

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Tuesday, JUNE 15, 2021

The Senate was called to order at 3:26 p.m., the President in the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Will the Senate please come to order? Members and guests, please rise and direct your attention to our Guest Chaplain, back by popular demand, Martin Dunleavy.

GUEST CHAPLAIN MARTIN DUNLEAVY:

Thank you, Lieutenant Governor. Grant us the ability to renew the ties of mutual regard which form our civic life. Send us honest and able leaders. Help us to eliminate poverty, prejudice and oppression, and that peace may prevail with goodness. Amen.

THE CHAIR:

Amen. Thank you so much. And Senator Flexer, would you mind coming to lead us in the Pledge and we'll also have our Majority Leader and Baby Rose joining us for that. All right.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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:

Darn, I think we missed Take Our Children to Work Day this year, but welcome Baby Rose. All right. So good afternoon, Senator Duff and assistant.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President. Good afternoon. Yes, I have my able assistant Rose here who is helping me out today, her first visit to the Capitol and into the Senate Chamber. And so Madam President, I was wondering if the Clerk has any business on his desk.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Good afternoon. The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda No. 1 dated Tuesday, June 15th, 2021.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move all items on Senate Agenda No. 1 dated Tuesday, June 15th, 2021 be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda be incorporated by reference into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objections. So ordered.

**Senate Agenda
No. 1
JUNE SPECIAL SESSION
Tuesday, June 15, 2021**

SENATE RESOLUTION:

SR NO. 25 RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE RULES OF THE SENATE FOR THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION, 2021.

BUSINESS FROM THE HOUSE:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS:

HJ NO. 401 RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE JOINT RULES OF THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION, 2021.

HJ NO. 402 RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE EXPENSES OF THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION, 2021.

HJ NO. 403 RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE PRINTING OF THE JOURNALS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION, 2021.

EMERGENCY CERTIFICATIONS

SENATE BILLS

SB NO. 1201 AN ACT CONCERNING RESPONSIBLE AND EQUITABLE REGULATION OF ADULT-USE CANNABIS.

SB NO. 1202 AN ACT CONCERNING PROVISIONS RELATED TO REVENUE AND OTHER ITEMS TO IMPLEMENT THE STATE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30, 2023.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION:

SJ NO. 75 RESOLUTION CONVENING THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN SPECIAL SESSION.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would like to ask the Clerk to call the following

Resolution from Senate Agenda No. 1, starting with
Senate Resolution No. 25.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Senate Resolution No. 25, RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE
RULES OF THE SENATE FOR THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION
2021.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move
adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And so the question is on adoption. Will you
remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is our boilerplate
rules for our Special Session.

THE CHAIR:

Very good. So, the question is on adoption and so
I'd like to ask if all are in favor of adopting the
rules for this Special Session, please signify by
saying aye. Opposed? The ayes have it. Senator
Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would the Clerk please call House Joint Resolution No. 401, please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

House Joint Resolution No. 401, RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE JOINT RULES OF THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION 2021.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thanks, Madam President. I move adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, these are for the joint rules of the June Special Session.

THE CHAIR:

Excellent, and so the question is on adoption of the joint rules. So all in favor of adopting those rules please signify by saying aye. Opposed? The ayes have it. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Clerk now please call House Joint Resolution No. 402?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

House Joint Resolution No. 402, A RESOLUTION
CONCERNING THE EXPENSES OF THE JUNE SPECIAL SESSION
2021.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the
Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is just a
Resolution regarding the expenses of our June
Special Session.

THE CHAIR:

All right. Let me try your minds. All in favor of
adoption of this Resolution, please signify by
saying aye. Opposed? And the ayes have it.
Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd
like the Clerk to please call House Joint Resolution
No. 403.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.
CLERK:

House Joint Resolution No. 403, A RESOLUTION
CONCERNING THE PRINTING OF THE JOURNALS OF THE
SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE JUNE
SPECIAL SESSION 2021.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the
Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this
is just regarding the printing of the Journal for
the June Special Session.

THE CHAIR:

Very well. All in favor of this Resolution
regarding printing of the Journal, please signify by
saying aye. Opposed? The ayes have it. Senator
Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would the Clerk please call the following Bills from Senate Agenda No. 1, the first one being Emergency Certified Senate Bill 1201 as go, and followed by Emergency Certified Bill 1202.

THE CHAIR:

Very well. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Senate Agenda No. 1, Senate Bill No. 1201, AN ACT CONCERNING RESPONSIBLE AND EQUITABLE REGULATION OF ADULT USE CANNABIS.

THE CHAIR:

And good afternoon Senator Winfield, here we are again.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes we are, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of Emergency Certified Bill No. 1201 and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Pardon me, I am going to call on Senator Duff and then we will go back to you for a while. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Winfield. Madam President, I rise to move that the transcript of the discussion and debate which took place in this Chamber on Monday, June 7th, regarding Senate Bill 1118 be incorporated as part of today's discussion and debate on Emergency Certified Bill 1201 into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript and be made a part thereof.

THE CHAIR:

And good afternoon, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Good afternoon, Madam President, I rise in support of Senator Duff's motion and support its passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Kelly and Senator Duff. And I just want to, for the sake of clarity and for the record, state that I believe your motion to be as follows. That you wish all remarks that took place and that were transcribed into the record during the discussion and debate in this Chamber during the Session day commencing on Monday, June 7th on Senate Bill No. 1118 of the 2021 Regular Session be incorporated as part of today's discussion and debate on Emergency Certified Bill No. 1201 into today's Senate Journal and Senate Transcript and be made part thereof, so that effectively it is as if those remarks are being made today on the Bill presently in front of us. Is that correct? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That is correct.

THE CHAIR:

Excellent. So are there any objections? Seeing no objections, so ordered?

CLERK:

Senate Agenda Number 1, Senate Bill No. 1118, AN ACT CONCERNING RESPONSIBLE AND EQUITABLE REGULATION OF ADULT-USE CANNABIS.

THE CHAIR:

Good Evening, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good Evening, Madam President. Mr. 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. Before us is Emergency Certified Senate Bill No. 1118. It is the Bill that responsibly and equitably regulates the adult use of cannabis. There have been several Bills throughout this Session dealing with the issue, Senate Bill 888, House Bill 6377, all of these Bills making attempt to get to a conversation that has been happening in the legislature for many, many years. The conversation has developed to the point where this Session we were talking about not only the legalization of cannabis but the equity conversation in that you are hearing so much in

other Bills but specifically as the legalization of cannabis has happened across the country.

Madam President, I will run through some of what this Bill does. The underlying thing we are talking about is the legalization so the threshold question before all of us is to legalize or not to legalize. Madam President this Bill allows those who are 21 years or older to possess and use cannabis, has possession limits built into the Bill and penalties for those who violate the Bills provisions.

Madam President it deals with the delinquency adjudication and serious juvenile offenses, prohibits minors from being adjudicated for certain cannabis possessions and removes most cannabis sales offenses as the cannabis is being legalized.

Madam President is deals with and allows for people to pay cannabis related fines by mail. It deals with criminal record erasure for the things that would no longer be illegal under the legalization of cannabis.

We know there is a lot of the Bill that deals with licenses and who can have licenses. It also deals with what are called cannabis gifts which allows consumers to give cannabis to other consumers for free within the possession limits. It deals with searches and motor vehicle stops, limits when cannabis, the odor of cannabis or the possession of cannabis can justify those types of stops. The issue of equity is obviously built into this Bill. We would not be here quite frankly so the Social Equity Council, is established to promote and encourage participation in the industry. And it deals with arrest and conviction data.

It deals with what are called equity joint ventures, so the produces and dispensaries would be required to create equity joint ventures and they pay a lower license expansion authorization fee or they convert to a hybrid retailer. It also defines what an

equity applicant is, there's a lot of Sections of this Bill.

It deals with criminal history checks, requires that all individuals who are listed on applications submit a criminal history before getting a license and it allows the Department of Consumer Protection to require criminal history checks for license renewals.

Madam President there is a lot to this Bill. It deals with what do we do with the monies that come into the state and how do we split those monies between the equity portion of the Bill, between prevention and what is the right way to do this. This is a Bill that comes to us through a lot of work. I have to say that Representative Robin Porter in the House had a lot to do with how this Bill touched on issues of equity. The conversation started with a single Bill and as I suggested earlier morphed into multiple Bills and the Bill that came out of the Labor Committee was obviously as people if they watched the conversation develop, very focused on equity portion and so there was a coming together of people involved on Senate Bill 6377 and House Bill 6377 and Senate Bill 888. There was conversation with the Office of the Governor, conversations with Representatives who have been in this conversation for a very, very long time including as I suggested Representative Robin Porter, in our own Chamber Senator Douglas McCrory, Representative Candelora, people who, if you paid attention to this you know have been intimately involved in this conversation.

Madam President, before I end and the debate portion of this, I just want to say that it is important to think about the history of cannabis in this country. If you go back to the beginning of the last century you could find cannabis in drug stores and then things changed. And it has something to do with the way that people understand other people. So when Mexican immigrants came into this country and

started using cannabis the way that we see others came into play. And cannabis became marijuana to more closely associate it with those Mexican immigrants and some of the stories that were being told about those Mexican immigrants and others as wild, as crazy, as sexually deviant and so we got to the point where cannabis was no longer the things that you would see in your drug store. There was a prohibition on cannabis and then this conversation developed up into the 1970's when under our former President Nixon, there was a commission put together, appointed by President Nixon and the president got an answer back from his own commission that said we should decriminalize cannabis, the drug that in the past we had in drug stores. We should decriminalize it because there was no reason not to do that and that didn't comport with the way that he saw the world and the way that we know that is that he had a former staffer who has told us what they were thinking. And there was from a political machinations and part of that was the former president has issues with the hippies that we used to talk about and Black folks. And so there was the beginning of the war on drugs.

This Session has been a Session where we have been talking about equity, talking about dealing with the policies of the past and making them right. To my mind, if cannabis has been made illegal not because there was a real reason to do it, but to deal with the others whether they be the Mexicans in the early 1900's or the hippies and the Blacks in 1970's, that is not good public policy and we have seen what has been wrought by having a war on drugs. Whole communities have been disseminated and some people will say, there are not a lot of people in our state in jail for cannabis today, but there are vestigial ways in which communities are still impacted by what we were doing.

And so as I wait for the questions that I am sure will come, ask us just to remember at the core of this is a question, the threshold question and

should we or should we not legalize cannabis. And the reason that I think we should legalize cannabis is not because of the money, that is an important part of this and not because of a lot of the other things that people have been talking about but because we should have never made cannabis an illegal drug, it should never have been prohibited. It should never have been a Schedule I drug particularly given the way that it got there. So Madam President, with that, I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Great to see you this evening. I am going to make a couple of brief statements or brief in my mind and then I have some questions. But first on a completely unrelated matter, I just want to say that my good friend and colleague Senator Winfield was in distress because he misplaced his cellphone and I turned to him and said, you know who the patron saint of lost things is, is St. Anthony, I said I'll say a quick prayer and you'll find your cellphone and within about two minutes somebody came and brought him his cellphone. Sort of a weird sort of serendipitous way to start this debate.

Regarding what I call marijuana, Senator Winfield called cannabis we have had this Bill before us in the Judiciary Committee for any number of years. I also am lucky enough to serve on the General Law Committee and we had hearings on marijuana in the General Law Committee in past years and I will say this, that I will take credit for being one of the chief proponents and crafters of the medical marijuana laws that we have in the State of Connecticut.

I am not fundamentally against marijuana per se and I do realize that it has medical benefits if used wisely and in the right form. And you know, when we had people coming to us, especially parents with children suffering horrible epileptic seizures years ago and urging us to do something with marijuana for medical purposes, it was heartbreaking. I mean we're not talking about one isolated grand mal seizure as horrific as that is, we were talking about parents that had children, little children suffering multiple epileptic seizures throughout a period of time, throughout the day 20, 30 seizures per day. You know, when people talk about medical marijuana they tend to think Oh, you're handing out joint or things like that. No, quite often the tetrahydrocannabinol the cannabidiol oil is distilled down into a medically determined amount and then it is given in a supervised manner to the child and it has a major impact on reducing the amount of epileptic seizures. So there is an upside when the component of marijuana, cannabis are utilized in a medical authorized and really scientific manner.

What we have before us this evening is probably, I'd say the step in the path towards complete legalization of marijuana - cannabis. I total oppose this. I think it sends a horrible message to our young people. I don't understand how in one breath, how in one evening this Chamber with certain individuals choking up because they know people have suffered from the opioid crisis that we have in Connecticut. More people dying of opioids in Connecticut per year than the entire State of Connecticut lost during the entire length of the Vietnam War. That's how much folks we lose in one year. We can clamp down on that and within a few hours we are going to legalize "recreational marijuana" "recreational cannabis".

I have the utmost respect for Senator Winfield but to say, Oh, it was available in drug stores, well go back to your caucus room, I'm sure there's some

sodas there labeled Coca Cola, they were originally made with cocaine. We don't have that anymore. Cocaine is highly addictive. People used to take morphine. Morphine is highly addictive. Opioids, opium dens, the late 1800's. We have drugs that will take you and enslave you.

I've been through enough hearings. I am not an expert. I am not, you know, I have no PhD's no MDs anything like that but I do know enough to know that the human being has an element of neuroplasticity in the brain. You create certain pathways through the brain like creating a path through a forest. You walk it long enough eventually it is more accessible. The brain works that way as well. And when a young person utilizes foreign substances that alter the brains normal mechanizations it changes that neuroplasticity and it can be really debilitating to certain individuals.

We've had Members in this Circle, I spoke somewhat humorously about our good friend, former Senator Ed Meyer, he has come up and testified in opposition to legalizing marijuana because a loved one in his family, I believe, died or certainly was hugely debilitated and he felt passionately about that issue. He came and testified before the Judiciary Committee, a Committee where he used to serve. And those stories are out there. Why this Bill, this year never went before the Public Health Committee is beyond me. That is the Committee of cognizance that would analyze issues as to what happens to the developing brain.

And, you know, it's interesting when you want to talk about extending the age where we treat young people as minors as opposed to adults, well, you know, you can't run away from the argument that the brain is not quite developed until an individual is 25 but all of that is conveniently forgotten when we talk about recreational marijuana. Well if the brain is only developed until 25 then I believe the neuroplasticity within the brain is still being

manipulated by what enters and is ingested by an individual during that time frame.

There is an element that we have in our system called dopamine. Yeah, does the word dope from that? Probably. I'm no expert on that but there is this element called dopamine and dopamine is the thing that your body utilizes to give you satisfaction and utilized by the body in a natural way does good things. A body completely deprived of dopamine can't even get out of bed in the morning. There is a range, I'm no expert, but it's sort of I think goes from like 40 to the low 90's the natural amount of dopamine stimulation, pleasure sensation that one has that allows one to go through one's day and be a productive human being, in a natural way.

I've told you before, and I'm not proselytizing, Father, Son and Holy Ghost that is my belief but whether you believe in a higher power, whether you believe in God, whether you believe in one type of religion or none at all atheists it doesn't matter to me, but I do believe that however you perceive yourself I think a healthy individual is an amazing thing. Whether you believe God created men and women or evolution or when one dies that's it, that's all she wrote, still human beings are pretty darn amazing creatures. And I think they are designed amazingly well to do what we do on this planet.

If one allows one to be a one's peace my understanding is that the range of dopamine, the natural dopamine released into your neuro system goes like from 40 to like I said like the low 90's. One can guess what the most high number that one would get naturally, I was surprised because when I looked into this some people chuckled because they figured sex, right. Most pleasurable thing a human being can have.

Well I think it's a close second is what they said to me. I couldn't believe when they came up with

what number one actually was. But they've done scientific tests on this, it would have been interesting to be part of the study group for all this stuff I will say, but apparently coming in at number one is the meal that you might want the most, whatever you crave. Why, I don't know. But maybe you need food to sustain yourself and if you just look at an evolutionary term procreation is really important but if you can't survive and eat, day to day, to day, to day, to day you're never going to make it. Human beings, you know, nine months to have a baby, assuming all goes well, but if you don't have a meal you can only go so long and then you're going to die.

So I don't know, maybe that all sort of feeds into this. But the reason I think those studies are important and I took anatomy and physiology, did pretty good in college, believe it or not, I am no super athlete by any stretch, but for a period of time I was actually studying to be Phys Ed teacher. I thought that would be a cool job then I switched gears because I was doing way better in social studies and then I decided I wasn't ready to go into the real world, so law school was appealing to me. Here I am as a State Senator and I find this job to be extraordinarily rewarding because I feel like I try to help people each and every day in some small way and what a blessing that is.

But your natural system doesn't even go over 100. When you take drug or alcohol it goes beyond the natural functioning and the dopamine level whether it's alcohol, whether it's marijuana, whether it's an opioid, whether it's hashish, whether it's opium itself all of these things push it and the numbers are astronomical.

Once you get into the higher forms of drugs those number skyrocket. Forget about 100 or less. All of a sudden you're looking at 200. Now 200 like marijuana, alcohol things like that were between 100 and 200 whatever those numbers are you might say

well that's not such a huge jump. Well it sort of double what you're used to on any given day. Do that enough and your body is going to start to feel it. And the neuroplasticity is going to be affected. We talk in terms of building up a resistance and that is one way to look at it, whatever you're taking if it's beyond your normal physiology, after a course of time it takes more and more of a substance to get what an individual perceives to be the same reaction.

We look at it in one way like you build up a resistance but also it's more like that path in the forest just gets walked, and walked and walked, and so it's not the same. The neuroplasticity has changed. The neurons and synapses are firing in a different way such that things are created that just sort of flow in a certain way and when that happens, then the drug whatever one is ingesting a human being can tend to need more, more, and more for the same affect. No matter what it is if it is outside the normal realm that the body was sort of created to handle no matter what it is.

And so there is a concern that I have that once you get beyond the normal pattern, I'm not saying I'm holier than thou or anybody else. This is not a moral thing that I'm talking about at this point in time although a lot of people look at it that way. But I'm just trying to look at it from a more physiological perspective especially as it pertains to our young people.

Now in the Judiciary Committee in past years we had a speaker sometimes he came up and spoke for like 15-20 minutes and sometimes he came up and spoke for like three hours. He's a researcher from Yale and he does studies on cannabinoids, and THC and whether you want to call it cannabis, marijuana and yes it has an impact and it can have a deleterious impact.

One says marijuana can be a gateway drug and some people like look down on that like "what are you

talking about", you know. I know somebody that does marijuana all the time and that doesn't lead them to other drugs, yeah you can point to anybody that might be the exception to the rule, but once you start playing around with one thing maybe you feel safe to try something else. Comes down to the individual, their peer group, what's available. Available, hum, availability is part of this equation I think, just a little bit. I think it's important. But in any event, once you start going down this path, this researcher said there is an exponential increase in what happens in your brain if you mix a small amount of alcohol with a small amount of marijuana. In other words he did tests on individuals on their ability to drive a vehicle and if they had like one drink or two drinks and sort of the rule of thumb is you can have up to two drinks and be able to drive a car. You will be under the legal limit and then he didn't do that with those individuals but had them have "x" amount of marijuana and I couldn't tell you if one hit, meaning an inhalation or one marijuana cigarette, a joint however you want to classify it, and the other thing, again it gets complicated, the marijuana, the people associate with when they were growing up in high school or college back in the 60's, and 70's and 80's is different in potency than the marijuana that is available today.

