're going to be the first in the nation that requires teacher preparation to do that.

I want to give a shout out to Abby Jewett from AT&T, who actually, through their foundation, they provided a grant to the Girls Who Code foundation here in Connecticut and they are able to, through that, offer some regional competitions from -- from young ladies to come from all the New England states to Connecticut to participate and learn a little bit more about coding. So, this is the way of the future. Madam President, I urge the Chamber's adoption. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further? Senator Anwar, to be followed by Senator Slap, to be followed by Senator Abrams. Senator Anwar.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this Amendment. Here's the basic reality. With the internet and with computers, the -- the playing field has been leveled for our students and across
the world. We clearly know that the ability to get education is literally similar for a person in the United States to another person in literally any other part of the world where you have electricity and then the internet.

And the programming that is a basic -- that -- that was believed to be something that was a specific requirement and people were spending time to get educated in that as a specialty, it is going to become a very basic essential need. It's -- it's the most basic knowledge that would be across the nations, across the countries. And -- and it is important to invest in this area. And I think this Amendment and this Bill with the leadership of our -- our Education Committee and, again, under -- under the leadership of Senator McCrory and -- and all the people who have been serving, we really are moving our state in a direction which we should be very proud of if we move forward and -- and accept this Bill.

I -- I -- I think this is going to be the necessity going forward. Every single child would have this information, would need this information. And -- and the sooner we invest in this effort of education for computer programming and learning in the teachers and subsequently the students, the better we are going to be. So, I would join my colleagues in -- in recognizing the value of this, but also recognizing the importance of -- for all of us to pass this Amendment and subsequently the Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further?
SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Yeah. Thank you very much, Madam President. Just very briefly, I rise in strong support of the Bill. I love this Bill. [laughter] I'm just going to touch on a few reasons why I do, and urge my colleagues, of course, to -- to also support it. One could really argue that computer science is the language of our economy and certainly where our economy is headed if you look at Connecticut. And Senator Witkos touched on this, as far as some real strong indicators that we could be a leader in technology in the state of Connecticut.

And just recently, in fact, the Hartford region was ranked number four when it comes to technology and opportunity for jobs and really strengthening our economy. So, lots of potential when it comes to computer science and technology. And the tech field is really notoriously not good at diversity or has not been, I should say. And if you look at the number of computer science majors, it has -- who are -- who are women over the past 20 or 30 years, it's actually going in the opposite direction of what we think it should.

There is a huge gender gap when it comes to folks majoring in computer science. Not only that, there's also a gap, if you just look at the wealth of towns, and you look at which towns in Connecticut right now offer computer science and which don't. And the disparities, both in terms of towns and in terms of gender, are not healthy and are not good, especially when you look at the future of our economy.
So, this Bill, I think, will tackle that because it will make computer science ubiquitous in all our schools, in all our towns, it'll make it much more likely that, not only my daughters will take computer science and be exposed to the language of the new economy, but that young women and girls all across the state of Connecticut will be exposed to it, will have that opportunity, and hopefully, many of them will go on to various successful careers in technology and computer science.

So, it's a -- a great Bill for a whole host of reasons. But I just wanted to touch on those two. And I want to thank Senator Witkos and Senator Maroney and many others, Senator McCrory as well. I know there's been real champions of it in the House and a certain contingent of folks in Avon, Norm being one of them. Senator Witkos and I know him well. He's been a real champion on this. So, it was a grass-roots effort. And I'm just so pleased that we're going to be voting on that right now.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in strong support of this Bill. I think it's our obligation to do what we can to prepare our children for the future. That's what education is about. And although my generation has seen that it's hard to predict what their future is going to look like, we absolutely know that computer science will be a part
of it. And so, we have to make it a -- an -- a part of their education as they grow up. I think this Bill, this Amendment is so good because it looks at private and public partnership. It draws upon all different agencies that we have from the state Department of ED, to the office of Higher ED, to the Department of Economic and Community Development. It looks at children from all ages, from elementary school, through high school, and more importantly, it looks at teacher preparation, because unless the people instructing them understand what -- what opportunities there are in the area of computer science, like what Senator Witkos was talking about, they really can't share that with our students.

So, I am so happy to stand in support of this Bill. And I thank all the people, Senator Maroney, Senator McCrory, Senator Berthel, Senator Witkos who have all done such great work on this Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is still before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Maroney.
SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. If I learned one thing from watching Seinfeld, which I did a lot, it's not to name names, especially when you're thanking people, but I do appreciate Senator Slap for naming Norm for all of his -- Norm Sondheimer for all of the help he has given and the Connecticut computer science teachers for all of their work. I think there are several other people who also helped. We did bring a lot of people around the table and they have been pushing this for a while. So, thank you to Shannon Marimon from the Connecticut Council for Education Reform, Rich Jacob of -- of Yale helped us host a round table, as well as Jen Widness. And then, there are so many so, I know I'm -- I'm going to miss some, but I thank them for their help. And if -- if there is no objection, I would ask that this Bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would the Clerk now please call Calendar Page 53, Calendar 596, House Bill 7082.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR McCRARY (2ND):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, 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 McCRARY (2ND):

Absolutely. Before I begin my remarks, I'll just say I'm, a little bit under the weather, so you won't get the traditional me. First, I want to thank all those who have put so much work into this -- this Bill, specifically Representative Bobby Gibson, who brought the concept to me early this year. I want to thank my staff, the OLA staff, OFA staff, a great team of individuals who have done a great deal of work.

I will speak briefly about what's in the Bill and then I will provide my reasoning why I think this is so very important. This Amendment combines -- I mean, this Bill combines the Bills of African-American studies and Puerto Rican and Latino
studies. The Bill requires all school districts to add African-American and Latino studies into their curriculum beginning in the year 2021, '22. The Bill requires development of African-American and Black and Latino studies in high school course. And by the year '22, '23, the Bill requires each Board of Education to offer a state approved high school course in African-American and Black and Puerto Rican history.

The -- the rationale for this, as an educator of 27 years in the business, when you talk about curriculum, there's three things that's very much -- the very important parts of a curriculum and they're the three R's. For students to be successful, the curriculum must be rigorous. It must be relevant. And the students must have a relationship with the curriculum.

There's so much that could be said about the need and why we need to do this. And also, I want to thank lastly, before I say a couple more words, the young people, the students in the state of Connecticut that came up here, they came to the capital and spoke their truth. They spoke their truth to the power, and actually it was two young ladies, I don't know if they're still here today, but they've been here, they came today, they came yesterday, and they came Tuesday, just to see if we can pass this curriculum. Because for them, they haven't seen themselves. They haven't seen their stories in the curriculums that have been provided for them in the public school system in Connecticut.

And for me, I hadn't seen myself and I haven't seen my stories, and I haven't seen my mothers' and fathers' and grandparents' stories in the curriculum
that have been provided to us in the state of Connecticut. And my parents haven't seen it. So, it's high time, that we, as leaders, provide every student the opportunity to learn from each other. This curriculum will not just benefit African-American and Latino people, but all our students.

We spoke earlier about the need for minority teachers in the state of Connecticut. But we also need a curriculum where every child can learn each other's history, can learn in an environment that can bring people together. There is so many things that people can learn about African American and Latino.

I will tell you a story, a quick one. I learned about a man named Pedro Campos, a Latino man, first graduate -- first Puerto Rican graduate from Harvard University. Not only did he graduate from Harvard University, he went back to Puerto Rico and he was recruited into World War I. He was recruited by a group of men called the Harlem Hellfighters. He joined the American government in World War I along with these other African-American men and fought, fought so that we could be free in the United States.

Pedro Campos not only did that, he went back and graduated from Harvard and became a lawyer. Now, you think about that. If a child who was from a Latino country, from Puerto Rico, learn about the history of Pedro Compos, that would motivate them. That's a curriculum that want to bring you want to come back to school. And think about it, those African-American men who fought in every single war, they were fighting what Double V -- call the Double
V. If you're not familiar with the Double V, the Double V was they were fighting for victory for the United States, but fighting for their independence in their own country. When they came back in the summer of 1919, called the summer of hell, because many of 'em were lynched in their uniforms. The uniforms that they fought so bravely to make America free.

There was a time when we, after the Civil War and, unfortunately, many times in our American history we wait to February and we teach about individuals, you know, the traditional people you hear about, the Martin Luther King, the Frederick Douglas, it was about five or six -- we talk about individual people. But we don't talk about systems.

And right after war, we had this period called Reconstruction. I remember in -- in the school -- school. I didn't know what that meant. But if I would have -- was taught that after Reconstruction, there were five black congressmen and these were ex-slaves, but they were congressmen in Washington D.C. representing South Carolina, Louisiana, Mississippi, and they were financed by ex-slaves, a man named Robert Church, who's the second largest landowner in the state of Tennessee, financed their campaigns, no one told us that. No one's told us that in history. That's the type of history that would motivate you, and not just depend on other people that show that you were doing things for yourself.