Now if you want me to do a comparison I can't tell you. I just know from the literature and the testimony from individuals even people in favor of legalizing "recreational marijuana" that the potency is much greater now that it has been. I don't know how you measure it to be quite honest. If you go into a package store you sort of have an idea of the alcohol, beer you can Google it but sometimes the packages, especially for the high end beers will have how much is in there, it its wine you I think almost every bottle of wine will have the alcohol percentage, I don't know.

I think the low ends are like eight percent the high ends could be like 14 percent and then once you start going up to other things then you get into proof and proof is sort of like number up to 200 and if you take half of that, that's the amount of alcohol in something. So you sort of have an idea and alcohol since the ending of prohibition way back in the 30's highly regulated. And each state is different. I mean some states probably model themselves after others and in Connecticut we have the three tier system, you know, and it's all broken down but you can go somewhere and it you sort of figure I'm okay with two drinks, you can sort of like figure out what that is. And if you have problems with that, you can go online and Google it and it will have like charts and stuff like that to figure that out.

I have no idea how if this Bill passes and gets signed into law how you would ever figure that out. I just don't. I don't know how they measure it, I don't know how they would label it and once it's out of its packaging and now you have like different forms of marijuana or cannabis, you know, it can be like candy, it can be like fudge, it can be something inhaled.

As I said, when we did the research on medical marijuana it was in a distilled into a droplet, so first of all, right now, cannabis, marijuana has a much higher potency than one may recollect either from one's personal experience or friend's experience or just sort of what we know from movies, television *Cheech and Chong*, whatever, you know, you can read it in the paper. I forgot who it was, her name escapes me, but she is a columnist I believe for the *Wall Street Journal* and she went to like Colorado and went into a hotel room and did marijuana and it was like a lost weekend for her. She said, boy, she was like prostate on the floor of her hotel room. And she came back and wrote this like interesting things, saying wow this isn't anything like she recalled or her friends told her.

So, you know, sort of, I just don't know. Sort of like a brave new world out there. A little bit of wild west when it comes to trying to get an idea of how this is going to be.

I understand there is probably going to be, you know, requirements for labeling and stuff like that, but I think that there is a lot of unknowns.

Now the other thing is what the researcher from Yale indicated is if you take an amount of alcohol that wouldn't affect your driving ability and a bout of marijuana that wouldn't affect your driving ability and you combined them, it's a synergy, it's not like one plus one equal two. It's like one plus one equal three or three-and-a-half and now what an individual might perceive to be not a problem in driving does become a problem in driving because the synergistic impact between the marijuana and the alcohol and they are still doing research on this.

Now if you go and you look at highway accident reports in Colorado and other states that have legalized marijuana you will see an increase. Have I done enough research to say pointblank absolutely it's because of this, I can't say that. But I think there is enough doubt in my mind that I think it needs a lot more research before I'm happy to go down that path. I don't feel comfortable. If it was one of our children that was killed on a highway because someone had two beers and a joint we would be heartbroken and the person driving that car that was the cause of that accident might have thought I didn't think I was doing anything all that bad because they wouldn't know that if you take this and this and combine it, it is not one plus one equals two, its one plus one equals three, or three-and-a-half or four. I don't want to put the public at risk.

That gets to our other thing. What is law enforcement do. Well it's going to be legal, I don't know how the State Police, I don't know how

local police, I don't know how anybody driving behind someone who sees them maybe smoking a joint, is that illegal? I don't know. Is there grounds to pull that car over? I don't know. I'm guessing, no unless there is some other kind of problem with their driving. If they are weaving, crossing the centerline, speeding, but if those things aren't there is there a predicate to pull that car over. I'm thinking probably not. Not if we go down this path. That puts the public at risk.

The other thing is that marijuana on its face might not seem so bad but if an individual is involved in trying to abstain from either alcohol or other drugs or something else like that, they may get it in their head that well, the state government just legalized "recreational marijuana" and by the way when you call it "recreational marijuana" that, you know, sort of sounds like playground, like an amusement park like you know, playing cards with your friends, you know.

Language makes a difference. How you sell something makes a difference. The terminology makes a difference. How, well right here. It's not marijuana cause that's a bad word it's cannabis. Tomato, tomato, that was back then this is now and again I'm trying to look at this from a public policy, public safety, and physiological perspective, not morality and I don't think anybody is out there sort of like saying people that want to get high or smoke marijuana or cannabis are evil people. Just like someone wants to go and have a couple of drinks aren't evil people.

But studies have found that if you're trying to control other things in your life, and you think, well I can, I might have these other issues but marijuana shouldn't be an issue. No that's not true. That's just not true. There's the literature out there if you do a little digging that while you might not call it necessarily a gateway drug it clearly again, floods those synapses with the

dopamine at a level higher than the body is designed to do creating those, with the neuroplasticity, the pathways such that now your body which might otherwise have been doing okay, whether it is psychological, whether it is physiological or a combination now your inhibitions are reduced and you fall into old bad patterns that were not good for you.

Again, no high horse for me, not a moral judgement, I'm just looking at it from the public health perspective to the best I can and there are folks here that sit on the Public Health Committee and they may have questions, that is they bailiwick and I don't have their insights this year because this Bill never got in front of them, and you know, that is a problem for me.

I absolutely, Senator Winfield is a man of his word without a doubt, 110 percent. His word is gold. So when he says it's not about the money, it's not about the money but for some people in this building I think it is about the revenue. That's a part of it. There's the equity part too. There were certain neighborhoods that were hurt by the war on drugs but I also agree you would be very hard pressed to find anybody doing any kind of time in our corrections system simply for possession of marijuana, especially since this, you know, mere possession of a certain amount, you know, you get a ticket essentially. You mail it in and it's already like that. This just goes that last step. But when you go that last step, when the state puts its imprimatur, it's seal of approval on cannabis, marijuana now I go to that other thing.

That other issue availability. You know, if someone offered you a beer and it was like normal name brand beer and it had the label and it was nicely sealed, you wouldn't think twice, right. I'm guessing. I mean if you had an urge for a beer. If someone said I will give you the equivalent amount of alcohol but its bathtub gin I don't even know what bathtub gin

is other than it is probably gin made in a bathtub. But you hear about that when they talk about the, when they had prohibition and so the legal sale unless it was carted in from Canada and you had all the gangs looking for their share and speakeasys and knock on the door and all that crazy stuff. But there was these here in the Northeast and I'm guessing all over the country, this thing called bathtub gin is probably some sort of high alcohol content spirit made in someone's bathtub, gross, that's just fundamentally gross. But if you really wanted something and there was nothing in the neighborhood that might do it. But most people would say now a days, well this one is labeled, I sort of know it has quality control. Okay, I'm okay with that. Bathtub gin, eh, no. I'd have to really want to have a drink to have bathtub gin.

Well that's where we're going now with marijuana with cannabis. Once the states says, hey it's okay, up to, I think it's up to an ounce, I'll get to that with questions, which is a lot. Get a bag of chips from your caucus room, think about how big that bag is. I was saying if I was smart, I would like figure out like what amounts we're dealing with and got like a zip lock bag and put like some oregano in there and held it up and said look at how much this is because even though it doesn't sounds like a lot, even if you say just like an ounce, an ounce is a lot, it's like, you know, compare it to a bag of chips. I'm guessing if you went in there and started to roll joints, marijuana cigarettes you could get a lot out of that. It's like the super high test stuff, I don't know. I don't know how many people get high off of like one marijuana cigarette now a days. I just don't have that point of reference. I'm not Jones' it for it either. Consider myself lucky in that respect.

So by doing this, by passing what we have before us this evening, now it's going to be available. The mystique will have been taken away. Well, let's not get to youth first, let's get to those 21 and older,

those that are contemplative by the Bill. They can have, I'm going to say, I'm going to use an ounce because that is just sort of an easy point of reference. They are going to have the ability to have that and not be breaking any laws, completely okay. Probably like, I don't know, I can't even say like a case of beer, something like that because I don't know the reference. But whatever it is, the state is going to say, that amount is okay. People that might have always had a little curiosity they may not rush out to a dispensary or a place that sells it, but if they are at a party, maybe have a couple of drinks and their friends say, hey look at what we have, the temptation now might be there. Forget about the mixing, we don't know what that is going to do.

We don't know if there is designated drivers involved but now the temptation might be there. And these aren't dumb people, these are curious people. These are people that might have always said, you know, I sort of felt like the dork, the nerd, the outsider in college, I saw my friends doing this and I didn't want to do that. But now the State of Connecticut says, a-okay and guess what, I'm going to sleep over my friend's house, I don't care. I'll try it. This I have no doubt will have people try marijuana that otherwise would never, ever try it. And I'm hoping should the Bill become law and I don't support the Bill, I'm hoping for most people, not a big, huge problem, but for some people I think it might be and for some people I think it will be. Again neuroplasticity, dopamine, habit, more and more for the same effect and for some people, it's going to be somewhat addictive, come, come be a part of it, now. Now.

The party is over, that couple that has that marijuana where do they put it? They put it in a safe place, some place safe. Yeah like people in the old days, people used to have liquor cabinets, the kids never got in the liquor cabinets, right even when they were locked? Hey mom and dad could

even measure the amount in the alcohol bottle making sure junior or missy never had a drink. That'd never happen. Come on. Kids are going to be kids.

First of all the first barricade, the first buffer, mom and dad don't do this or mom and dad only do "ex", that's gone. That is out the window. Now the role models are takers of this new form or drug, it's available, it's not a new form, it's been around for hundreds and hundreds of years, I'm sure but it hasn't been in the house, right there, and maybe it is under lock and key someway, somehow, but kids are pretty smart, they know where the keys are. And, you know, things happen. But more importantly it's what we're telling you young people and I'm sort of happy because I think in many respects the generations behind us are sometimes a lot smarter than we give them credit for.

They certainly have eyes to see and ears to hear and they look and they see and they observe and in many respects some of the bad habits that I bumped into between myself and my friends when I was in high school and college, they don't go that direction. They are wiser. They have other things to fill up their time but they're also observant. They would rather go in this direction than that direction. But now we're going to create a whole new temptation, a whole new thing that they are going to have to come to terms with.

And if this becomes law, it's a matter of short period of time, now all of a sudden those kids in high school are going to be confronted head-on by this. Kids in college, I don't know. What do you do with a kid that's 21 in college? Make them room off campus, how's that going to work. It's going to be complicated. It's going to be just like it is with alcohol right now. I didn't see it so much in the papers this year probably because of Covid, but, you know, it's not unusual to see problems off campus at stores, or other college parties, you know, people drinking, doing crazy things, out of

control. Throw marijuana into the mix. Throw cannabis into the mix now. Oh those kids are now housed off campus in these apartments, is that going to stop anything or is that just going to make it that much easier. I don't know.

See, what I think we're doing by blessing this and yeah, I'm sorry, that's how I view this, by blessing this movement in this direction we are now creating a whole new thing that our young people are going to have to deal with, one way or another. Now people are going to say, they do it all the time now. It's just being sold illegally. Yes, I don't argue that.

This is an issue to some extent but when you make it legal and accessible to those 21 and older, and you are predicting revenues of "X" hundreds of thousands of dollars if not millions, that is presupposing a certain amount of sales that are now going to go into the system and if we tax it too high, then we are creating a huge demand on the "black market" or wherever people are buying marijuana right now when it is illegal. And if you take away all the penalties then if I'm a dealer I'm going to find out what the limits are and hey, now I know we're talking about let's say an ounce but if I've got a pound because I'm the person that's now dealing, but the penalty has been reduced, hey open season. Great environment for me, the State of Connecticut just helped my business.

So these are huge question marks I have and I don't believe they have been adequately answered to my satisfaction. I think each and every person in this Circle has grappled with this issue one way or another and I'm going to urge everyone to vote no, I certainly don't urge everyone to vote yes. I think it is a big mistake. You know, how many people had parents who said if all your friends jumped off a bridge would you do that, you know? No.

If a hand full of other states are doing that why should we. Oh well, you know, the adjoining states

are doing this, we're just going to lose revenue. Really, really? If it's wrong, why can't we be the island, the oasis. Why can't we be the safe harbor for people that don't want to go down this direction. You know, we could market ourselves in that way as opposed to saying, well, this state is doing it and that state is doing it so we as may double down. You know, representing a border district has always been frustrating. Whenever we like jack-up gasoline taxes and I say, hey, hey, you know, I got a bunch of towns bordering Massachusetts it should be call "Taxachusetts" now people go across the border to get their gas and while they are there they get their cigarettes and they get their groceries. How frustrating. Well, you know, that's how it is. Porous state lines but you don't have to just copy all these surrounding states not unless you have all the answers and I don't think we do.

So between the neuroplasticity, the dopamine flooding the synapses of the brain the forming brain of the adolescents and young people, the temptation That this will pose because it now will become ubiquitous and prevalent and have the stamp of approval, the people now will be tempted that are over 21, and families maybe broken by young people that go down a path that they otherwise might never have gone down. Hey what a Session. Eighteen you can gamble online, you can gamble on sports. Turn 21 get high, you never have to leave your basement, yeah, that's progress.

I have some questions for the proponent of the Bill, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield please prepare yourself. Proceed, Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Sure. I'm just going to ask some broad brush questions on various areas of the Bill and no need, I mean this is a long, long Bill and a lot of Sections and I'm not grilling you on every little Section tonight but I'd like to get the broad brush regarding your position regarding it. First of all, I'd like to know what this Bill does regarding home grown marijuana. I know for a number of years we really didn't want to go down that path where people are growing plants. I know there is expected revenues considered to be gleaned from dispensaries but my first question is, does this Bill contemplate the growth of marijuana? Is there like, I don't know, where do you get the seeds to grow a plant of marijuana or am I going to be able to go to a nursery and get like, you know?

I got to be honest, like I just planted, with the little time we had over the weekend, I had these petunias. Petunias are great, you plant them in like the late spring and they will go all the way to the fall [Laughter] but if you don't bed them in time, they will wilt and die and so I'm all for trying, especially in New England trying to grow my vegetables and flowers from, you know, plants you get from a nursery as opposed to from seed because seed you got to start planting in March. I mean there's people in this Circle that plant from seed, but I don't have that quality of a green thumb. So, I'm just wondering where do you get the stock and what's contemplated as far as individuals ability to grow stuff at home?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Bill does deal with the issue of home grow. Once the Bill is passed

those who are medical qualified patients can begin home growing and in July of 2023 home grown would be allowable for individuals who are outside of the program and they would be allowed three mature plants and three immature plants. They would be allowable a maximum of 12 plants per household. So when you think about the individual who has three mature and three immature that is six plants, that is basically the allowance for two individuals and beyond that we would not be able to do that. I don't pretend to know all about seeds and cultivation. The machinations of that are beyond my capacity but the Bill does deal with the issue and lay forth what the quantity that one can home grow is.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much and I appreciate that answer. And again.

Through you, Madam President.

Regarding erasure of records, I know the Bill contemplates, you know, we had Clean Slate Bill and we had some other proposals regarding erasures of records and I'm just wondering what this Bill does to either enhance that or like what is contemplated by that portion of this Bill that has to do with criminal record erasure.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I think this will happen quite a bit. I actually want to get to the Statute but I can tell the good Senator, Sections 8 and 9 deal with erasure of the criminal records and allows for petitions to erase the cannabis related convictions within a certain period. I will first give that to Senator Kissel and answer as the process by which it happens.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And so there is a portion of this Bill that has to do with erasure and in the interest of time maybe some of my colleagues have some further questions regarding that but I'm going to keep moving because I don't want to hog the Circle. I always think I am going to be brief, brief to me is probably a different world.

But the social equity part seems to have been, I wouldn't say a stumbling block but something where it took a fair amount of time to reach at least a consensus amongst those supporters of the Bill and I guess and again, correct me if I am wrong, but I sort of feel like there is this notion that there was this war on drugs and there were certain communities that were disproportionately impacted although somewhere along the line in one of the Public Hearings I attended it was like suburban, like if you look at a list of top ten communities where there were convictions for drug related offenses, you know, that top ten list has major urban areas but there are also some fairly small rural suburban towns on that list as well.

And so I'm wondering if when we talk about social equity are we talking about any community that has a large number of historical convictions for drug and

exactly how that measured. In other words would a small rural community not be considered because it's population is small even though as a percentage of its population may be there was like a much larger percentage of convictions. I'm just wondering what the yardstick is.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, just one second, Madam President. Let me see if I can orient myself in the Bill to give the answer to Senator Kissel. Thank you, Madam President. So when we are talking about the applicants who would be under the social equity portion of the Bill, it defined beginning on Line 235, which is social equity applicant, and then it suggests what the characteristics are.

So the individual would have to had a household income of less than 300 percent of the state median income for over the last three tax years proceeding the applications. The resident would have to be a resident of a disproportionately impacted area but not less than five of the ten years immediately preceding the application or to be a resident of a district disproportionately area for not less than nine years prior to attaining the age of 18. Those are in combination the ways that the social equity applicant is defined.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And again disproportionately impacted community and I am guessing we would just use municipality although, I really admire Senator Miner's colloquy with Senator Cohen regarding boroughs, and subcomponents of municipalities. I'm guessing though we are not going to get down to that level. But a disproportionately impacted community has there been a run like what the top five disproportionately impacted communities would be? I know the other factor sort of tends to be more individual centric but the communities probably should be available.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. So the Bill provides a disproportionately impacted area which the definition refers to, that is in Line 78 and that is a census tract that is determined by the Social Equity Council under Section 22 of the Act and it was include historical conviction rates for drug related offenses greater than one-tenth of an unemployment rate greater than 10 percent.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Through you, Madam President.

Yea, okay.

So, through you, Madam President but has anybody sat down and says all right, looking at these definitions, you know, Hartford is in there, and

Bridgeport is in there, and New Haven is in there, and Lisbon is in there and Sprague is in there. I mean has anybody like looked at that criteria and sort of punched in the numbers because those numbers are fairly objective. They are what they are.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. During the discussions that led up to the creation of the Bill, there was several time where the definition was, the definition of what the impacted area was discussed and tried out if you will seeing where we would land on maps. I don't have the maps with me but yes, they were looked at.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Where are those maps?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

I don't have the maps with me. I don't know how to answer that question any differently than that.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Well, there is plenty of stuff here but I think since we are debating the seminal Bill for the first time here in the Circle and it's got to go down to the House, that if there was a run and we know someone out there has the map that, and by the way, that is not a disparaging comment on any of these towns and cities that I just sort of rattled off, I was just throwing names out there. And by the way, you know, if you are a disproportionately impacted community I don't necessarily equate that with something extraordinarily negative.

I mean if you were one of the individuals impacted in those communities I'm sure you would view it as negative to some respect that is why you are getting a disproportionate benefit in the process but I don't want anybody in those communities to say, hey, you know, you're ranking on my town because I'm not. That is not my point at all. I guess, I wish I could get my arms around, hey, you know, does one of these communities fall in my district? I don't know. Is something, one of these communities in Hartford County? I don't know. So if that is out there and we can sort of dig it out before we do a final vote on this Bill that might be helpful otherwise I guess we will just have wait and see.

This group, and I think you referenced it in the answer to my previous question, this Council. Who is on there and not, you know, precisely like, Hey John, you're on there. Like who makes, you know, usually we have certain appointments from different legislative leaders and things like that. And I'm just wondering like what is the notion behind the

composition of this group because it appears they are going to have, if not, total authority, a lot of directory authority as to where social equity component of this Bill goes.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, if you give me a second I will get to Section 22 in the Bill.

Madam President? So if Senator Kissel will find himself on Line 1046 that is where Section 22 of the Bill begins and when they talk about this Social Equity Council there will be 15 members of the council, one would be appointment by the Speaker of the House of Representative, having certain qualifications.