In South Carolina, after Reconstruction, there was more African-American people in their state government than whites. Matter of fact, these ex-slaves were the first to set up free public
education in the state of Connecticut -- I mean state of South Carolina. They did it for everyone to learn. We don't learn these stories. We don't talk about them. They're not a part of our curriculum. They're not a part of things that we study. It's a shame that we have the largest achievement gap in the state of Connecticut. But overall in the United States, less than eight percent of the students view history as their favorite subject, and less than three percent view social studies as their favorite subject.

Well, if you were sitting in a classroom and all you learned that you was a slave and you was troubled and you didn't bring anything to this country, then you wouldn't think that -- that subject was very important to you, either. See, the problem we have is, if you were never told you did anything, then you would never believe you can do anything.

And then, those who are -- and -- and they required to instruct you, will believe you cannot do anything. And we fall into the trap that we have in Connecticut that the former Secretary of Education said is the soft bigotry of low expectation. And we sink and sink and sink in that every single year. It's time to change that and provide a curriculum where everyone can benefit and everyone can learn about the positive things that they've done.

We'll -- we'll -- we'll provide an opportunity for all of us to see. I'll be -- I -- I'm finishing up. But I just have to add, if -- if -- if we -- as a kid I learned Patrick Henry, and the famous lines of Patrick, give me liberty or give me death. Fighting for the United States of America. Want to get out of the arms of the British rule. Great story that
we learned in school. But if you had a curriculum of inclusion, you could have that same story and learn those same concepts of fighting for freedom if you was talking about Dr. Martin Luther King sitting in a Birmingham jail and his letter that he wrote. Same concept. Same understanding. Motivates everybody. But we don't get that. And that's what a curriculum like this would do.

I will say in closing, a man named Marcus Garvey, had a concept called a Universal Negro Improvement Association. When people said he couldn't do, he did his own. When black women were not allowed to join the Red Cross, he created the Black Cross. And those Black Cross individuals fought to serve in World War I. And they had the to serve in segregated units, taking care of wounded prisoners of war who were treated better than the men who was over there fighting. There's nothin' that -- Marcus Garvey had a concept to uplift his community. Nothin' different than Nipsy Russell was trying to do before he was assassinated. It's the same concept, folks.

And that's why recently, when one of my favorite artists, Jay-Z, wrote a song, and one of those songs, he said, legacy, legacy, legacy, legacy, black Xs, that's what needs to be taught to me. It resonated. It resonated with people. Because we knew where he was coming from. We knew that.

And lastly in closing, if we would talk about Ida B. Wells, I don't know, most of you might not know about Ida B. Wells, but Ida B. Wells led the charge to end lynching in the United States. She wanted -- she put her life on the line to end lynching. We was taught that lynching was because some just --
lynching was not about the men going after other women. It was about competition, economic competition when those men did for themselves and built their own stores, their own churches, and their own schools.

And when people didn't want to compete with them, they burnt them down. Same why they did in Tulsa. These things happen all through our country. But, again, if we had an opportunity to create a curriculum that inspires and uplift -- inspires and uplift, a -- a curriculum of hope, a curriculum of opportunity, a curriculum of unified support and health, that's how we move our country forward. That's how we move the state of Connecticut forward. And that's how we move our children forward.

So, with that being said, Madam President, I ask that we move adoption and we support this opportunity, an opportunity we can do that most states have not done but be a leader, a leader in education, a leader for the country. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good evening again, Madam President. Thank you. Madam President, I rise in support of the Bill before us tonight in the Chamber. I thank Senator McCrory for providing us with some very emotional and important perspective with regard to why this -- why this Bill is -- is before us, and why it's so
important for us to -- to include this curriculum going forward.

You know, there's an old saying about, if we forget history, we -- we're doomed to repeat it. And I think that as Americans, regardless of our nationality, regardless of our race, we -- we have an obligation to not forget history and the things that have been done to -- to people over time and the great things that people have done over time in our country to move our country forward and to get us to -- to be the greatest nation in the world.

So, I do rise in support. I do have a couple of questions that I would like to ask of my good Chair on the Education Committee, just for the purpose of legislative intent and some clarification. So, if I may, Madam President, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank -- thank you, sir. Please proceed. Senator McCrory, prepare yourself.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, the -- the Bill as -- and I know a lot of work went into the Bill, the Bill as written, does it require a high school student to complete a course in African-American and Latino studies for graduation? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.
SENATOR McCORY (2ND):

Well, that's a very good question. Initially, when we -- when the Africans got together, actually we wanted separate courses. We wanted one -- there's so much history that can be taught, that we wanted one for African-American studies and one for Latino studies. But we compromised, because that's what we do. And then, you know, we wanted this course to be required for every kid to have to take in the state of Connecticut before they graduate, but we realized that -- that wouldn't be functional. We couldn't do it. It will cost too much money. So, we compromised that also. So, no, no longer will the course has to be required for graduation. The course will only be required and it -- it won't be required until 2023 to be offered to students in every school district. So, it has to be offered to students. It is not required for graduation. And it can fill three requirements. It can fulfill requirement as an elective, it can be -- fulfill a requirement as an English or Humanities requirement, or a history requirement. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator for the clarification. And you actually anticipated a couple of my other questions. So, I will move on for those. Just for my understanding, the course is not required for graduation and it can be used optionally as an elective for a credit in Humanities
and English towards graduation for earning a diploma under the policies of the local Board of Education? Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR McCORRY (2ND):

Absolutely, Madam President. And one more thing I would like to add. The -- the curriculum will be developed with SDA in conjunction with SERC to make sure it's top notch. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator for -- for that. I have no further questions on the Bill at this time. Again, I do rise in full support of it. I think this is a -- a good piece of legislation before the Chamber tonight and I encourage adoption. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill that's before us? Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I'd like to
associate myself with the remarks of Senator McCrory and to also add that, although, I sincerely believe in what he was talking about in terms of if you can see it, you can be it, and how important that is for kids to relate to the curriculum, I really -- one of the things I love most about our country is our diversity and the multi-cultural aspect that we live amongst. And when we deny kids the opportunity to understand everyone's culture, everyone's background, everyone's contribution, then we, not only fail those children that might not see themselves in the narrow perspective of history that currently is taught, but we also deny all of our children from a full understanding of what American History is. And so for that reason, I'm in very strong support of this Bill. I think it's the best thing we can do for -- for all of our children. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If I may, a couple questions to the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President, I got a couple questions from my school district. They
wanted some clarification. I think you answered some of those regarding the fact that the course for African-American and Latino studies could supplement a history class, an English class, and a humanities class for graduation requirements, but they asked if it's in the course offerings and they don't have enough students that sign up for it, will they still be required to offer it to the students? What would be the benchmark to -- for that requirement to make sure they held that class? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR McCRORY (2ND):

Excellent, excellent question. So, traditionally in public school systems, when you have a course that is in your course of studies, it takes between ten and 20 students requesting that course in order for the school district to provide it. But I can't imagine a school district where you don't have more than ten or 20 students who want to learn somethin' like that. I would think that as a school district would inspire the kids to want to do that. So, that's the least of my concerns. But that's -- the answer to your question is they have to have at least ten to 20 students who want to take a course in order for the school district to have to provide it. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Senator Witkos.
SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Okay. Just for legislative intent, just to clarify, if my local school district has a requirement that there must be at least 14 students enrolled in a course and you just offered the ten to 12 or ten to 20, if it's all the other course requirements are at 14, is that okay that they -- they don't offer it if there haven't been 14 students that enroll in the program?

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

So, I -- I will say they won't have to offer it. But I almost would think that that will be a local decision. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. You know, I look forward to actually seeing some of the curriculum that Senator McCrory had just described of the short little preview I guess of some of the history that is available out there. And I hope it's taught in all the classrooms. I found it very intriguing. And I'd like to, you know, see the textbook that is developed by the State Department of Education and look forward to voting for the Bill. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator McCrory.
THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Thank you, Madam President. You know, we all come to this Chamber with our own personal experiences that -- that hopefully allow us to legislate from a place of equity and justice. And I can tell you, as a person of -- of mixed background of both black and Hispanic origins, it was always difficult for me when I went to new schools. As an Army brat, we went from school place to school place. It was always difficult for me to just simply find a place to sit, right. Never quite black enough for the African-American students, maybe too black for the Hispanic-American students, and just maybe an oddball to the rest of my students who were at a -- at a chow hall or at -- at our -- our lunch tables.