One is appointed by the President Pro Tem of the Senate. One is the Majority Leader the House Majority Leader of the Senate, and then I'm going backwards, sorry. I'm reading the Bill backwards, I'm sorry. One is appointed by the Minority Leader of the House, one is appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate. One person is appointed by the Chair of Black and Puerto Rican Caucus and then there are four appointments by the Governor, the commissioner of Consumer Protection or their designee, Consumer of Economic and Community Development, the State Treasure, the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management. These are the members of the Social Equity Commission.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much and I appreciate that answer. Now I am going to switch gears a little bit here. When the Commonwealth of Massachusetts moved in this direction they did it my referenda and it passed the referenda and as a provision of the legalization of marijuana in Massachusetts there was also a provision to my understanding regarding location of dispensaries and the way Massachusetts did it was if your community, let's say, Springfield, voted in favor of the legalization then you would have a right to create a dispensary in that community and the only way that that community could then turn around and impose rules and say no, would be through another ballot in that community because that community already voted by majority to allow for the legalization of marijuana.

Conversely if your community, I used to work in a summer camp in the smallest community in Massachusetts a little town in the southwest corner called Mount Washington, so let's say the 600 people in Mount Washington voted no, then and someone wanted to put a dispensary up there, I'll let you know nothing goes in up there in that town, they don't want anything in that town, and wonderful people, but they are very protective of their scenic location and just bucolic forested little community, I love that community up there. They are great people. But in any event in that kind of community the local elected body, first selectperson, town council or whatever they had, they could make that determination because that community by a majority vote said, "no" we don't want to legalize marijuana.

So let's say this Bill goes forward, is there any provision in here that would allow a municipality to turndown an applicant who wanted to create a dispensary in that community. There is probably going to be cities and towns out there that want dispensaries and it could be large, small, just, you know, the people and there is probably going to be a

lot of municipalities that are going to say for whatever reason we are not interested in having a business in our community that sells or dispenses cannabis and we want to say "no". So I am just wondering how a community, what authority they have one way or another regarding dispensaries being located in their municipal parameters.

Through you, Madam President. Oops, Mr. President. You took me by surprise.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. So if the good Senator could find himself on Line 6965 beginning there it talks about the communities in Connecticut and what they are capable of doing with these cannabis establishments and through zoning the communities can prohibit the establishment of a cannabis establishment, establish reasonable restriction so it is through the community zoning process that they would be able to make those choices.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

And through you, Mr. President.

I am guessing not a lot of communities have zoning regs right now that address marijuana or cannabis dispensaries so should this Bill pass and be signed

into law, would it, would it be incumbent on a municipality that had a concern regarding this that they should be about the business of amending their zoning regulations? And if they did in response to the passage of this and this becoming law for example in all other ways following all their local rules and regulations and posting of notices, pass the regulation saying no dispensaries, could they be brought into court as being unfair or something like that?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. On the first part of the question, I don't think particularly given the way that the Bill was constructed that it would be my place to tell a municipality what they should do with their zoning. We make the language permissive. They can zone and make regulations or they can chose not to have one of these facilities. So I would just leave that there. I just forgot the second part of your question, I'm sorry.

Through you, Mr. President.

I would ask that Senator Kissel restate the second part.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel would you restate that part of your question please?

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

And I guess the answer to my own question is anybody can sue a ham sandwich is the old adage but if a municipality following its own rules and regulations and changed its zoning or adding to its zoning regulations to create and prohibition on dispensaries for whatever reason, could they be brought into court as somehow violating the rights of someone who was in business and wanted to put a dispensary in that municipality.

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm never going to suggest what people will try to get in court for but because the Bill expressly gives the permission to the municipalities to use zoning I don't think that the individual who might, as Senator Kissel well knows, attempt to get into court would have much standing in the court of law in the State of Connecticut once this is passed in the Statue.

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. And one of my chief concerns are young people and a lot of communities pride themselves in their school districts and being "family friendly" it's very reassuring to know that a community that chose to

not have a dispensary within its borders has a mechanism to move forward with that.

I would now like to switch to the portion regarding licensure and any concomitant regulatory fees.

And through you, Mr. President.

If someone or some entity, a corporation, an LLC wants to get into this business assuming this becomes law, is there a filing fee, where does it go, and what is the filing fee get them? Somewhere in the back of my mind \$3 million dollars pops in there but I just want to be straight on that?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Give me a moment to pull to orient myself and then orient Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I would ask a question because I think the answer depends on who we are referring to getting into this process. So there's differences for retailer, hybrid retailer, cultivator. I ask if the good Senator would be more specific but before that, I would say that starting on line 1590 we deal with retailer licenses, 1594 hybrid retailer licenses,

1698 cultivator licenses. But I just want to make sure that I am actually answering the question that is being posed to me.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much.

Through you, Mr. President.

And I am going to start winding down because there is a lot of my colleagues want to ask some questions and I am going to reserve like a few, like five minutes to wrap-up at the end of all this but. So I've just got a couple more areas. So for the next individual that wants to jump up, I'm just saying you're on deck pretty soon.

But regarding this, the overarching general question is, this is our construct. This is our Bill before us and a concern that some of my constituents have raised is that this is sort of a slippery slope.

I hate to use that hackney phrase, there's so many others, but they are concerned that local entities can get in this business, jump through all the hoops, do everything that they have to do but then slip what is their position here in Connecticut and that before you know it some large multinational corporation, it could be big tobacco, it could be big pharma, it could be a big alcohol corporation, it could a tobacco corporation and then all of a sudden that is the entity that is making the profit, there is going to be this social equity component, I get that, but the corporate profit to have like almost a monopoly on this situation if you are one of these really money interests, is a serious, I wouldn't necessarily say threat but the possibility and is there anything in the Bill that would

prohibit that and I know we talked about angel inverters and things like that, it just says to me big money come on in and, a lot of our largest corporations are wonderful corporate citizens and it is not a disparaging thing that I am saying about them, but it is one thing to look at this as sort of like small scale and once you start ratcheting up the large scale then new things percolate as the years fly-by.

So I'm just wondering does this Bill contemplate that down the road major corporations or heavily monied LLCs or hedge funds could own these enterprises and there is nothing in the Bill that would prohibit that.

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. So I would say to. Sorry. I would say to Senator Kissel that I do think there are limitations in the Bill. I think there are limitations because at least with the initial application for any of these things we're talking about half are reserved for social equity so those would have to be people who meet those definitions but also we limit the number of licenses that you can obtain, right, under the Bill. So I don't think. And this is a good question because I think one of the concerns across the communities as we were dealing with the issue of what it would be to license was exactly what Senator Kissel was talking about. It is interesting though, I'm sure Senator Kissel meant no disparaging remarks but it is interesting we are kind of reversing roles here as it is sometimes is laid out in the Chamber about business, right. So that is interesting but the

notion that we should not allow individuals to come in and monopolize the system is built into the Bill.

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and how nice to hear Senator Winfield. I never had a doubt that you are a free marketeer, so. No news there.

Employer relationship with employee, schools, corporations, we have a lot of defense industries they are huge employers, Sikorsky, Electric Boat, United Technologies in its various forms and subdivisions, to my understanding that when you are receiving federal funds there are certain prescriptions.

This is going to move away from federal law regarding marijuana/cannabis and so for these companies to have these contracts with the federal government for the defense industry or whatever, are there protections in here that would allow a corporation an LLC, some kind of, even a partnership, even a sole proprietorship to impose restriction on their employees thereby requiring them not to be under the influence of cannabis while on the job and also to perhaps be randomly tested although it is my understanding we don't have a really good test right now that is time specific - which is a huge issue for pulling people over and like, you know, my understanding is like take a strand of hair but that person could have gotten high like 30 days ago, it's still going to be in the hair.

But I'm just looking at it from the business person's point of view. What are the parameters

that they can use? And is there anything reassuring in here for these large corporations that have major federal contracts and I doesn't have to be a defense contractor it could be a federally chartered bank. Anybody that has dealings with the federal government and I've heard like you can't have anything like this on Bradley International Airport, all governed by Federal Law.

So, through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Bill deals with federal contracts, critical safety and make exemptions for those things, that was part of the conversation recognizing that we build that into the Bill. I will say, Senator Kissel may know this, there is an Amendment that makes largely technical changes but also clarifies even further that we will call later in the discussion.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Yeah, I'm going to end with this part, sort of two part thing. I actually have two more things and then I'm just going to pass it along again with the reservations to conclude at the end.

So the first of the last two inquiries have to do with schools and I'm just wondering, you know, one of my hugest concerns is school children and are there provisions in here that would allow boards of

education, town council, first selectmen, board of selectmen whomever is in charge in a particular municipality to have rules regarding cannabis use on school property, by teachers, and/or by administrators?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Give me a moment, I know there is but I have to get to the section.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. There is a statute that currently allows for schools to implement policy dealing with the use, sale, possession of alcohol controlled drugs. After January 1, 2022, the only thing that changes with the policy is that you can't receive greater punishment, discipline, or sanction than they would based for the sale or possession of alcohol. That would align possession of alcohol rules that the school would have with the possession of cannabis rules.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And there are a whole slew of questions that I could ask about school and school policy related to that but I am going to move on to my last area of inquiry. And that has to do with not the traditional cannabis, marijuana that one associates with dried plant materials that one can roll into joints, marijuana cigarettes, that one could put into devices such as pipes and bong, and hookahs I guess and things like that. But, you know, this whole area developed so much that now there is candies, there is probably food like cake or fudge and things like that and in particular anything that looks like a candy, you know.

I was talking to some of my colleagues earlier today and I said, you know, people just got all over Joe Camel. Joe Camel was appealing to kids and, you know, Joe Camel got knocked right out and no, no, no that appeals to young people and lures them into the health risks of tobacco and, you know, I'm not so sure I was against Joe Camel but I understood the rationale behind that and so now my, if we are going to go in this direction and they can turn cannabis marijuana into gummy bears and candy forms that look like, you know, the stuff would get at Halloween for Trick or Treat, I hope we haven't done away with that because of the pandemic, cause that's a great tradition for families to have and neighborhoods. You know, go into any *GVS*, *Walgreen*, *Rite-Aid* what have you, major store the candy aisle, there's all sorts of stuff but it is now all of a sudden well in fact, I think we had a Bill that we already voted on or we are going to vote on, that package stores can come up with some kind of I think it's like candy that has alcohol in it and they can sell that.

And so if they can do that with alcohol and it's my understanding from public hearing that they can do that with cannabis, so my concern is there anything in the Bill before us that would cause us to walk before we run when it comes to these new forms of

solid cannabis marijuana and especially those that could be, if not overtly directed to young people maybe somehow inadvertently directed to young people because they are in the form of something that might otherwise might be innocuous and completely, not super healthy if you talk to your dentist or trying to watch your calories but, hey you know, no one is going to get uptight about a piece of candy unless you're, you know, have health issues regarding sugar and stuff like that.

I guess what I'm talking about is cannabis brought to a form that clearly looks innocuous but could be very dangerous not only for children but, you know, for the even the person over 21 that has, you know, no idea what a piece of cannabis laced chocolate is going to do to them and, you know, you might do it and the other sort of part of that is that if it is in a food form, it gets into your system slower, so like, you know, if someone is smoking something it's going to hit them faster and they are going to know, should I drive, should I not drive and all these other things that are hazards where ass it sort of slowly seeping into your system you could be halfway down a highway and then all of a sudden bang, it hits you and now you're a real danger to yourself, whoever might be in your car with you, other people on the road, so I'm just wondering if these other forms of cannabis, does this Bill address that and if so how?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President I hope that I answer the question, but happy to make a second attempt at it because there is a lot there obviously for good reason.

So, Madam President the Bill has some prohibitions thinking about the fact that this is supposed to be legalized for adults and we are not attempting bring young people into the consumption of cannabis. So it prohibits advertisements of cannabis to any audience that is less than 90 percent adult because on the reliable data that we would have. It prevents, prohibits any mechanism that targets minors like characters, animals, celebrities. It prohibits smartphone ads unless the user is a verified adult, websites that would have the advertising would have to verify that there is greater than a 21-year-old audience. It can't sponsor concerts or events unless greater than 90 percent adult audience. Cannot advertise outside or within 500 feet of a school or other place where children are gathering. So the Bill does take into account that we had things like Joe Camel and will prevent those types of things.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. I was not trying to over an hour and a half, I have. And I know there is a lot of people in my caucus in particular but I'm sure others on the other side of the aisle want to speak on this Bill as well. And again I am going to speak one more time when we are getting to the end, hopefully not 4:00 a.m. but life is life.

But I do believe this is the wrong direction for the State of Connecticut. I think there are so many unanswered questions. I don't minimize the good intentions of the proponents, they have been working at this issue for a number of years, there is nothing new about the concept of moving in this direction but again, especially our young people, the message that it sends, the unanswered questions

regarding potency. The unintended consequences regarding individuals that might not otherwise try cannabis/marijuana in any way, shape, or form, its deleterious, impacts when combined with other drugs or alcohol especially as it impacts the ability to drive.

Law enforcement that is a whole area I could have asked questions on but others I'm sure will follow up regarding that. But the inability to my knowledge to have anything like the sufficiency and accuracy of a breathalyzer test or even, you know, to that matter, I know there is some training that individual officers can have but, you know, the horizontal nystagmus test to my knowledge, I'm no expert on that, I just refer to the law enforcement experts on that but there is like, it's not just like your balance, I sort of get an idea about that, but you eye does stuff if you're trying to follow your finger like it won't move a certain way and that's how they can sort of conduct further tests.

I don't think we even had anything like that for marijuana/cannabis but maybe we do. But I just don't think we have anything that might standup in a court of law and again the big question is do we have anything that if a car gets pulled over, you know, with an alcohol related stop, that's been tried and tested in the court of law and there is a certain, you know, things that protect both the person that is pulled over as well as, you know, the public safety and I think we are in a grey area when it comes to marijuana/cannabis and so for all those reasons and again fundamentally concern regarding the direction our state is taking regarding this, and its impact upon the generations following us, behind us that look up to us, I don't support this Bill at this time and with that, I will yield the rest of my time to others in the Circle that have questions and comments.

And I want to thank Senator Winfield for being so open and answering my questions and it has been a

pleasure to work with him on the Judiciary Committee for these many years and I look forward to continuing to do so. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. First, let me say I am happy to answer any questions anyone has. And then the suggest that as I said in answer to one of Senator Kissel's questions there is an Amendment that cleans up some of the language, commas, certain things like that but also adds in language that further clarifies the exemptions that exist and that can be adverse actions taken as required by federal law deals with CDLs and things of that nature. Strikes Section 85 of the Bill which is a school survey that we dealt with in another Bill and strikes Section 174 which was dealing with an entry into the system and so it is LCO 10470. Well, I already summarized it but [Laughter] I ask that the Clerk call LCO 10470 and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 10470, Senate Amendment "A"

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President I urge Adoption. I kind of did that backwards, already summarized the Amendment so, there you go.

THE CHAIR:

And the Question is on Adoption and you have remarked and you are welcome to remark further if you would like or I could open the floor and see if there are any other Senators who would like to remark on the Amendment that is before the Chamber. Senator Kissel. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, to correct it, maybe it was on me but it was 10470.

THE CHAIR:

10470, is that correct? Give us one minute we are amending the Amendment.

All right so we do have the appropriate LCO 10470, oh and I will ask again if anyone else would like to comment on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I know that Senator Winfield sort of gave a synopsis of the Amendment I guess with his indulgence.

Through you, Madam President.

Knowing my position in opposition to the Bill would you say that this tightens up the Bill or loosens up the Bill in that summation would be helpful to me.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. As it adds in that there is an exemption so that there can be adverse actions taken for federal, as per federal law and we can deal with disqualifications of CPLs and things like that, and I mean the technical parts don't loosen it, I would say that this Amendment in a sense does tighten it but I recognize Senator Kissel is on the other side of the discussion I would not be upset if he checked my work.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. That is good enough for me. At this point in time I do think it tightens it up a little bit, not enough to get me to come on board that's for sure but I'm not going to oppose the Amendment and I think it's good to move this debate further along down the road, so with that I leave it to the good consciences of everybody here in the Circle but I don't, as someone who dramatically opposes this Bill that it necessarily makes it any worse and maybe makes it a little better. Thanks.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. 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 those in favor of the Amendment please signify by saying, Aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed. The Ayes, have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Senator Champagne, Good Evening.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good Evening. I have quite a few comments on this Bill. We are going to start by saying that, you know, being a police officer for 22 years one of the biggest comments and the most, I should say a lot of the studies that I've seen said that people do not use illegal drugs, the number one reason is because they're illegal.

What happened in Colorado, you got a lot of people going there just to use a lot of them for the first time, a lot of them ended up in the hospital. And we are going to see that here. In fact it's not were going to see this here, we are already seeing it here. A hospital on the border in my district has seen so many patients coming out of Massachusetts who have been under the influence of marijuana, many with psychological issue go in with psychosis and different things happening to them, in fact at a meeting up there that was one of the topics we talked about. So this is going to create a problem where we are going to hurt people. The black market doesn't go away.

In fact, this legislation is going to help the black market, it's going to protect the black market. It's going to make it easier to transport those drugs and as I go through this I am going to point that out. I am going to just jump right into it.

So this starts by saying a person can have one-and-a-half ounces of cannabis plant material on them and they can have five ounces at home locked up or they can have five ounces in the car, in the glovebox or the trunk locked up. That makes it easier for drug dealers to transport the materials around. Under the age of 18 get caught with marijuana, five ounces of plant material or the equivalent amount of cannabis products your first offense is a written warning. What we've seen numerous times is the criminals, especially the gangs, will take those younger people and they will carry the drugs for them and they will deal for them and if they get caught in possession it is a written warning. So they're good. But again if they get caught again they get referred to the Youth Service Bureau where they are adjudicated as a delinquent, either way the same thing. Nothing is going to happen. I can see this getting a lot of young people involved in this. The funny thing is get caught with alcohol it's \$136.00 dollar fine. So you pay a bigger fine for having alcohol than you do marijuana.

Eighteen years of age or older but under 21 you are fined \$50.00 dollars but if you can prove that you're poor they are going to waive that. If you are a juvenile I don't think there is really an offense and it also states that you can't get arrested.

I am going to jump ahead a little bit up at Section 8 because I want to talk about the erasure of the criminal records. You know, where, if you are looking to become a dealer in the State of Connecticut where do you get your drugs from? It's the cities that's where you get it because that's where you go and buy it. So you go buy it and you bring it back and you sell it.

And what was the biggest arrest in those areas, it was for dealing drugs. You knew what you were doing, you were making money, a lot of time you were making good money. I stopped a 14-year-old one

night he had \$1,200 dollars in cash in his pocket, brand-new sneakers, \$100 something dollar sneakers, walking down the middle of the road, part of a gang. Not even two weeks later somebody went to his bedroom, demanded his money, and then shot and killed him when they shot him through the window. But we're going to erase the drug dealing charges. Nobody is really locked up for possession. When they went through and decriminalized marijuana the prosecutors all said that there is nobody in jail for possession, not for just a simple possession. So if you had a small amount of marijuana equal for four ounces or you had six plants we're going to move to erase that, which we are going to erase records anyway so, you know, I guess that's the same thing.

Just going to jump around, going to go straight forward to make it easier to follow. Section 11. Section 11 I thought was interesting. Basically and it's not just Section 11, it's all the Sections, it talks about the different groups that are going to be in the marijuana business and it says, that "employee or backer of cannabis establishment may be subject to arrest or prosecution" hold on, "notwithstanding any provision of the general statute, no cannabis establishment employee or backer of cannabis establishment maybe subject to arrest or prosecution, penalized in any manner including but not limited to being subject to any civil penalty or denied any right or privilege including but not limited to being subject to any disciplinary action by a professional licensing board for the acquisition, distribution, possession, use or transportation of cannabis paraphernalia related to cannabis in this capacity." So these are the protections I think they don't want them arrested, this is what makes it legal for them to do that at least on the state level not on federal level. And if the law every changes on the federal level this all changes as well. You know, we're basically getting in here that if you're dealing, you know, we are going to let you do that, not a

problem. Not going to read each one of those, just go through it.

Section 18. That's where we're talking about "existence of any of the following circumstances shall not constitute in part or in whole probable cause or reasonable suspicion shall not be used as a reason to support any stop or search of a person or motor vehicle" that's the odor of cannabis or burnt cannabis. "The presence of cash or currency in proximity of cannabis without evidence of such cash or currency exceeds \$500 dollars" so if you're dealing and you have five ounces in the glovebox another ounce-and-a-half on you and you have less than \$500 dollars, cause you don't want to go over \$500 dollars cause they can seize your money according to that, again making it easier for the black market.

Actually, can I ask a question of the proponent?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Absolutely. Please prepare yourself Senator Winfield. Please proceed, Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just a question, the marijuana being sold in dispensaries is there going to be a tax stamp or some identifiable mark on the packaging that taxes were paid and this came from one of the outlets?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

My mic isn't on. So, Madam President.

Through you, Madam President.

I do not believe that there is a tax stamp associated with the products under this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And through you again.

Is there any identifiable mark that would say that this came from one of the legal marijuana dispensaries?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I do not see anything in the Bill that has that there although I would say that there are regulations that will be created that could potentially do some of the things that the Senator is asking questions on.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So again it is not in the Bill that we are going to vote on today. Which basically, I didn't see anything in here that talked about size or packaging or anything like that either, so again I can load up my car with five

ounces, and ounce-and-a-half on my possession, make sure I have less than \$500 dollars in there and nobody is going to know the difference, even if I am pulled over and I don't know, for some reason somehow the officer comes up with a legal standard to search the car which is pretty impossible, you can't even say that it marijuana from the black market or if it is from the dispensary. So in other words as long as the drug dealer stays under the limit, keeps the cash under the limit he's good. He can keep on dealing.

In Line 1572.

Through you, Madam President.

To the proponent of the Bill. In Line 1572 there is ways of they are going to come out with ways to have the permitting the outdoor cultivation of cannabis can take place, basically growing marijuana outside. How are we going to make sure that that marijuana is going to be protected and not be accessible to children in the neighborhood or anyone else for that matter?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. The Commissioner would be promulgating regulations, those boundaries would be incorporated.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So again we are leaving it up to somebody else, we are not putting that in the law to make sure that these grow facilities are protected. I know I was talking to somebody recently about growing in Massachusetts and just the security and everything they've got to go through and it's got to be indoors and then I'm just reading this and if the Commissioner can come up with some sort of standards that we can grow outdoors, I hope I'm not seeing this as a, you know, we are going to have field, after field planted and no protection around it because it is a lot harder to protect marijuana outside. I don't need to talk about that.

Another question.

Through you, Madam President.

On Line 3674, "the laboratory shall maintain all minimum security and safeguard requirements for the storage of handling of controlled substances." Do we have anywhere in the Bill what minimum security and safeguards for the storage is?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President if you give me a second to catch-up to where the Good Senator was. Madam President, sorry it's taken me a while I don't know where anybody is going so I have to catch-up. Madam President the Bill itself doesn't layout the safeguards that are in place.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would think that a law of this magnitude and the fact that, you know, securing this away from our juvenile or our youth I should say, would be important and I figured they would have some sort of minimum security safeguards contained in this Bill.

On Line, or I'm sorry, Section 93. "A drug test of an individual yields a positive result solely for the tetrahydrocannabinol shall not be construed without other evidence as proof that such individual is under the influence or impaired by cannabis." Can you just tell me what?

Through you, Madam President.

What tests are available to prove intoxication?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President I would first ask the good Senator to orient me with the Line because I couldn't make out what he was reading and it's just impossible to even know what the question is. But before that I just want, because I didn't know how this was going to take place, I would have responded earlier, I just want to respond to some of the things he said just for clarity because when he was in Section 11, he ended his commentary on so drug dealing is okay.

I'm not sure that is what Section 11 is about because Section 11 relates itself to the establishment itself and operating in such a way as to do the things the establishment, which is not drug dealing, the establishment would be doing. So I'm not sure that is correct and I think it is

important and I recognize the point being made but I don't think that is correct.

If I could be oriented to the Line it would actually answer that question as well.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Sorry, I said Section 93 but it is 4261.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I need a moment to get to the Line. And so Madam President I am sorry, having tried to follow and couldn't follow, I am not sure what the question is, I would be happy to answer the question now.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Sorry, I was just going back to Section 11 to see what you were talking about.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne, please proceed.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Sorry.

Through you, Madam President.

What tests are available to prove intoxication besides the field tests?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I am not sure that. I'm not sure I understand the question, this Section here is talking about whether there is a positive test or not, not intoxication. So maybe I didn't hear everything that the Senator is talking about but perhaps he could clarify for me what he is intending by the question.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So after the individual is stopped, if they can find an officer with the proper credentials, they see he is intoxicated, they bring him in. You can't put somebody on intoxalizer because that determines how much alcohol is in the system. So what tests are going to be used to see how much marijuana is in the system?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Maybe because it's been a long day, I'm missing the question. I'm sorry. I'll try again, sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

When a suspect when the individual. We want to see if the individual is intoxicated from marijuana but maybe this is the wrong Section to bring this up and, I can bring it up at another Section, but I am just trying to figure out if they have tests available to determine if somebody is intoxicated. So maybe this is the wrong. It should have been brought in when we were talking about under the influence. But if somebody is under the influence of marijuana, driving, they get pulled over, they go through the specialist and they are brought back to the station. Is there a test we can do to see what the level of intoxication is on that individual?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

I think in terms of the level of intoxication there isn't to my knowledge a test that does that although I have read about research and work being done and tests that are in the not too distant future that perhaps could do that type of thing.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Through you, Madam President.

So basically this relies on the drug expert and right now I'm pretty sure we don't have enough drug experts in the State of Connecticut. What are we going to do if we don't have enough drug experts for when this law goes into effect?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. That is a conversation that has been ongoing. There has been conversation and I believe that the good Senator may know this about drug recognition experts not having enough and putting money into not just the budget that is current but even the past to make sure that we have enough drug recognition experts as someone having something to do with that. I am aware of the issue and have been working on that issue even currently. So, Madam President we are working on making sure that whatever we are in requirement of we will have.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just to give an idea of what kind of costs we're looking at, I attempted to get two officers into the, this Drug Recognition Expert Class, it was going to cost \$13,000 dollars for two. That is a massive expense and I don't think many departments are going to be rushing to get into that. I'll talk a little bit about that a little more as we go on.

Line 4272, it gets into, "with respect to a parent, legal guardian of a child, newborn infant, or pregnant woman shall not form the sole or primary basis for any action or proceeding by the Department of Children and Families or any successor agencies provided." Basically they are talking, what I believe here they are talking about, you know, they are under the influence of marijuana and that can't be used against them as a parent or guardian of children. Am I reading that correct?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

I think, so what this Section is dealing with is the presence of metabolites in the system and what it says is, with respect to that the mere presence of the metabolite is not the cause for an action or proceeding but, that if there is harm or risk of harm to the child, or an action may proceed.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is going to lead me to my next question which is going to be on Line 4056. And it says basically they are talking about in buildings, but I am going to start with 4056 and it basically says, "within a child care facility or on the grounds of such child care facility except that the child care facility is a family child care

facility" home is defined in Section 19(a)77, "such use is prohibited only when a child enrolled in such home is present during customary business hours." So basically the way I read this is there is a home daycare, and you cannot partake in marijuana use during customary business hours. Is there anything in this that would stop that daycare person from using marijuana just before the kids arrive?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. I, looking at this Section, there is nothing that would prohibit one using cannabis outside of those customary business hours when the children would be present.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That is a little concerning to me as well. All right. I know the Department of Health didn't weigh in on a lot of this, in fact I don't even believe they were at the Public Hearing, which is concerning to me because I know this, you know, a lot of this is, a lot of this should be in their realm. I'm not going to talk about that.

You know what, so in a hotel in order for somebody, in order to prohibit somebody from smoking and you have to have or to be somebody to be convicted of smoking in a hotel or other area, it goes into you

"must have a sign", Line 4121. It describes the sign, "It shall have letters at least four inches high with the principle strokes of letter not to be less than one-half inch wide." Can this sign be as you enter the hotel, can you have a sign on the door?

Through you, Madam President.

On the door that says, you know, "No smoking marijuana"?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I'm sorry to do this to the good Senator but I was trying to catch up with him and in doing so I missed him. So if you could restate your question.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And through you, again.

We will start at Line 4114 and it basically says, "in each room, elevator, area of the building in which the use of electronic nicotine or cannabis delivery systems or vapor product is prohibited by this section, the person in control of the premises shall post or cause to be posted in a conspicuous place signs stating that such use is prohibited by state law" and then it goes into the size of the sign. Can I put one sign on the door or must I put all over the entire inside the building, the

elevators, everywhere that you cannot smoke marijuana on the premises?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I think conspicuous means places that one would likely see or run into the sign and I think that language also is in effect currently for electronic nicotine and so it would be pursuant to the same way in which electronic nicotine signs would operate. I would also say that while that is a Section that talks about the part that the operator has, is also true in Line 4066 that there is prohibition on the usage of cannabis in any room offered as accommodation to guests by the operator of a hotel, motel, or similar lodging.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'll take that as you must put signs up. Okay. And then 4710, it talks about "no person having possession or exercising dominion and control over any dwelling unit or private property shall knowingly, recklessly permit any person under the age of 21 years of age to possess cannabis in violation of the law." Does that include parents?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, if you give me a moment, I just caught up to the Line. Madam President as the Section reads and it is a wholly new Section, as the Section reads, there is no exemption for any individual so it would apply to all individuals.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Line 4768, it says, "no peace officer shall stop an motor vehicle for a violation of this Section if such violation is the sole reason for such a stop." That is a pretty strong sentence. So if I see, I'm a police officer.

Through you, Madam President.

I'm sorry. If I am a police officer and I see a guy smoking a joint and he is driving down the road, clearly it's marijuana and now I can smell it because I get behind him, I can't stop that car for this?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President I have to go back and read this Section that is referred to because I just caught up, so give me a moment, I will make an attempt to catch up.

Sorry, Madam President and trying to keep up and read the Sections. So I believe the question is about Section 112(c) and one could not as Senator, the good Senator suggests one could not pull one over for the sole reason was any of the things that are happening in this action.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

This is concerning to me. This is saying I can see somebody smoking marijuana, driving down the street, and I can't pull them over if I'm a policeman. Let them keep driving, as long as they don't commit and motor vehicle violations they just keep driving till they hit somebody. How do I defend that? Well I followed them hoping he would violate the law and when he finally did, he blew through the red light and killed somebody. I've got a big problem with that part. I see a crime and I can't do anything about it.

I go to Section 113. Another question.

Madam President, through you.

Section 113 basically same thing, 4788, 4789 "no peace officer shall stop a motor vehicle for violation of this Section if such violation is the sole reason for such stop." Is that correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I'm not sure there is any dispute there, that is what the Line says.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I am just verifying. I want to get it on record that we are just going to allow that to happen.

All right then we go to Section 114 and one part in here is a little concerning to me and that is 4797. And it says that you can go a little before that, "the law enforcement unit shall have accredited" basically I'm going right to the top cause I'm not going to be able to get this out.

"No later than January 1, 2022, each law enforcement unit shall report to the Police Officers Training Council in the manner specified by the council recommendation as to the minimum number of officers that such law enforcement unit should have accredited as a Drug Recognitions Expert in order to ensure adequate availability of drug recognition experts to respond to instances of impaired driving allowing that law enforcement units may call upon drug recognition experts from other law enforcement units as necessary and available."

That one sentence "may call upon drug recognition experts from other law enforcement units as necessary and available" this process is not a get out of the car and talk for ten minutes. This process when you start the drug recognition expert goes into this, this can take up to an hour and this law is saying that you know what I'm sure the other town is going to be okay with you borrowing their

officer for an hour when they are on minimum staffing on midnight on a Friday night.

And I don't know how many departments are going to be willing to say, you know what, we'll send our officers over there but you know, I still have to think about the qualified immunity being taken away on July 1, I don't know if I want my officer in other towns right now until we can figure something out. I got a problem, you know, automatically assuming that, you know, these departments can start sharing these drug recognition experts, you know, across town lines and lose the office for up to an hour.

I have another question.

Through you, Madam President.

And basically when we do these minimum numbers drug recognition experts did we come up with a way that they are going to be paid for or is this going to be on the municipalities?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As I suggested before, we already begun the process of dealing with the issue of not having enough drug recognition experts and looking at budgetary ways of dealing with that. I think it would probably be a combination of the work that is already ongoing and making sure that municipalities have a part to play in this as well.

We will also say that because of the language here talks about as necessary and available it is not as if the requesting jurisdiction could just take people at their whim so availability would be as determined by those who would be sending and so I

think that while I understand the concern as this Section reads, it is not a concern of just pulling people into a separate district and being concerned about immunity although I think the issue of immunity that we dealt with is not an elimination of qualified immunity. We had a long discussion about that. That is not what the state did, that is not the public policy of the State of Connecticut.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I did read, may call upon drug recognition but we can't rely on that simply because it does take an hour and that is the point I was making. And the fact is that, you know, as of July 1, there is going to be a lot of thought put into the qualified immunity and the fact that it is much easier to sue a policeman even if he is doing everything correct because there is still going to be lawyer's fees and everything else and every single one of these police districts are going to have to think about it. That was the point I was making.

Now I want to talk about the social equity and innovation fund. I guess we're starting to put a certain amount of money into this fund and my question.

Through you, Madam President.

Does this money go into the general fund at all?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. It would be in the general fund for the purposes of that particular fund and inside the general fund.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And as part of this fund, is this part, would the expenditures from this account be part of the spending CAP?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

The budgetary part of this is a little bit beyond what the Bill is. I don't have the answer on how that has finally been decided. As you know, budget negotiations and the budget have been underway and I am not privy to, like you, and probably folks up to this point, privy to where we've landed. So I can't tell you where that is in terms of the budget.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And I am going to take probably the same answer for Prevention of Recovery Services Fund, which, you know, I understand that fund a little more. You know, were going to basically help people that, well start to get addicted, hope we get them out, and I hope we use that for opioids and alcohol and everything else. But, you know, I've got to look at the first one and say this is a slush fund. This is a fund that was developed and can be spent outside of the budget, outside of the control of this body. And anything that is outside of the legislature can be spent by anybody outside the legislature especially tax money and this is going to be tax money because that is what it is, should be going through the general fund and should be going through the budget process and should not be put into these special funds and be spent in any other way unless it is cleared year after year through this body.

I have no more questions, thank you for answering those though. I'm going to keep going, I just wanted to say that.

You know, in the 1960's and 1970's, THC was about and that the tetrahydrocannabinol, the active ingredient in marijuana, those rates were about three to five percent and today or when I left those were sitting, the really good stuff was around 45-48 percent. Now that we've commercialized it, we have products that are 100 percent. This has addictive qualities. If you look at the 100 percent compared to that three to five percent and you think about how much you have to smoke in the 1960's - 1970's you're taking oh probably in the low guess, a large freezer bag full. We're talking about a very powerful drug at 100 percent. Even when you drop it down to 75 you're still talking about a powerful drug. You know, when you get older people and they talk about marijuana and the marijuana not hurting

them, this is a point I make, the fact that the amounts are so much higher.

Now the State of Connecticut is going to control, they are going to say you can't have more than this but let's get back to the reality of what I've been taking about through this time and the reality is we have made it very easy for drug dealers to transport their product. We've done everything we possibly can so that the police don't catch the black market marijuana, so easy that we are even going to prevent them from stopping a car if the guy is smoking a marijuana cigarette, driving down main street full of people. This law has a lot of problems with it. This is a 290 page document here. I figured we'd have a lot more security, a lot more of this is what we are going to do to protect people instead I see giveaways to the unions. I see a slush fund being created and I just see a lot of problems in here. I fear for our youth. I fear for our youth, our kids. We say that we've been working on this for so long, they say years, that is fantastic. This is what you came up with in years? Let's stop the police at all costs from preventing an accident from happening because some guy is driving down Main Street smoking a marijuana cigarette.

Madam President I think I made my point and it's a point I didn't want to have to make but I'm going to be done here. I may come back depending on what's said afterwards, but as of right now, I am going to end and turn it over to somebody else. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber? Good Evening, Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Good Evening, Madam President. Madam President, regarding this Bill I asked myself is it okay, is it

okay to have recreational marijuana? And I started thinking, you know, the benefits, you know, we recognize the difficulty regarding the enforceability of this, or marijuana dealing with it. Studies have found the effectiveness in treating chronic pain, there is a plus there and it's been helpful for those who have gone through chemotherapy and multiple sclerosis, so there is the medical aspect of it.

And then there is also the economic benefits of it as well. We're talking and I thought I had read that, you know, this would create about 17,000 jobs here in our state and it would also help balance part of our state budget. In addition, the public support is 65 percent and there is also that it is also permissive and what I mean by that 18 to 20 states have legalized it already, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Maine, Vermont, and New York have all legalized it, all pretty much surrounding us here in New England.

Mental health and safety Bill have been passed here this session including suicide prevention training programs, allowing up to two mental health days for students and tonight we voted on for making a document that would list the resources for children with psychiatric disabilities and behavioral health disorders and we also addressed, I think last night or the night before, or last week a piece of legislation that dealt with domestic violence. All for safety and well-being of our, the people of Connecticut. So I guess we can agree the importance of assisting and helping our community, our you know, all the people in the State of Connecticut in dealing with mental health issues, you know, the suicide prevention and even forms of domestic violence.

I do have a couple of questions and maybe four or five for the good Senator.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, through you.

Can you provide me your thoughts on the importance on mental health, suicide prevention and domestic violence?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

All of those are important subjects as the good Senator knows. We did a Bill, Senate Bill 1091 on domestic violence this year. We have done a Bill on the issue of domestic violence nearly every year. A couple of years ago being concerned about particularly some of the people who are in some of the protective services, we did a Bill that dealt with their mental health on various iterations of that. It's an issue, all of those issues, I think he mentioned three are issues that year after year we come back and pass policy on and some of vote for and some of us don't.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, almost every single year we address some type of domestic violence Bill, mental health Bill and it just seems to grow every single year and I think we heard the Doctor Senator Anwar earlier talking about what is happening in the emergency rooms as well.

There is also a revenue side, Madam President of legalizing marijuana.

And through you.

Could you tell me what the expected revenue is once this recreational marijuana is fully implemented?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I cannot answer that question. There have been all kinds of numbers put forward. I think the state will see. We've talked on the order, I will say, some people talk in the range of \$80 million dollars, some people talk \$200 million dollars. I was involved in the crafting of this Bill, the notion that there would be revenue coming to the state was present but we didn't focus on how much which didn't inform any of the language in the Bill, we focused on the fact that revenue would be coming but how do we regulate cannabis in this state, that was the focus of the Bill.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. And I agree that there has been an array of different revenue income projected or estimated. I've seen some as high as \$120 million and most recently what I've read in the finance budget is about \$73 million dollars that would include some of that money going to the FTF. Many proponents of the Bill are promoting legalizing recreational marijuana as low risk.

Through you, Madam President.