And the brilliance of educators to be able to see that, the ignorance that we all have, and to be able to take the power of history and to teach kids things like the plight that maybe Irish-Americans went through when they came to America, and they put up signs like, Irish need not apply. And to see the impact of knowing one's history and what a difference that would translate that, the next day at school, by having that class, having a fellow Irish student of mine say, hey, Bradley, you can sit over here if you're looking for a place to sit. The power of education of clearing ignorance. One of the things that I'm extremely proud of my time on the Board of Ed in Bridgeport is that we passed this exact piece of legislation. And to see it not only
pass through the Board of Ed, but to be in the back of a classroom and to listen to educators provide this class, it's not just the impact that it does for Hispanic and African-American people of knowing one's history. It's the impact that it does for all of us to understand how human we all are.

To look at, I think as Senator Sampson remarked about Dr. King, to look at really the essence of the -- of -- of people and not the color of their skin. And I think that this piece of legislation, it's not going to just be transformative for African-American students, who we -- as we all know, have been totally striped of history and language and cultural and origins. It's not just going to be instrumental for Hispanic-American students who have a very similar historical kind of deprivation, but it's going to be an impact for all students of any color, and it's going to really bring us to be one United States of America.

And I'm -- I'm so encouraged by the hard work of Senator McCrory to get us to this point. I -- I also take heart that there would be people whether they be white, black, brown, of Jewish faith, of Muslim faith, of Christian faith, will sign up for this class because we all want to understand each other. And I believe educators want to cure us of ignorance. And I think this is one step of getting us there. So, thank you very much of the hard work of your Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Bradley. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further? Senator Anwar.
SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in strong support of the Amendment. I wanted to start off by saying how impressed and how touched I am with Senator McCrory. You know he's not feeling well today. He actually was essentially not well enough to be here and -- and he said, whatever it takes, even if he has to be here on a stretcher, he's going to come here and -- and talk about this. And you probably heard the passion that he has shared with us, which is a passion that should infect everyone who has actually listened to him and heard him clearly why it's -- it's important. And -- and I want to thank you for your leadership, Senator McCrory. And -- and I -- I hope you feel better and you get some rest and we pass this Amendment and the Bill very fast. And -- and -- and we want to get you to -- to get some rest.

But -- but I want to leave you with a thought. We make the best decisions in our lives based on the knowledge that we have. And at times, now days when I see people, the decisions that they're making, I -- I feel that the decisions they are making are not fair or right. And then, I recognize that sometimes based on the -- the vacuum of knowledge that exists in their minds about the history and the experiences our brothers and sisters have felt or experienced in the past. How do you equalize that? And that would require providing them with the knowledge. Providing them with the understanding of the experience. And then, you have -- we -- we -- we will be in a better place for people to make right choices, right decisions for our society and our country to move in the right direction and -- and be in a better place. This Bill allows the
individuals to have that opportunity.

Our education for our students is incomplete without this part of the curriculum and many other parts of the curriculum. And without experiencing the history, the beauty, and not so beautiful history of the country is going to require us to be investing as a society. And only then, we are going to be in a better place for this perfect union. And I -- I am proud of my fellow Senator and other members of the Education Committee to come forward with this bipartisan effort, to make our students in a better place and in a better future for us.

So, thank you and I look forward to voting for this Amendment and the Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. We are on the legislation, not Amendment, and would ask if there any -- if anyone would like to remark on the legislation that is before us. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you -- Senator McCrory.

SENATOR McCRARY (2ND):

Madam President, if there's no objection, I ask legislation be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir. Mr. -- Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:


THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Please call the vote. The machine will be opened.

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 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 has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Consent Calendar No. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those 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, that concludes our business for today. The Senate Democrats will have a caucus beginning at 11:00 o'clock with session following at noon. And I'll yield to Senator Witkos.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Senate Republicans will gather 11:00 o'clock, 11:15-ish o'clock, somewhere in that range and -- for caucus, as well. See you all tomorrow.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. We are adjourned. Go forth. No, Senator Duff?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I'd like --

THE CHAIR:

Are there any other --

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I'd like to --

THE CHAIR:

-- announcements?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

-- yield to Senator Moore, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Moore, we would not forget about you.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Madam President, I almost forgot about myself, there
for a moment. So, I just want to remind everyone tomorrow is dress down day with the proceeds going to Home For the Braves, $5 dollars for dressing down, $10 dollars for not dressing down. And I'm taking cash only. Thank you, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. With that, I move we adjourn, subject to call of the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

We are adjourned. Go forth and govern.

On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 11:07 o'clock p.m. adjourned Sine Die.