Do you believe this legalization of marijuana is low risk or high risk.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. I'm not sure that's a question that can be answered. I think it depends on what one is talking about and I would be happy to answer more specific question. I will not of course speak for anyone else who is involved in supporting the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Fair enough. Let me ask it another way.

Through you, Madam President.

Do you believe marijuana is harmless?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I think that almost anything can be harmful. Certainly not, and I'm not trying to be obtuse here, but certainly ingesting anything into the body potentially can be harmful. The fact that you're lighting the cigarette, your marijuana cigarette, a cannabis cigarette your life could potentially have some harm. There are all kinds of ways that it might be harmful. I don't think of itself it is necessarily harmful.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. The public perception that marijuana is harmless is out there. Let me move on. You know, recently this past year all experienced Covid and we've had, when Covid emerged there was a lot of, oh we shouldn't be listening to what's out there, there was almost downplaying of Covid itself as a virus and I think as time went on, it didn't take too long for the public to realize that this was a serious matter. How important.

Through you, Madam President.

How important was it that we followed the CDC guidelines in dealing with Covid?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I'm not sure what the CDC guidelines or Covid have to do with cannabis but I will say this, the science is important on any issues of science.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. So you would say then that following that science was terribly important for the well-being for the public safety?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. Following the science yes, was important there but again I'm not sure how that relates to this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

I take it.

Through you, Madam President.

I take it that you trusted that information?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I really would like to understand what the question has to do with the Bill. My perspective on COVID-19 is not what is at question here today.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I just bring that up because when the Covid came about it was important, I agree, it was important to follow that science and I turned to my medical friend who is a nurse anesthetist. I have a couple of friends that are doctors and PAs so I turned to them and I asked them, "Gee could you get mixed information" watching the media and you're listening to whatever you can gather so that you can make the best decision for yourself. So I turned to my medical friends and they absolutely follow the science, follow the science and I trusted that. I trusted that information.

So I just have one additional question and then I'll move on. Do you know what mental or physical problems that marijuana can cause?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I know there has been suggestions about what the usage of cannabis can cause. I know that recently in some places where there has been excessive there has been a certain syndrome but generally unfortunately we don't have the science we should have because this being a Schedule I drug, many of the things that people are referring to are actually survey usage not research directly on cannabis because you can't do it given the way that public policy currently is.

Through you, Madam President.

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President I would not agree with those comments, you know, there is ample information regarding how harmful marijuana is to the mind and to the body. There are devastating consequences of marijuana use. Dangers of marijuana are not really selective any more but science. Need to come to terms, let me start over. We need to come to terms with the truth about the science of marijuana. We have top scientists that continue to show how marijuana use harms the mind and the body.

I'll begin with the CDC, the Center for Disease Control reported that some believe marijuana is not addictive or people cannot become hooked on the drug but the research shows one in ten marijuana user will become addicted. And for those who being to use before the age of 18 the number increases to one of six becomes addicted. The CDC goes on, marijuana impacts the cognitive, excuse me, there are cognitive problems in using marijuana. It is

linked, it impedes capacity to remember. Learning and focusing is affected. Physical and mental problems like cardiovascular and pulmonary diseases. Most concerning is the development of chronic mental disorders including schizophrenia. High doses can cause hallucinations, delusions, and psychosis.

Studies from the *National Academy of Medicine* indicate marijuana use increase traffic accident fatalities. Effects motivation and cognition, learning impairment. Cannabis is likely to increase the risk of developing schizophrenia and other psychosis. The higher the use the greater the risk. Regular cannabis use is likely to increase the risk for developing social anxiety disorder. The research goes on.

The *Journal of Neuroscience* has published low levels of marijuana use may irrevocably alter the teen brain specifically in the area that deal with memory, emotion related processing and learning.

The *University of Pennsylvania* writes, "Marijuana users were more than likely to have lower scores on memory, lower scores in learning new information and lower scores on high level problems solving.

In a world drug report by the United Nations cannabis products can produce temporary symptoms of psychosis, loss of ability to learn or remember recent events, reduce the ability to carry out certain mental tasks, make certain decisions and pay attention. And there is a growing amount of evidence that suggests that a person who starts using cannabis early and using heavily could run an increased risk of psychotic disorders. Physically marijuana smokers have a risk like those of smokers bronchitis, emphysema, asthma, and extensive use can cause suppression of the immune system and can cause cancer to the head, to the neck or to the lungs.

There is a reporter, an investigative reporter who worked for a while over at decade at the *New York*

Times, Alan Barrington, and he writes, "Peer review research in top medical journals, shows that marijuana can cause or worsen severe mental illness, especially psychosis. That seems to be recurring. Teenagers who smoke marijuana regularly are about three times more likely to develop schizophrenia the most devastating psychotic disorder. We've heard psychotic schizophrenia, let me just define for you.

Psychosis is characterized as disruption to a person's thoughts and perceptions that make it difficult for them to recognize what is real and what isn't. Those disruptions are often experienced as seeing, hearing, and believing things aren't real or having strange persistent thoughts, behavior, and emotions. And schizophrenia is a disorder that affects the person's ability to think, feel and behave clearly. It's characterized by thoughts or express, or experiences that seem out of touch with reality, disorganized speech, or behavior, and decrease participation in daily activities, difficult concentration and memory may also be presented.

The most thorough review of this research the *National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine* link marijuana use to a variety of down sides including respiratory issues, schizophrenia and psychosis, car crashes, lagging academic and other social achievements and low birth weights if they smoked during pregnancy.

Madam President, marijuana is bad for one's health. Health problem risks are high, yet widespread perception is that marijuana is harmless and many believe that it won't hurt them but the science says differently.

Madam President, I have an Amendment and if the Clerk could call LCO 10453, I ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk please call the Amendment.

CLERK:

LCO NO. 10453 Senate Schedule "B"

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

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

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I just said that the science says that it is very clear, science says differently regarding the hazards, it's very clear that marijuana affects one's health. But yet there are so many people that feel and believe that it is harmless. Excuse me, are there any warnings of the health hazard in this Bill?

I don't recall reading any, I do recall reading something regarding the advertising of it and I think that it is important that we make people aware of the hazards should this Bill pass. I believe that it is important for us as a Body here to put some safeguards and warn them similar to what we've done with alcohol. Right now it is scheduled to be sold without these warning but we need unambiguous labels. At present there is no national mandate regarding warnings, regarding the packaging of marijuana that's sold. But again turning to what we see with tobacco and with alcohol containers, I

think that it is important that we put these warning labels on. There are some states that do this already and I urge passage of this Amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Will you remark further on the Adoption of the Amendment before the Chamber? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President, I'd be happy to remark on the Amendment. First I want to thank the good Senator for his concern about the science. I would reiterate my point which wasn't that there isn't a notion that cannabis is dangerous.

My point was given that cannabis is a Schedule I drug, the research that should be being done on cannabis is not being done. What we do and actually if you go to make the point, you go to the CDC to the very point that was being made and you look down you see that they have used surveys to do this but they are not using cannabis and watching reactions. So when the expert came before the Judiciary Committee not just in the year that we are currently in but in several of the past years I asked him about that versus doing the type of research that we all would actually want to happen and he admitted that, you know, they have to draw professional inference from it but that is certainly not the hard type of science that I think people would get from the indication that was just said.

What my point is, is that I don't think that when you look through many of these pieces of peer reviewed research, that you find research on human beings using cannabis. The reason is we don't allow for it, the same reason why despite the fact that perhaps the good Senator and I agree about what cannabis can do for a medical patient the federal

government would tell you it's not actually real otherwise it couldn't be Schedule I. So for those reasons I would rise to oppose the Amendment before the Chamber. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Yes, Madam President I just want to be clear that this Amendment is asking that the containers and the packaging that on those packages that we advise them that there is a health hazard in the product that they are about to consume and we're looking for the, and I will just simply read it, in Line 1059, after the materials, insert "and shall include a packaging insert containing an advisory of the National Center for Disease Control and Prevention concerning the potential harmful health effects of cannabis use." Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. No further comment on the Amendment, I think what I need to add is just rise again to request a roll call when the vote is taken.

THE CHAIR:

And a roll call vote has been requested. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Will you remark further? If not I will open the vote on the Amendment.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, this is Senate Bill 1118, Senate Amendment "B". Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment "B" on Senate Bill 1118. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Amendment "B" of Senate Bill 1118. 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, will you please announce the tally on the Amendment.

CLERK:

Senate Amendment "B" of Senate Bill 1118

Total number voting	35
Total voting Yea	12
Total voting Nay	23
Absent not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) The Amendment fails. Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. That is very disappointing, Madam President. I think maybe most voted in the, against the Amendment because they didn't know that the Amendment was doing. That is unfortunate and maybe they will go back and they will reassess and think over what they just voted for. But I'm going to move on.

I am going to address the next item. That mental illness and violence follow marijuana, Madam

President. In a 2020 publishes article in the *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, the article says scientifically documented links between certain marijuana users and violence, a study that collected data from 50 years, a half a century, points out that even a single dose of marijuana may cause impairment and behavior control that may underly impulsive, violent behavior. Further the study provided a strong indication that chronic marijuana use suggests a possible causal effect with predicting future violence. The study, additional studies have reported panic attacks, confusion, hallucinations, suspiciousness, and paranoia often occurred in chronic marijuana users affecting their cognition in ways that enhance aggressive response to perceived provocation.

The Journal of Interpersonal Violence found the marijuana use was associated with a doubling of domestic violence and other studies show violence and aggression associated with marijuana use stated the same thing.

Why is this Bill in front of us? It is certainly not for the safety, health and wellbeing of our children, our brothers and our sisters and our family members. Then what is it? If it is not for the safety of our, the people of Connecticut, then why is it still in front of us? Is it because the surrounding states are doing it or there are 18 or 20 other states that have adopted this? Is it for the money? I bet it has a lot to do with that. Is it because it will create jobs and bring economic activity. And then at what price? At what price? The science says that it is harmful, harmful and we are not even going to warn them that it is harmful because we just voted down an Amendment that would have provided some type of labeling, hazard to your health, caution. But no, we didn't do that.

Is it because we want to stabilize our state economy? You know, so we're going to get \$73

million dollars to help cure or to balance our budget. My God, what have we come to? Our state economy has been in financial dire straits and shambles for decades and all of a sudden passing marijuana is going to help cure it.

So now we're turning to this Bill that is going to harm some of our friends, some of us have experienced family members who have dealt with the consequences of marijuana use. How can it be? Are we really, really going to do this? What are we doing? Shame on us. Madam President, the science is clear, on the health hazards of marijuana. Marijuana is harmful to one's health and what message are we sending in not listening to the science. Are we prioritizing revenue for lives? Really? Are we going to jeopardize the health and well-being or the safety of all the people of Connecticut in passing this Bill? I refuse to harm the people of this state. I am not smarter than a scientist, I chose to protect my family, my friends, and their families. Madam President I will not support this Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber. Good Morning, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Well, it is morning. Striking at midnight. Good Morning. I rise to offer my opposition to this Bill which is in essence the legalization of marijuana or cannabis as you want to call it. And we are trying to keep up with our neighbors, New York, and Massachusetts. That has been one of the rationales that has been offered. And in fact, we are trying to keep up with our neighbors not only in the possible legalization of marijuana but also internet and sports gambling. Just trying to keep up with our neighbor, that's what's been said. But

ultimately I wish we would follow our neighbors in different ways.

Before I start, I want to acknowledge the Chair of Judiciary for his tireless effort and I did my best to understand the 300 plus pages that we just publicly released today. This legislative process that we are undergoing on this is one of the frustrating aspects of this entire Session. The fact that Bills that come out monumental, significant policies that we have fought and debated for many a years coming to fruition in a unique environment of this Covid pandemic in which this building, this building, and this Circle in which we are debating on has been closed to the public, that we are not fully getting the view point of people whose lives will be impacted by the votes that we will be casting today. And as a Ranking Member of the, Co-Ranking Member of the Public Health Committee I was equally frustrated that the Committee of Cognizance never had a Public Hearing on this important issue. This very important public health issue where we could have had medical experts and view points and testimony from many people that could have offered a perspective beyond the revenue and the social justice side of it both of which are extremely important. But we have not addressed the public health consideration. And unless I missed it, we didn't address it.

It seems ironic to me that this Bill is full of irony. That we will be legalizing a Federal Class I narcotic, a controlled substance while we as a legislative body tout, tout the fact that we are looking to ban flavor vaping and because of budgetary constraints we are not going to be able ban flavored tobacco but we have been trying to do that too. But again we as a body are full of pride when we say, we are going to ban tobacco and vaping because it is harmful to the health of our community and our children. While again we are now going to approve a Class I narcotic. Yes, we say it is not going to be available to children. But we're not

going to sell alcohol to young children. We are not going to sell tobacco to young children but they still get access to it. The permissiveness in which this engender, is ironic.

Another irony is the fact that we are voting to approve a drug that will impact people's lives that may or may not, that we never had a Public Hearing in the public health sector to consider the potential addictive nature of this drug. But ironic again is just today, we touted in Public Health, a pat on the back that we are now proceeding with opioid and substance abuse counseling to address the plague and the damage of addiction in our communities. While again we are going to pat ourselves on the back that we are going to do something that we've been trying for many years, approve a Class I Scheduled narcotic.

While we implore against drunk and distracted driving on our roads it seems ironic to me that we have not listened to law enforcement talking about the ability to diagnose or to potentially prevent individuals from driving while under impairment. Have we not learned from cases in Colorado?

Again this Bill has many of my colleagues are especially concerned about this Bill and I genially hope that I was wrong about my worries tonight. That we will not as a legislative body approve public health policy that we make in the future and that the irony that I cited and mentioned does not come back to haunt us as a legislative body.

I do want [Mic Off]. Back on now, stopped the mic? I want to take a moment to recognize what we have done as a state that I applaud. As an individual that recognizes the disproportionate impact of the onerous application of our laws on drugs and that is the opportunity of the social equities side and the economic opportunity of this Bill. I appreciate that. I appreciate that we are going to economically right a wrong of improperly or unfairly

incarceration of people. Unfortunately, this proportionally against those of color. It's important and I think this Bill's effort to erase those records are important. I do believe in a second chance. So in that respect there are components of this Bill that needs to be lauded. The social justice side and the social equity side is well intentioned.

And I applaud the good Chair for his emphases and forceful encouragement of that application. But I will vote "No" on this because ultimately the irony is not just in words. My hope, genuine hope is the fact that we will not be back here ten years from now touting a marijuana substance abuse addiction program to prevent lives from being irrevocably damaged. That we will not be back here five years from now talking about new law enforcement because of the increase of impaired and dangerous driving. That we will not be back here touting Bills that said how can we prevent our young people from abusing this product. I genially hope that I am wrong but unfortunately you look at the other states, I don't think I will be. I encourage that people vote this Bill down and give a better opportunity for a better quality life and healthier life. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber? Good Morning, Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Good Morning, Madam President. I rise for a few comments on this Bill, I know that it is early in the morning so I will try to make this a quick as possible.

What we have in front of us tonight, or this morning, I should say, is a 300 page Bill that most

of us just received. And although it may have been worked on in certain Committees, this Bill which ultimately effects Public Health never came to Public Health and never had a Public Health Hearing.

So how does this Bill affect our state? Does it improve the public health of the citizens of Connecticut? I say no. What this Bill does is legitimize and validate the use of an addictive drug while at the same time this state is spending \$160 million dollars a year, minimum on addiction services.

The word legal translates to many as safe. But today's marijuana is very different and anything but safe. This is not just my opinion, this is the opinion of the World Health Organization, and many, many medical associations. Remember how we've all heard we need to believe in science. Science say marijuana is addictive, it's potent and it's a Class I drug. It's in the same classification right now as heroin.

The marijuana of 2021 is highly potent and it can be mind altering. It is nothing less, at this point, than a public health emergency crisis on the verge of emerging. It is a drug that has been reinvented and remarketed to create a sense of normalcy and acceptability for elected officials to garner votes, looking for revenue for their state. It's acceptance is literally being distorted as social justice.

Many minorities and this is a fact, have paid an unreasonable price for selling and using marijuana in the past. That is wrong and it is unfair but legalizing this drug does not lessen the adverse impact of it and it does not correct the past. I can fully understand decriminalizing marijuana and I believe in that but that doesn't seem to be enough. This state wants to absolutely enrich itself in a profit model, supporting a product that can cause

serious addiction and mental health conditions, specifically in children.

The same industry that brought us Joe Camel is now itching to enter into the marijuana market. The folks behind cigarettes that were once "good for digestion" are now literally months away from being able to buy marijuana facilities that will sell recreational marijuana. And I have to believe that all of us in this Circle and in this building would never have allowed tobacco to get where it is today if we have known now, sorry, know then and the affects we know now especially with tobacco use.

Legalization of marijuana means great risk to our most vulnerable. They stand the most to lose with this legislation and they stand the most to lose in the world of addiction. They are losing, or the vulnerable is on the losing side of this Bill for profit and for revenue and this time it is out state that is the entity that is profiting. It is a disaster in many people's opinion waiting to happen for the health of our children. And my comments are, specifically on children. Children in our schools particularly those with developmental issues will be easily able to ingest marijuana by edibles, beverages, not to mention vaping.

This legislature just this year has raised Bills banning flavors on vaping products such as cotton candy, Juicy-Fruit and flavored cigarettes and cigars. These are legal products that have been cleared by the FDA. We may not like them but they are federally legal, yet now we sit in this Circle and we are looking to allow federally illegal products to be made, products that have flavors like Juicy-Fruit, gummy bear, lollipop and at times are indistinguishable from candies that kids normally see in some place a CVS, a supermarket or convenience store. If that is not hypocrisy I don't know what is.

How do we handle an explosion of another addictive substance in our schools when we can't even handle the current addiction issues that we have. How do schools handle children that are suspect of being under the influence and why would we consider saddling parents with yet another worry and concern? Right now I see this as the State of Connecticut becoming the impetus and the beneficiary of drug dealing in this State of Connecticut for financial reasons only. If we were not going to be making money off this product we would never entertain the thought of legalizing it. The legalization will only add more misery to those who are already most vulnerable, the long-term costs cannot be weighed and I think it will imperil our future for our children.

This is simply a seamless expansion to the addictive habits of smoking. Legal tobacco for everyone's information killed a half-a million Americans last year, that is ten times the death of illegal drugs. As legalization continues we've seen in other states that kids aged 12 through 17 have increased their use of marijuana significantly, it's tripled. Marijuana use disorder. Does that sound familiar? Opioid use disorder rates have doubled. The CDC has shown that one in six children under the age of 18 become addicted and one in ten adults becomes addicted. In states such as Colorado emergency room calls for children, newborn to eight years old have increased three times since the legalization of marijuana.

And legalization of marijuana in no way impedes the market for illegal marijuana. The opposite is true, it actually grows the market because the taxes are so high on legal marijuana that the black market continues to thrive.

I just want to share with you that Electric Boat just won a \$64 million dollar Navy contract for overhaul work. Major employers made their thoughts clear to the Governor's office and to those who were

crafting this Bill and I thank them for the language that is within the Bill but I have to tell you that they are adamantly opposed to this Bill and I am concerned that being one of the largest employers in the State of Connecticut when we still have not recovered our jobs from 2008 that it puts their contract with the Navy at risk to have the legalization of marijuana pass in the State of Connecticut. All things being equal when we are competing against Virginia with a higher cost of business in the State of Connecticut when we have legalization of marijuana regardless of what anyone says, it puts us at risk to lose Navy contracts.

So why are we doing this, what is the push? This Bill never went through Public Health, it never even had anyone from Public Health ask to weigh in on it. We are doing this because this legislature simply cannot get enough money to sustain its spending problem. Perhaps the public health crisis in the state really is spending and we should consider that. We haven't recovered the job losses from 2008, we have the second highest debt per capita in the country, one of the highest taxed states in the country and the highest unemployment rate in the country.

This Bill may generate \$80 million dollars in revenue but the cost will way outstrip any kind of revenue we will see come into the State of Connecticut and the irony cannot be missed on this Bill. Passing a Bill for legalization and then taking a portion of that money to fight addiction for the thing that you are legalizing says it all in itself. Whether the Bill that we pass or the revenue that we make from that products, we are going to use a portion of it to fight the addiction on that product.

We should be, in the State of Connecticut, promoting healthy options, promoting living with clear heads. We just heard earlier in the Circle today a Bill about a navigator, peer navigator for opioids. We

had Senators in tears over the loss of family and loved ones. Are we going to need that for marijuana? Are we going to need a marijuana peer navigator? I'm afraid we will.

Again, this is not the marijuana of years ago when I was a young person. This is highly potent, highly addictive. Now our state is going to be a partner, an enabler in the blurring of the minds, not only for us but for young children that can have easy access to these products. Easy access to gummy bears and things like that that look something normal like they normally would get in the supermarket.

We are legitimizing a highly potent, mind altering drug to collect our little piece of gold that we may get from it to fund our bureaucracy in a state that has forgotten about the most vulnerable and lost its way on this Bill. It is time that we look at the true nature of what this can do. This is not simply just legalizing marijuana. Look at the Bill, it is pages and pages of who makes money off of who and we are forgetting about the most vulnerable, our children and I think that is really, really sad. So with that, Madam President I have an Amendment that I would like to call. The Clerk is in possession of LCO 10461 and I ask for it to be called and moved and I seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10461, Senate Schedule "C".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. This Bill, I'm sorry, this Amendment would delay the implementation of the legalization of recreational marijuana until January 2024 when we have had time for the Yale School of Medicine, the Department of Public Health and the Department of Psychiatry and Neuropharmacology to undertake a study and this study would include three things that are most important. The first thing that it would include the understanding of the impact of cannabis on the brain development of youth, adults, adolescents and infants, something that we are seeing increasing problems with ever since the legalization in other states. It would also look at prevention and treatment of addiction to cannabis because regardless of what you hear in this Circle there is a misconception that cannabis is not addictive and that people cannot become addicted, that is just false.

The third thing that it will look at is minimizing the risk of serious mental illness related to cannabis by smoking or ingesting the product and it would also look at minimizing the risk of cannabis on driving because if you look at the studies, and I have references that people can look at if they don't believe what I am saying, young drivers are already at risk let alone smoking cannabis.

And right now, law enforcement colleagues do not have the tools to test people for cannabis intoxication in the field, it is just not available. So I would ask that the Circle please support this Bill, it would give us the background we need before we make the grave mistake of legalizing marijuana before we have all the information. Yale University School of Medicine has the resources and has the availability and expertise to provide us with the information that we would need to make sure that we are making the right decision before we move forward and I hope that my fellow colleagues will join me in this Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. And I just want it to be clear that you moved Adoption of the Amendment.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

I did. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. And I don't know if I've spoken to you since it became morning, so good morning.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I rise in opposition to the Amendment. I will make a couple of comments since they were foundational to the reason for the Amendment coming out. It was presented that the legalization that we have would build up the illegal market giving away the taxes present themselves.

It is true in other states they have tax rates of 40 percent and 24 percent, very high tax rates. The State of Connecticut will not have that, it is embedded in the Bill that we have a 6.35 percent and there is also a 3 percent to the municipalities should they choose to do this. Nowhere close to what you are seeing in other states. It is also represented that there are multiple, multiple times of increase in the usage of young people.

There have been a lot of studies that have suggested so but when you have gone to the State of Colorado for instance, you look at the Department of Public Health they have told us that is not actually what has happened. Also last month, the United States Department of Education released a report on this, of course it is a survey because that is what you have to do with cannabis given it is a Schedule I drug, but the National Center for Education Statistics said that is not the case. So I just want to make sure that when we are talking about what the data is that we are looking at reliable sources and we are all on the same page. I rise in opposition. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber?
Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President and thank you for the good Senator for his comments. I do have a list of references of clinical studies that have been done on the use of adolescent with the increase in the use of recreational marijuana in states that have legalized it, one in particular is the Association of Cannabis Use in Adults and Risk of Depression, Anxiety and Suicidality in Young Adults: A Systematic Review and Analysis out of the *Journal of American Medicine and Psychology* and I am happy to share that with the good Senator and also a reference of about 20 other different studies, they are not clinical trials because again it is not federal approved so it is very difficult to do that, but I am happy to share that with him afterwards and again I do encourage those to support this Amendment. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President, not really to continue the discussion, I don't think that is appropriate but I will say that I have read that study. Madam President I rise actually so that when the roll is called I ask it be called, when the vote is called I ask that it be called by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further and the Amendment? If not, a roll call vote has been requested. I've opened the voting machine. Mr. Clerk please call the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. This is Senate Amendment "C" for Senate Bill 1118. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment "C", this is Senate Bill 1118, Senate Amendment "C". Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Amendment "C". Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1118, Senate Amendment "C".

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine is locked, please announce the tally, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "C" Senate Bill 1118.

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yea	11
Total voting Nay	25
Absent not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) The Amendment fails. Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, Madam President I rise, the Clerk is in possession of LCO 10464, and I move Adoption and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10464, Senate Schedule "D".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, Good Evening, Madam President. This Amendment simply deletes Section 102 and 103 which requires a LPA agreement or union workforce. From what I have gathered there is two primary preemptive doctrines that apply to state regulations of labor relations and a labor piece agreement requirement is preemptive under Federal Labor Law unless the market participant exemption applies.

The proposal of this LPA would require cannabis licensees to agree and abide by an LPA as a condition of licensure requiring an employer to enter into an agreement with a union or dictating any of the terms of such agreement would clearly intrude on the prerogatives that are protected under Federal Law and such would be preempted. The State of Connecticut is not a direct market participant in the adult use of cannabis markets and thus no exemption to preemption applies here. So I move Adoption of this Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark on the Amendment before the Chamber? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I rise in opposition to the Amendment and when the vote is cast it be cast by roll.

THE CHAIR:

And a roll call vote has been requested and that will happen we have had discussion on the Amendment. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? If not, I will open the voting machine, please announce the roll call vote Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, this is Senate Amendment "D" of Senate Bill 1118. This is Senate Amendment "D" of Senate Bill 1118. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment "D" of Senate Bill 1118.

Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Amendment "D" for Senate Bill 1118.

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1118, Senate Amendment Schedule "D". An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senator voted? The machine is locked. Mr. Clerk please announce the tally on the Amendment.

CLERK:

Senate Amendment "D", Senate Bill 1118.

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yea	12
Total voting Nay	24
Absent not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) The Amendment fails. Will you remark further on the legislation before the Chamber. Good morning, Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good afternoon, or good evening or good morning, or whatever. Hi, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Yeah, one of those.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

How are 'you. Will we stand at ease for just a second please?

THE CHAIR:

And we can stand at ease.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff, good morning, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good morning, I would like to yield to Senator Cohen, please.

THE CHAIR:

And Senator Cohen will you accept the yield.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

I do, Madam President. Thank you and good morning.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

So this is a really tough one for me and the folks around this Circle know that I don't often stand in speaking on Bills one way or another unless it is something that I'm really deeply rooted in and I really feel compelled to speak on and that is the case here.

I believe wholeheartedly that we need to continue to make progress as on the decriminalization of marijuana but as long as cannabis is illegal our Black and Brown brothers and sisters are disproportionately impacted and I am proud of all of the good work that our wonderful colleague, Senator Gary Winfield has done to address the equity component of this and I am hopeful that with its passage because I do think it will pass here tonight

that records are indeed expunged and that those who have been adversely affected and impacted by this get a leg up in business and opportunity if they so choose.

Additionally I believe that we really need to grow our medicinal marijuana program. We've heard tonight about some of the impact of opioid addiction. I think we are all too quick to prescribe this highly addictive and damaging, this highly addictive and damaging opioids and yet we've not legalized medicinal marijuana use for all the pain ailments that opioids are prescribed and often indicated for. I also know that we are surrounded by states that are legalizing adult use of marijuana. Yes, these states reap the benefits of taxation of this substance and yes, our residents can easily cross the border and partake in use. However my many concerns at this point are outweighing these points in favor.

I have concerns of the potency of these products. I was happy that we were able to negotiate movement on this but unfortunately it is still too high and the higher the THC, the higher potential for addiction, psychosis, schizophrenia, demotivation, memory impacts that we have heard about here tonight. And kids are often the ones to suffer these affects the most. We know that those under the age of 26 do not have a fully formed frontal cortex and with overuse there are clearly defined impacts to the brain. If 26 were the age which the brain is fully developed, why then are we legalizing this drug for use in those over 21? I have concerns over addiction.

As somebody who grew up the daughter of an alcoholic and was surrounded by addicts all my life, I know all too well the impacts of drug and alcohol abuse. It tears families apart, it changes the lives of users and everyone who touches them. It is an illness addiction. One that not everyone is predisposed to but one that many are. For my family that is all too real. I am the mother of a smart

athletic and very capable 16-year-old son and equally smart and athletic and capable daughters that are 13 and 11.

They are going to do great things and change this world in ways that I can only imagine. But I worry incessantly about their health and safety and I wouldn't be truthful if I said I didn't think of the possibility of them having to deal with an illness of addiction themselves. We know the hereditary nature of this illness and there are plenty of studies that indicate that for teen users of marijuana this is an experimental drug and a gateway for future use of illicit substances.

My husband and I had to have the conversations, conversation after conversation it seems like with our children about how they may carry these genes for this illness. The illness of addiction. That they may try a drug or a drink and may never be able to stop. That might seem harsh to some but when you grow up the way both my husband and I had, you want to protect your children from the reality that they can become an addict just as easily as my father did, or our friends that overdosed and passed away or family members that are now in recovery and struggle everyday with addiction. And I named the underlying mental health illness that can be exacerbated with the use of cannabis. The prevalence of this has been found in use in young adults.

I know that we are not legalizing this for children but I also know the message we are sending to every child out there the minute we legalize. We are telling them this drug is safe when in reality for those under a certain age, it is anything but.

I have concerns that we heard tonight over how our Police will handle this. I have concerns over babies and toddlers getting their hands on what they think is candy because it certainly looks like it. In fact I recently had a conversation with a friend

who is a pediatrician and she told me she got her very first call from the mother of a 2-year-old that had eaten a few gummy's that were on the counter. This is the new reality that we are going to be dealing with.

And to the business owner quite frankly, I have concerns over the workplace and how this will be monitored and the impact, what those impacts will be for the business owners and for those who are potentially impaired. What will happen to the businesses in terms of workers' compensation? What will happen if somebody gets hurt while operating heavy equipment and whether or not we know that they are impaired by use of marijuana.

And finally I heard from my farming community, farmers that really want the ability to be business owners and reap some of the potential benefits in this Bill and unfortunately that is not made possible by this Bill. And so for all these reasons tonight, I will be voting "No" but I do want to thank the good Senator Gary Winfield, the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and all of the others that he worked so hard with to bring forth this legislation that I do think really tries and to get at the concerns that I had he was always there to listen as I brought him my concerns over potency, over faming, over the mental health aspects of this, over addiction services and the equity component that I mentioned at the beginning. And so I thank him and my colleagues for all of their hard work and Thank you, Madam President for the time.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber? Good Morning, Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Good morning, Madam President. I have a few short comments that I'd like to share and, you know, I ran for public office on issues that dealt with things like this and however long God has me being able to voice, make my voice heard here in this great Chamber I wanted to place myself on the record as to where I stand on these issues.

I go to court on almost a daily basis as a criminal defense attorney and I see that we often times have a gun docket and a drug docket. And when I first started going to court as a young attorney I would go to the attorney line, those of you who are attorneys are familiar with that line, I'd go to the attorney line and I would wait to get processed with my colleagues and the marshals would stop you and they would say, that's for attorneys child support line is on this side, they thought I was there for child support court and it took a few months before they recognized my face and saw me with enough frequency. And when I got inside of the courthouses, I would see a sea of people and all of them looked just like me, different shades of my complexion, similar background, similar experiences to life, a sea of people who looked just like me.

So when we talk about the war on drugs as something that is past tense it is very much a real thing. We see it every day. We don't see Yaleies get arrested for possession or distribution of marijuana, we don't see UConn students get arrested in that fashion, we don't see middle America, white America specifically getting arrested in those numbers. It just doesn't happen and there might be a sprinkle here or there of some pretty egregious actions that will lead a kid into criminal court here in Connecticut for similar actions that would have a kid that looks like me, comes from places where I come from to be arrested with frequency to make up the docket of people in our criminal justice system who go through that. And I know that firsthand, I've experienced it in my own family, people who have been arrested for the sale of narcotics. I

don't think there is a kid that grows up in urban American who doesn't have the same experience.

With all that said I also know that the way we are going to bridge this great divide racism, economic division, etc. will not be by the sale of marijuana. Maybe there was a point in time in the 70's and 80's where there was drug kingpins in Harlem and Oakland and other places but things like the RICO Act and other federal statutory acts which according to the Southern Poverty and Justice said 86 percent of RICO prosecutions and indictments, 86 percent are on African-American and Hispanic gang members, 86 percent and its inception in 1951 where they came up with this prosecution it was specifically to target Italian Americans who were involved in the Cosa Nostra, the Mafia and they made by their own admission that by the time in 1951 when they started that commission and they implemented RICO as a federal statute in 1970, the Mafia had turned or infiltrated as they say legitimate business, it was too difficult to make those prosecutions on the majority of the Mafia families at that time. There were still some but the vast majority targeted African-American and Hispanic gang members.

I also know that what would cause African-American and Hispanic success, white success is not a mystery. There are plenty of economists who said these things and they looked at the divide, the economic divide that exists between White homes and Black homes and they noted that in 1968 *The Economist* published that there is actually a widening between the gap from 1968 to the present. They said that back in 1968 the medium household income of an African-American home was a little over \$6,000 dollars. The medium white income of a home was over \$70,000 dollars. Today medium household income is \$13,000 dollars, the average white income is \$149,000 dollars significant widening of the gap and economists like Brandon O'Flattery a Columbia economist said the reasons for that are these five

things: Home ownership, access to credit, investment, inheritance, and education. Those five things are the reason why we see this broadening gap between White and Black, the have and the have-not and I think from my experience of serving the Board of Ed, it is a reason why we cultivate racism in this great land.

When you go to a place like Bassick High School and you see open bay showers and you see from one end to the other of these open bay showers that don't exist anymore in most schools, urine stains from one corner to the other and you come from Darian and you come from Westport and you come from Greenwich and you see that when you are playing a basketball game, guess what you think of people who look like me. Guess what you think of the community that I serve? You don't leave that town with a favorable impression. There is no secret of what it takes to shorten this gap, to help our communities to heal the racism, to stop the injustice. It's those five things and both liberal and conservative economists have told us exactly what we need to do to address these problems and they told us the secret to create a sense of unity in this country.

I don't believe the sale of marijuana is going to be the fix. I don't believe it, I know it will no longer be the fix. They rap about it now in pop culture and they say drug dealing just to get by. There is no longer the days of the kingpin and once we allow the big companies of the world to come in to the market, the big tobacco companies of the world to come into the market, you can forget about it.

There will be no competition with those guys. They are much better at the advertising, the packaging, the burning of it, the science of it. You can forget about the "Evils of the black market." The opportunity that existed and we want to talk about real opportunity in urban America to make an impact and become successful existed when there was a black

market. Cause guess what? Those people weren't in that market, it was a market that was free for people of minority communities to be able to engage in that business and they did for many years. Many people were engaged in that industry and made possibly millions of dollars. And guess what? Unlike the slave trade with the heirs of those were able to keep their wealth that exists for that community, unlike the people who stole land from other folks that the heirs were able to keep those lands, that doesn't exist for the African-American community unlike even modern day the Mafia, by their own admission by the Department of Justice that the infiltrated legitimate business. Their heirs were able to keep those businesses and send their kids to private schools and move up the economic ladder and in our communities that did not happen.

This will not be the fix and it burns and it bothers me when we have the opportunity to fix things like ECS formulas to make sure we create new and innovative ways to give more funding to teachers, that we get the best and the brightest to come into our school system. We have things that can improve the infrastructure of our school system. We don't invest in that. We have the ability to create access to capital. East Main Street through recessions and depressions of vibrant Hispanic community from one stem of the towns to the other stems a bunch of Puerto Rican and Hispanic businesses. You what doesn't exist on East Main Street, not a single bank. There was one community bank, there was one federal credit union and it was going through a little bit of a hard time and instead of rescuing it, like we did for the other big banks that serve other communities we let it die.

Stratford Avenue, Connecticut Avenue the Black section, the Eastend of Bridgeport from one side to the other, we did it, we built 95, we cut through the community, we made it a one-way corridor, we made it impossible for people to engage in commerce

on those streets. Now you go there and it is a desolate neighborhood. Banks don't want to invest and it is very difficult to get any investment.

Colleges, less than a third of African-Americans get into college, males who get into college who are African-American less than a third will graduate with a college degree. Less than a third and it is unequivocal that these are the things that allow people to move up the economic ladder to allow people to have access, and this is what I will tell you, this will be the great fix. I had the opportunity to go to a man's house who lived in Westport who brought me there for a meeting. He was talking about some business opportunities that he wanted to bring to Bridgeport. He had a beautiful mansion in Westport and he brought me in and we conversed about the different things he wanted to do with the great City of Bridgeport and he viewed me as an equal, not because of my title, not because of whatever else, because of my education. He saw in me that there was a learned man.

I bring young kids, when I was on the Board of Ed to see this man's home, this beautiful home and in his backyard was the ocean. You can even see Long Island Sound as far as the eye can see, you think it is the Atlantic Ocean exposed in its totality. And kids were there saying "wow, wow" this is incredible and when I told them you go up and down the street, you know what everybody has in common, everybody here has a college degree. They might be Jewish Americans, Italian American, Irish American, African-American everybody on the street here who has these multimillion dollar homes, they have a college degree. And this is what it takes to be successful. People have served on the Board of Ed would tell kids you don't need to go to school, you don't need to be a lawyer, you don't need to be a doctor. I live in a community where I am the only one. I don't want to see that I live in a community, I live in a state where I go to court and there is a sprinkle of people who look like me who

are actual attorneys, or judges or people who people who work in the administrative process. That is how we fix America.

It is not going to be weed. That time has come and gone. The ability to make some sort of social justice program that we could fix all the woes of the world, those times have come and gone. Now we have people selling nickel, dime and little street drugs on the street, there is not going to be any economic vitality through that. Not in our community I can tell you that emphatically that won't happen. But we can, we can with a smaller investment bring kids to Egypt and see the Pyramids of Giza and let them stand in awe when that happens. We can bring kids Ethiopia and see what the Black Jews have done in building these massive cathedral like, out of rock and mountain in Ethiopia. We can do those types of programs and they would cost pennies on the dollar and radically change all the social woes that we constantly complain about or we constantly worry about. We would radically change those things.

So I have a serious issue with these pieces of legislation when we flippantly say, it's time to pass marijuana, it's time, our neighbors are doing it, this is for the economy. Man lets fix what's broken in our community because it is right in our hands and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to do it because they already did the heavy lift for us. They are telling us what needs to happen. So I wish and I pray for the day that we do the hard lift of saying to each other, you know what, yes I live in a community of affluence, yes I have an accent, yes it has been by the providence of God and my hard work that gave me that opportunity but for us to succeed as America we have to share. We have to share. And that doesn't mean you give up 100 percent of what you've gotten. That doesn't mean that you forget everything that you've learned or who you are, the culture that you represent but you can have as much as you want but at least the crumbs that fall on the

ground we have to share. We can't continue to live in these silos of economic segregation.

And with that I say, I have strong reservations about this Bill. I will continue to hear the debates here tonight and I pray and hope that we do the hard lift of fixing these things because at the end of the day whether they are White or they are Black it our kids, it's our country. We have to push it forward.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber? Good morning, Senator Formica. Pardon me, I have just been informed that Senator McCrory would like to speak and then we will move to Senator Formica. Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good Bill, let's pass it.

THE CHAIR:

We all appreciate the brevity, Senator. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thought I'd let that great moment live on for a minute or two there. Madam President, I thought about this Bill all day and what I thought I might be able to bring to the table to talk about, talk about my concerns. I grew up in the 60's, went to school in the 60's. I had a different, I had a different opportunity in life. At age 13 I started my pathway to addiction. I started with probably what is the gateway drug liquor and I began with that but I quickly morphed into different and other things marijuana being one.

And Madam President, my story tonight is going to be about who can we be, what do we want. And I went through my addictive period in my life from age 13 to the time I was 28, bouncing from place to place, feeding my addiction, and moving forward with no real purpose. What can we be? Who can we be?

Madam President, there is a lot of arguments to legalize this, this drug. There may be economic reasons for the state, there may be economic reasons for some people who are in a difficult position in our cities and could use a lift. There is a lot of money to be made by the people, the wealthy that are going to control the distribution of it. But Madam President, I return to who do we want to be. We just came off an pandemic for a year that kept everybody home. And that should have been a good thing, bringing people around the dinner table all the time. We saw a lot of problems with domestic violence. We saw a lot of problems with the stress of all of that offered, job and money worries and we went through a very tough year collectively. But I don't know if medication is the answer, Madam President. I keep thinking who can we be. I listen to Senator Cohen's concerns about her children, what she sees at ages 11 and 13. I remember back what I saw when I was 13 and what happened to me by the time I was 28. Who knows, maybe that's how addiction goes and won't happen to many people if this gets legalized.

But Madam President, I think it is time we find ways not to medicate but to empower, not to medicate but to enlighten, not to medicate but to encourage and expand horizons. And I think that is where we need to be with our children and I think that is what we have to be. I am very fortunate that as I come up upon my 20th, I'm sorry, my 40th year of being clean, my children never saw that other person and I had the opportunity to stand right here in this seat, number 20, where many great people have sat before me and many great people will sit after me. But I can tell you, Madam President I couldn't be

prouder to stand here, to serve as an elected official for 30 years, to have a business, to raise a great family being in love with a wonderful person, raise four great kids. Madam President, I tell 'you when I ask who can we be, that would not be me if I didn't put the addiction down at age 28. My life would be entirely different.

So I am fairly certain that the votes are here to pass this Bill and I appreciate the enthusiasm that some of the proponents have but I am wondering if that is the direction our state and our country want to be for a few bucks for our budget. So, Madam President, I again feel so grateful for the opportunity to stand here today and be able to say that and be able to say there is a better way. I am concerned about the health, physical, social, emotional benefits. I am concerned about workplace safety and hiring and I think those are important concerns that aren't addressed in this Bill and I don't think they could be.

So, Madam President, I thank you for the opportunity to stand here. I am most grateful for the opportunity that I have had to be able to stand here as a result of what I learned after 15 years of active addiction. So, thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. And good morning, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good morning, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of the legislation before us. First I just want to thank those who have had a hand in putting this legislation together. There have been a number of people who have worked so tirelessly over many, many years to bring us to this point today.

First I want to thank our Senate Co-Chair of the Judiciary Committee Senator Winfield, our Senate President Senator Looney for his work and effort over many years of proposing and bring this legislation forward when many thought that it never stood a chance and his visionary leadership is what is bringing us here at this point right now. Want to thank Representative Porter for her work, Representative Rojas for his efforts, the Governor's office, our own staff and again many others who have worked so tirelessly especially this year to get the Bill to a vote this evening or this morning I should say.

Madam President I know this is not an easy issue for a lot of people because in the Circle or in the legislature some may say this is legalization just for the sake of recreational use and I would say that it is not legalization for the sake of legalization otherwise we would have been able to do this a long time ago. This is a much more complicated issue which I know has frustrated many people outside our Capital and throughout the state. When people sincerely ask, especially with polls that are overwhelmingly show that people approve of legalization of recreational marijuana why haven't you gotten around to legalizing this yet?

People want it. Why hasn't this happened? And as I try to explain to folks that legislation is always very complicated and this is a prime example of that. This is again, not about legalization but about so many other facets beside legalization and we're talking a lot and we've spoken a lot about equity this evening and erasure of criminal records. We're talking about opening businesses and how it melts in with the medical marijuana industry that we have already in this state, how do we keep kids safe, how do we make sure that what we're doing is right, how will we learn lessons from other states that have legalized before we have and so when you add all those things up, plus many strong opinions it takes a long time to try and make sure we get a

Bill that, get a Bill that is reflects all those who are in the room and can gain the votes of a majority in the legislature.

What I know is that when we speak about marijuana there are sometimes two conversations about legalizing recreational marijuana and kind of moving forward but also pretending that it is not here already because marijuana is here. It has been here for decades. It has just not been here legally in the state but it is here. It is not something that if we vote for this Bill we are all of a sudden importing something new to the state, it is a product that is here already and that is actually what scares me is that we see right now children, school children and adults and others who are using recreational cannabis in an illegal and unregulated market and many times they may not even know what they are using and that is what brings fear to me and which is one of the reasons why I think it is important that we actually regulate and legalize this product.

For us anyway as we see other states around us that are legalizing it is important that we control our own destiny. This is not about and never has been for me anyway, the revenue this is really about controlling our own destiny. We are a small state. We see other states around us that are legalizing and if we are going to have control over this market we need to make sure that we are in the driver's seat and not in the passenger's seat. But what I see though right now in an illegal market is I see when I am, when I used to jog over at the high school track in Norwalk and I would smell marijuana from kids who were smoking under the bleachers and that worries me on a number of different levels one of which is because the kids are smoking and they don't know what they are smoking and we haven't put on the fine points of, you know, legalization and obviously it would still be illegal for them but they are purchasing product off a market that who knows what's in that and what it is laced with and

how it might get them more addicted to even another product because this is all an underground economy right now.

I live by a park that it is on the Wilton and Westport and Norwalk border where when they are leaving the park and they are coming down the road where I walk my dog and I smell marijuana coming out of cars where people are driving so this is nothing new but here we are trying to put, wrap our arms around a policy that hopefully when we vote on this Bill will help us to set policies that need to be set in place and have a product that is taxed and regulated and takes the needs out of the unregulated black market.

So, Madam President I think that this again is important for us to think about how we want to control our destiny as I said earlier. The product is here but it is not here in the way in which we want. It is around us in other states so the question is how are we going to control our destiny here in the State of Connecticut?

Are we going to have other states around us take the lead in this or are we going to join that and affirm that here in Connecticut we have our policy and our own policies and were are going to work to make sure that we keep our kids safe, that we keep our workplaces safe, that we enforce the laws on driving, we do everything we can in order to ensure that what, the policy that we are voting on tonight is the policy that works for our state. So this has been, again, many, many years of a conversation and debate on which way we should go on this issue. But I think we've seen over time how this is one that is important for our state and one that will be, I believe, will be positive because what is happening now with this market is not working, hasn't worked and has been many decades where we have seen the failure of having cannabis legalized in the State of Connecticut. So again, I rise to support this Bill

and urge my colleagues to support it as well. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on the Bill before us? Good morning Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Good morning, Madam President. I rise in opposition to this Bill for a number of reasons. First and foremost is that I don't believe this year that this issue was framed in the context of whether or not marijuana is a good social policy. That this is something that our communities and our children should aspire to, no instead it has been largely discussed in the context of revenue. It was placed in the Governor's budget and from there the conversation ensued.

What we heard from many of the opponents was the damaging effects, what it does to young developing minds. We heard about addiction, we've heard a lot of things but we haven't heard the solutions to those issues. So I think that is one of the biggest problems here is that I haven't heard a compelling argument that marijuana is good for a society and this is something that we need to pursue.

Now proponents will tell you that if we adopt this, black market goes away. The illegal unregulated marketplace somehow evaporates. We know that is also not true. But because where government exists and where government regulates and where government taxes, guess what, makes the product more expensive, more costly. So the black market, the illegal unregulated market will continue to exist because it can still be done cheaper and thereby still have a marketplace for individuals who will purchase it such as people who couldn't purchase it legally at age 21 but somebody younger than that, our kids, our teenagers of the State of Connecticut.

Proponents will also tell you that this is something we need to do because our neighboring states are doing it. Just think about that, it's okay so because our neighbors do it we should do it. And I think isn't that what our mom's told us when we were growing up. Isn't that what we tell our kids that just because the friends you hang around with, the people who are near, just because they do drugs, doesn't mean you should do drugs. But the proponents will have us believe that because other states around us are allowing and legalizing drugs that we need to do that to. I think that is a false premise. And once again, you know, you just sit back and think common sense, you know, my mom wasn't wrong. My mom was a democrat to. But my mom wasn't wrong when she was telling me these things.

And so therefor when the proponents tell us we have to do, we have to capitalize on this opportunity because our neighbors are doing it, I think that misses the mark.

But as a Senator coming from Stratford, I am also concerned about the potential that we may lose jobs because of this. One of the things that Connecticut does really, really well is defense contracting. We build the world's best helicopter in the Town of Stratford. So good that the president flies in a Sikorsky helicopter. That helicopter is built with federal defense contracting dollars. Marijuana is illegal under federal law. What I don't want to see happen is that Connecticut pass a policy that is going to be in violation of a federal law that may give incentive to other states to lure these jobs away from Connecticut to states that comply with federal law. In other words Connecticut will now have marijuana, recreational and legal but a state like Florida where Sikorsky also has a plant follows federal law. That may be an incentive for defense contract dollars to go to Florida rather than Connecticut.

It's policies like this that make Connecticut unfriendly to business and has caused us to become dead last, dead last in job growth. We don't need to create incentives so that the good paying jobs that we have here for our kids end up going to other states. God knows it is difficult in this very and highly competitive job market to keep and to lure jobs to Connecticut. But it is policies like this that make us uncompetitive and make our jobs go elsewhere. So when we look at this, these are the types of issues that we need to think about, think long and hard about. Is this good for Connecticut? Is this good for our kids, for our communities, for our economy for our jobs? I don't think it is. I don't think it is a smart policy.

At the end of the day what it comes down to, what we do a lot of this about is for our kids. It is about not only today but what is Connecticut going to look like. Why do we do what we do? I do this and I am voting "no" on this Bill because I love my kids. I want the best for my kids. I don't want to make marijuana more available and accessible to my kids nor do I want this for your kids or for any of the kids in Connecticut. But that is what this is going to do cause it is going to be hard to distinguish the legal marijuana from the illegal marijuana. The legal marijuana that somebody can go into a store and purchase and invariably it is going to work its way down the 19, 18, 17, 16-year-old. And is that what we want to create an environment, a community, and a culture? I don't think so. So for Connecticut's children, Connecticut's youth I don't think this is a smart choice. So, Madam President for Connecticut's future, for our children I urge my colleagues to vote "no." Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the Bill? Good morning, Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Good Morning, Madam President. I rise in support of the Bill. Madam President this is legislation that is 88 years overdue in this state. When the United States recognized in 1933 the terrible mistake it had made for over a period of 12 years in trying to enforce prohibition and all of the terrible things that fell out from that, they should have extended that principle a little bit further and realized that turning to marijuana with the same degree of ferocity of enforcement as happened with alcohol would be just as counterproductive and just as destructive as it has proved to be over the years.

Madam President, I represent clients whose lives were blighted for the rest of their lives by the convictions for relatively minor marijuana offenses when they were young. They paid a terrible price for this and an disproportionate price in low income and minority communities. And the problem with marijuana enforcement is the same problem with alcohol enforcement. Abraham Lincoln about 60 years before prohibition went into effect, I think encapsulated the issue in the wisdom of this statement where he said, "Prohibition will work great injury to the cause of temperance. It is the species of intemperance within itself for it goes beyond the bounds of reason and that it attempts to control a man's appetite by legislation and makes a crime out of things that are not crimes. A prohibition law strikes a blow at the very principles upon which our government was founded."

Now, Madam President in the law, the criminal law is respected not because it is the law but the law follows public opinion. A law follows the feeling of the heart of people about that is or is not criminal behavior. Now even those who commit crimes against others want to have the protect of the law even robbers and thieves and others know that kind of offense that's something they hope to have the government protect them from themselves. The problem with prohibition, Madam President whether

the alcohol or tobacco or marijuana in this case, is that it tries to impose by law something that is against the inherent feelings of a large segment of society either a majority or a substantial minority and the problem what happens from that, Madam President is that even though the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Anti-Saloon League had recognized a real problem in the late 19th Century they knew the trouble that was being caused in society by excessive alcohol consumption, the violence, the domestic violence, the public violence, the loss of employment, the lost health, the early death, the family disruption all of those things caused by alcohol were in fact real. They had identified a genuine social problem. But the remedy they chose to try to fix it was wrong because it was excessive and there were so many people who still wanted to have the right to drink that they do so temperately, they never felt that that law was a just law.

And what happened, Madam President was that in its enforcement and during those years of prohibition respect for law was undermined. We saw in many cases that highly respectable citizens would go to speakeasy's, they didn't think of themselves as being anything other than responsible citizens because they felt the law was unjust. We saw many cases of jury nullification where you had speakeasy's closed down and distilleries and breweries broken into and closed down. The evidence couldn't have been more clear and in many cases the jury acquitted because they felt the law was unjust. The danger, Madam President is that the enforcement when against the will of the people and the sense of what should or should not be punishable as a crime. That is the real danger.

Madam President, and as with alcohol and tobacco, the responsible thing to do to recognize what is in accord with human feeling on this is to legalize it for adults and stringently license and regulate its content to control quality. What we saw, Madam

President of course during prohibition with the terrible toll taken by alcohol that was no longer regulated but deaths were caused, illness was caused, blindness was caused by this so called bathtub gin and other unregulated substance with alcohol that was sold. We see the same thing now with marijuana laced with fentanyl and other things, the quality cannot be controlled and it can be very lethal in many cases. In fact we can be proud that Connecticut along with Rhode Island were the two states that never did ratify the prohibition Amendment in the first place and we should, I think, keep that wisdom and common sense in mind in thinking about what we should do tonight.

Other consequences we saw during prohibition with the rise of criminal empires because there was so much money to be made illegally in bootlegging and in the operations of a very large but suddenly illegal market operating outside the tax system and outside the law. It made multimillionaires of criminal figures who at the end of prohibition turned their attention with the resources made during prohibition to other enterprises, infiltrating businesses, infiltrating unions, and bringing about all the social harm that we have seen since then.

So, Madam President this is an issue not just about legalization of marijuana but Senator Winfield pointed out early on it is also an attempt to redress problems that have occurred for generations and that is the aggressive and excessive enforcement in minority communities. The price paid by those who were poor and without connections and without influence while in many other communities the law turned a blind eye and chose not to enforce against affluent, well-connected white youth. That is a reality of what we've seen, Madam President. So we need to recognize is that this is a matter now that the legislation is not just a simple legalization but the equity portions of this Bill try to make some attempt to redress those grievances and those

injustices that go back 80 years or more by trying to find ways to promote entrepreneurship in this new business to create ways for minority communities and those without significant resources to secure funding, to increase to 40 percent rather than 25 percent the amount of angel investor credits that could be available because it will be a challenge for anyone who is not well connected and trying to get into this field to get this funding, the financing because conventional financing continues to not be available.

But Madam President we have to recognize that there has been a terrible tragedy inflicted upon people for so many years because of the aggressive enforcement of laws in this area just as was the case with alcohol prohibition because to be respected criminal law as to be accepted in the hearts of the overwhelming majority of the people. It can't be the bare majority, it has to be an overwhelming majority because if it is not, you have the undermining of respect of the law, corruption of judges and law enforcement officials as we saw during prohibition the amassing of criminal fortunes all of the other ancillary evils that occurred in that period of prohibition when the nation realized after that experiment that it had failed and created consequences far different from what had been anticipated at the time.

So, Madam President now is the time for Connecticut to recognize that we should do what the other enlightened states in our region have done, legalize the product for adults, license it, regulate it, control the quality and also an opportunity for economic development in our urban areas. So, Madam President I urge support for the Bill this evening and I want to thank Senator Winfield for all his leadership and work in this. I was so proud to appoint him to the working group on this issue that he Co-Chaired along with Majority Leader Rojas who was asked to take on that role on the part of the House and Representative Porter and Senator McCrory

and others who worked on this issue having seen what it has done in their communities over the years. So, Madam President I urge everyone to think of this as a matter of equity and a matter of redressing wrongs that are historic. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, I will open the voting machine and Mr. Clerk if you would please call the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, this is Senate Bill 1118 as Amended, Senate Schedule "A". Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1118 as Amended by Senate Schedule "A". An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1118 as Amended by Senate Schedule "A". An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, this is Senate Bill 1118 as Amended by Senate Schedule "A". An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1118 as Amended by Senate Schedule "A". An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 1118 as Amended by Senate Schedule "A"

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yea	19
Total voting Nay	17
Absent not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) The measure is passed. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President I move for this item to be immediately transmitted to the House of Representatives please.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

THE CHAIR:

So now, the question is still on the question of adoption on E-Cert Bill No. 1201. So Senator Winfield, will you remark, sir?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, before us is the Bill on regulation of dope, legalization and regulation of cannabis. There is an Amendment in the system which is a strike-all that effectively becomes the Bill. That is LCO No. 10906. I would ask that it be called and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Certainly. Mr. Clerk, would you please call LCO 10906?

CLERK:

LCO No. 10906, Senate Amendment, Senate Schedule
"A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment that becomes the Bill basically takes the Bill that this Chamber voted on just about a week ago, and adds a couple of things to it.

Let me just first start off by saying we, by adopting this Amendment, do not have to attach Senate Amendment "A" which was attached during that debate; that's part of this Amendment.

It also allows for community service in place of a fine for those who are indigent. It bans elected officials who are in the General Assembly from participating under this Bill for two years after leaving the General Assembly, the revolving door clause as some might talk about.

We had the study of home grow, that is eliminated, we'll just move forward with home grow at the point in which it was to be in effect under the Bill. It requires, as you may know we had THC content in the Bill. It requires THC labels to talk about the content of the products.

It clarifies what is and what isn't FOI-able under the Bill that we had. It also dealt with an issue that was in the definition of social equity applicant, where some people believe that you might not allow for people who have been -- found themselves in prisons for actions they had taken during the prohibition of cannabis to participate, it clarifies that.

Madam President, it is an Amendment that I think helps to make this Bill a better Bill and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Hello, Madam President, great to see you this afternoon once again. Well, as I spoke for about an hour-and-a-half on the Bill last Wednesday, I am very much pleased that those remarks will be incorporated into this afternoon's transcript on the Bill that's before us today, and I understand that we are on the Amendment.

Just a couple points on the Amendment, and when we do vote on the Amendment, I would ask that we do that vote by roll, Madam President. And I also probably will have some general remarks after that vote on the Bill, assuming it does become Amendment.

But a couple provisions that we have before us with the Amendment. First of all, I think as from the 30,000 foot mark, I think a lot of the provisions in the Amendment move the Bill in a positive direction from my perspective, even though I don't support the legalization of what's called colloquially recreational use of marijuana.

But on the first point regarding what we could call the revolving door provision, or the prohibition on someone getting involved in the industry if they're serving in the Legislature, right now, for example, if you were on the list of people approved to be a judge, even if you won an election, if you didn't get sworn in you could then turn around and get appointed as a judge because that prohibition is against you being in office, and then being selected

by the governor and then eventually, hopefully approved.

This, to my understanding, through you, Madam President is slightly different. If, for example, you ran for another term, you were successful and you chose not to get sworn in, you couldn't then two days later engage in this. You'd still have to wait two years. So it's different than the provisions that are in effect for someone that wish to be considered for a potential judgeship, as an example. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. In Lines 2547 through 2550 is where this provision that was part of the Amendment was added, and Senator Kissel is correct. What it says is, it's two years after leaving state service. So it's not just the fact that you did not swear in again; there is an actual two-year buffer whether you swear in or do not swear in, and leave state service either way. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I appreciate that response and I wholeheartedly support that. Because, again, public confidence in the system of, I guess for lack of better terminology, checks and balances regarding the construct regarding legalization of marijuana for adult consumption, we need to have the confidence of the People of the State of Connecticut.

And so having a system where people are involved in service, especially here in the legislature to turn around and then enter the industry in a short period of time, people might get jaded, feel that people are utilizing their connections implicitly or explicitly.

And again, I think that as we venture down this path, which is filled with possible pitfalls, I think anything that we can do to make sure the public has full confidence as much as possible, at least in the governance of the system, and the fact that an individual can't be involved in tweaking it or voting on Bills affecting it, and then turn around and then jump into that business itself, at least for a period of two years, that's a very positive change and I applaud that.

The other provision expands the individuals a little bit, in my opinion, although at least for me, not in an untoward way. The original proposal that we voted on and debated last Monday, not yesterday, but a week before that, talked about individuals getting involved from a community that had been disproportionately affected by the war on drugs or by tough penalties on those involved with drugs, and there were some delineations as to how to describe that.

People that had records, income rates, things of that nature and it's my understanding now, with this Amendment, that we also have a delineation and it's an either/or, of an individual having a certain kind of background of convictions and connectedness with illegal drugs.

And again, the notion being that as the effort to bring equity to this new chapter in our state's history, the proponents wish to acknowledge that if an individual has paid their penalty, and either been incarcerated or punished in some other way, and all of that is behind him or her, and they meet

these criteria that they could be considered for appointment to some of these positions and make application.

I know that's sort of a rough version, but is that what we're trying to do by this Amendment, or at least a portion of this Amendment? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I will just orient anyone who's listening in the Bill or any Amendment that Senator Kissel is talking about Lines 2247 through 2251. And yes, it's precisely as he describes that we are in fact talking about communities where there were, because of the policies we had, at one time higher rates of arrest for cannabis, particularly for people of color.

And the notion that those people might not be included in the definition, while I don't believe that's what the definition did, was problematic for many people that I've had conversation with. What we did here was laid out the language in such a way that it is clear that those individuals are included.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I want to thank the good Chair of the Judiciary Committee for that response as well and I appreciate the outreach that Senator Winfield had with myself both yesterday and today. And I also don't believe that the

underlying language foreclosed an opportunity for these individuals to avail themselves. But sometimes we take a boot and suspenders kind of approach to legislation and if it assuages the concerns, by some folks out there, so be it.

I don't think it works to undermine anything in the underlying bill. At this point in time, I don't have any other questions regarding the Amendment per se, although the Amendment, being a strike all, it essentially becomes the Bill and I do want to reserve comments for later after we do vote on the Amendment.

But just briefly, I do have that overarching concern regarding its impact on children. I do believe that individuals that might not otherwise experiment or try marijuana now will be afforded an opportunity to maybe go down that path.

My guess would be that for many of those folks, there will be no deleterious effects, and long-term addiction or stepping stone to other addictive narcotics or drugs or alcohol or anything else like that of an addictive nature. But for some, I think that's an inevitability and there will be tragic tales that will come forth from that.

I know proponents have said, we already have illicit and illegal drugs on the black market today and people can avail themselves if they want to go and purchase these items. And there's no quote-unquote quality control. But I still think that if things are available and readily available, far more individuals will take advantage of those opportunities to maybe take a step down a path that they might not otherwise go.

And we see that because in the same breath that we're going with marijuana at the same time, with things like vaping products and things that might appeal to children, or others, we pull back on their ability to be marketed or freely available.

And so on the one hand, we acknowledge that if something's there, right before you in a store on a countertop, individuals that might not otherwise purchase that or experiment with that now will and if it's not readily available, they won't. And that's just human nature. And I think that's just marketing 101.

We also know that it's not that the potency that people might recall from 20, 30, 40 years ago, either personally or through talking to friends or others who did it, or watching movies that were prevalent at the time. And indeed, we're talking about substances far more powerful and might have far greater impacts on an ability of an individual to process information, eye-hand coordination, drive an automobile, and other things like that. So that's highly problematic.

There's other issues regarding employees and their employer, and how the employer can make sure that their employees are 100% capable when they get on the job site, especially if it's a dangerous job that might put themselves or others on the worksite in danger. That's a giant question mark, in my mind.

Its attractiveness to minors. It doesn't have to be inhaled, it can be in a hardened substance, it could be a candy, it can be a cake, a brownie, all sorts of other things, really, as far as the imagination can go can be packaged in that way. And once we go down that path, it's going to be very difficult to put that horse back in the barn.

And again, it's appeal to young people could be devastating for many individuals with a beautiful and bright future ahead of them.

Problems with detecting it, if you pull someone over, you can't do the horizontal eye nystagmus test, you can't do a breathalyzer, other things that

are tried and true and have been proven in a court of law to be effective and dependable. We don't have those available to us right now for prosecution or for law enforcement to do curbside checks of drivers and things of that nature.

In fact, even the ability of a law enforcement officer to pull a car over is in doubt so I think for those reasons, there's major public safety and law enforcement issues with major question marks as well. And I think this will have the deleterious consequences of putting the public safety at unnecessary risk.

And we should really wait for technology to catch up so that we can actually find out if anybody's had cannabis marijuana or whoever you want to call this drug within a certain set period of time, six hours, 12 hours or whatever, is determined to be the window that we need to be most concerned with, from a legal perspective.

So there's so many other issues that I touched upon in that hour-and-a-half about eight days ago, I won't retread all of that. Again, I'm happy that it's all incorporated herein.

I personally think the Amendment, or the modest changes that occurred to the Bill that we debated last week are negligible, if not somewhat positive, but it's not going to change my view at all regarding the underlying Bill in its totality. And I will get into that, again, a little bit more but I just wanted to speak briefly on the Amendment because it's a strike all and I know that several of my colleagues probably want to weigh in on this at this time as well.

And so at this point, I will just urge everyone to vote their conscience on the Amendment, I will be voting in favor of the Amendment and then voting no on the Bill, because I think the Amendment and takes what I perceive to be an ultimately bad Bill and

makes it somewhat better in small ways. And I applaud the proponent for at least moving in that direction.

And for those reasons, Madam President, that's how I'll be voting in the hours to come. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Thank you. Looking through this, I do like, you know, one or two parts of the Amendment. But I do have some questions about the change to the social equity applicant, just so I can understand it better. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir and prepare yourself, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. My first question is basically, are we taking people that have been arrested for drug dealing and giving them a higher, a better chance of getting these licenses that are made available through this Bill?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I hope that this answers the question. If the question is, does this Amendment increase the likelihood by making these individuals, potentially making these individual social equity applicants, as I suggested, I think the way that the language is currently written, if they're captured and inside of the communities that we talked about as a social equity applicant, without a prohibition on them participating, they would be captured anyway.

What this language to my mind does is clarify that they are a part of it. The conversation about cannabis legalization also is a conversation about policing in certain communities, the way policing has happened, disproportionate contact between communities of color and police and the outgrowth of that.

And so, to the mind of many people who were involved in this conversation, it was important to clarify that they were under the definition included. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And who determines these communities? Is it by percentage of arrests? Is it percentage by conviction?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

If you give me a moment, the communities we talk we're talking about are those that are that meet that definition in lines 83, 84, which are

disproportionately impacted areas. And if I may briefly read a portion of it.

The components of that are a historical conviction rate of drug related offenses greater than one-tenth or an unemployment rate greater than 10%, to kind of get us those census tract areas. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So the people in these areas are getting a better chance at getting the licenses than the rest of the 3.6 million people in Connecticut?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President, I'm not sure that I would necessarily agree with that. I think what the Bill does is it sets aside a portion, 50%, for social equity, to deal with the fact that we have policy that has affected these communities in ways that I don't think any of us want our communities to have ever been affected. And, allows for them to get into this, the program that we would have.

There are many people, no matter what you do, who will have a greater chance of participating in this system than any of us, and particularly in communities of color that have been operated upon because of the way we've chosen operate in this state for many years.

And so I see this as the conversation on equity where some people will say, well, you're getting more than I'm getting. That's not what the conversation is about. The conversation is about the fact that some things have happened and you have to go back and deal with the fact that they've happened and that doesn't mean equal, it means equitable. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President, I guess we view equitable differently, because I see it as fair and impartial. But, you know, my point is, it isn't the fact that, you know, we are looking at this differently. I'm looking at this as, you know, when arrests are made, arrests are made for people that do something wrong.

Whether people today say that, you know, it wasn't viewed as something wrong, it doesn't make a difference. At the time, this legislative body basically made laws and those laws were enforced and people got arrested. And they followed the tracks of where are the drugs being dealt?

I mean, my town where I live, there were quite a few arrests for drug dealing. In fact, I remember I was on the frontlines of it, especially in the early 1990s when crack cocaine was out there. There were people being beaten, shot, all kinds of things. It was a mess. It was a mess in the cities, and it spilled out into the communities.

And during that process, you know, and I'll talk more about this later on as we get into the main Bill, but let's stick to the Amendment. We should never give somebody a leg up on a job. We should make sure that we treat people as equals. We should

also make sure that, you know, we give opportunities to any groups that -- any minority groups or women businesses, anything like that.

But when I look at people that have been arrested for violating the crime and saying, you know, we should give them a leg up. We should give people who broke the law a leg up. But then again, I think that's what this whole session has been. Erasing criminal records, giving free phone calls, and the list goes on. It's surprising.

But, you know, I'm just going to stick with this Amendment right now, because I've got a lot to say on the other -- on the main Bill, but I believe that that rewarding somebody for dealing drugs when they knew what they were doing wrong, is wrong and I'm against this Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? If not, there has been a request for a roll call vote, so I've opened the voting machine. Mr. Clerk, would you please call the vote?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Amendment "A" on Senate Bill 1201. Senate Amendment "A" on Senate Bill 1201. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 1201, Senate Amendment "A", AN ACT CONCERNING RESPONSIBLE AND EQUITABLE REGULATION OF ADULT USE CANNABIS. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Amendment "A" on Senate Bill 1201.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine is locked. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Amendment "A" of Senate Bill 1201:"

Total Number Voting	30
Necessary for Adoption	16
Those voting Yea	23
Those voting Nay	7
Those absent and not voting	6

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) Amendment is adopted and now we return to discussion on the passage of the legislation as amended. Will you remark, Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I said that I was going to save a few remarks for the Bill, as amended, and here we go.

And again, I will not to the great happiness of my colleagues here in the Circle, go over that hour-and-a-half that I did that last, eight days ago but I feel like I articulated a lot of concerns and hopefully, some of those won't come to fruition. But I do have this overarching concern that what is the message that we're sending to our young people?

And even though the marijuana is supposed to be secured in a home, lock and key, young people are going to find their way in there, just like 30, 40 years ago, they found their way into their parents' locked liquor cabinets and things like that, unfortunately.

But also, just seeing grownups, adults, smoking marijuana, sends a message. We've had proposals in

years past, where people didn't even want to have cigarettes smoked in automobiles, because they felt that that created a bad image for young people in the cars, either the secondhand smoke or seeing grownups adults in the car smoking, it would cause any young person in that car to say, hey, if it's okay for that person, that grown up, then it's going to be okay for me. We're going to see the same kind of thing.

You know, where are the people that are authorized to be able to get high to smoke marijuana? Is it going to be a public park in town? Is it going to be a beach? Is it going to be a lake? And who's going to be around and who's going to see that and say, it can't be that bad?

I know the argument keeps coming up. Well, it's already prevalent. It's just being done in the black market. But again, once you make something legal, it's far more prevalent for individuals that might otherwise not have made that decision.

The lack of an objective test for law enforcement is a huge issue. Its appeal to young people as far as forms other than smoking, I just think that human nature and marketing and creativity is going to put it in a form where, as much as we try to regulate it, there's going to be workarounds. And there's going to be things that open up horizons that we just can't even imagine.

I've got to be honest. Like 20 years ago, if you talked to me about vaping or electronic cigarettes, I would have roll my eyes. But now it's like, right at the forefront and we have to catch up to regulate a lot of these things. And when we think we have our arms around some of these things, scented or it tastes a certain way, you know, powers that be march in and they loosen those proposed regulations, or they thwart proposed legislation. That's the reality.

And there's a lot of money going to be involved here. I know there's the social equity component but there's also a huge big business component. I think I stated probably unartfully last week, but and I think it was regarding another Bill, but I would like to live in that shining city on the hill.

You know, Senator Kelly put it, remember when your mom said if everybody jumped off a bridge, does that mean you should jump off a bridge? I don't think so. I mean, if all our surrounding states are doing something, that's not a huge reason why we have to as well.

And then when I hear people say, well, we're losing revenue. Now, it's just become an argument of dollars, right? Oh, New York's going to get revenue that otherwise we would get. I think there's too much of a downside. I think there's a great upside if we were the oasis.

I'm going to leave it to others here in the Circle, but I want to thank Senator Hwang pointing out earlier to myself and others in our caucus that I believe it was a Los Angeles Times article, indicating the state of California's marijuana industry is facing real peril, and may need a state bailout. Wow, isn't that the goose that laid the golden egg? That's laying an egg, all right.

I mean, imagine 10 years from now, now all of a sudden we have to bail out some sort of industry? And by that time, it'll be controlled by large corporations, multinationals. Whether it's big tobacco, big pharma, I don't know who's going to get their arms around this but all the groundwork will have been laid. And then five, ten years ago, we won't recognize the folks that are in charge.

They could be hedge funds. Nothing against any of those entities, large corporations working for the benefit of their shareholders. But what gets lost in all of that is the quality of life here in

Connecticut. What happens to the generations behind us? What happens to the people that are maimed or killed on our roadways because somebody combined two things that otherwise didn't seem dangerous, that turns out to be deadly?

What happens to our public safety where we can't even allow law enforcement to pull over drivers that are not able to function correctly, to keep the roadway safe? And if they do pull them over, they don't have an ability to conduct a test that will stand up in court, because we just don't have that technology yet.

What do we do when someone reports to work and they put themselves and their coworkers in danger? And again, we don't have that objective test. You can't take a hair strand. My understanding is that can tell if someone had marijuana 30 days ago, not yesterday, not this morning. So how does the employer enforce those rules and regulations?

To me, these are big question marks. And, you know, when someone's job is at risk or someone's life and limb has been put in peril, there's going to be court cases and these are all things that are going to have to be sorted out.

And people can say well look at other states, you can learn from other states. Well, other states, if you look at the literature, in the news articles and some of the testimony by even proponents they'll say learn from our mistakes. I'm not so sure we have.

In our zeal to move forward and not to be out raced by surrounding states, have we really gleaned from all the mistakes those other states have made, both financially and socioeconomically and public safety?

You know, on a lighter note, I read an article, it's referenced in Capitol reports, it had to do with a Charlotte's legendary lobster pound up in Maine, where they're now putting marijuana smoke into

lobsters. And she's purportedly doing it so that they don't feel as much pain when they're boiled.

And they actually had another group in Maine do a more scientific study and there's a question, do lobsters actually feel pain like mammals and human beings or not? And they said their reflexes are much slower, so that there was some sort of impact. Does that mitigate in favor of this Bill, against this Bill? I don't know.

What it did tell me is that we do live in a crazy world where you can't even imagine what's coming around the corner. But it's not a game and it's not a toy and it's not a candy. It's not a dessert. It's dangerous. It's a drug, and it does have an impact.

And I haven't even gotten to the question, does it have a long term impact on your synapses? On your nervous system? On the neuroplasticity of the brain, on the developing brain in a juvenile? And those are all areas being researched now as well.

And do we want to march down this path for a few dollars without knowing the answers to those questions? Again, the shining city on the hill, that's where I want to live. I think we can do better here in Connecticut. I think we can be the oasis, I think that we can be the destination where a family brings their young kids and says, we don't have to worry about going to the beach, or to the lake, or to the park. Because in Connecticut, they didn't go down that road.

It wasn't worth those few hundreds of thousands of dollars, or millions when they factored in all the negative consequences and downside to that socioeconomic equation.

We can be that state if we want to, it's not too late. But unfortunately, I feel that there's enough folks in this building both in this Chamber and down

below that our future is being carved out in front of us and we don't know what the last chapter of that story is going to be.

And for that reason, Madam President, I urge my colleagues in the second chance on this Bill, as amended, to vote no and tell the people of the state of Connecticut there's a better way forward for peace and progress and for Connecticut to be the very best place to live, work and raise a family. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the amended legislation? Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm going to try and not touch as many bases as I did last time, but I do have some items that I did come across that I do want to bring out.

You know, I did talk a little bit about it when we were bringing out the Amendment, but I'd like to start with a couple of questions for the proponent of the Bill. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed. Prepare yourself, Senator Winfield. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This concerns the first -- my first question is Lines 313 through 320. And it talks about any person under 18 years of age who possesses or has under such person's control five ounces or more of cannabis plant material, an equivalent amount of cannabis products as provided in subsection of this section, or an equivalent

amount of a combination of cannabis and cannabis products.

And it basically says, you know, if they get arrested, basically they're going to be adjudicated as delinquent pursuant to the provisions of Section 46B-120.

And I guess my question is, if a car gets stopped by a 17-year-old and inside that car are 25 pounds of marijuana, is that person going to go through the delinquent process?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If you give me a moment just to get to where the good Senator was, I will get you an answer.

Madam President, the section does read, as Senator Champagne suggests it reads, that for those offenses, one should be adjudicated as he has indicated. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And basically they'll be adjudicated as a delinquent. If anybody's been paying attention to the stolen cars across Connecticut, the adjudicated delinquent is surely not working. And as I said before, on this Bill, this is a drug dealer's dream of a Bill.

Through you, Madam President, under Line 321, it says no person may be arrested for violation of this

section. And, when I go to my next page, which I have, when I go to Page 13, under the same section, on line 363, it says subsequent offense they will be guilty of a Class C misdemeanor.

And I guess my question is, if they can't be arrested, how do we deal with the arrest of that misdemeanor? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I would have to ask the Senator a question in order to be able to attempt to answer his question.

The Amendment we just adopted became the Bill. Is the Senator in the Bill or in the Amendment? I'm having a hard time figuring out where he is.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne, where are you, besides in the Senate Chamber?

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

I think I'm causing a problem here because I'm using the original Bill, Madam President. I did not have that Amendment in hand, so I will just go with the sections. I apologize for that.

So we are currently in the same Section we were just in, and the following line would say no person may be arrested for a violation of this Subsection. And then it just continues on under Subsection e-1.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If you give me a moment to, now that I can orient myself to figure out what the -- how the question relates to the Bill that we have, I would gladly do that.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I'm almost there. I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:

No problem. I just saw you standing, so I didn't want to ignore you.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I'm sorry it took so long. I had to figure out where the Senator was and then kind of walk backwards. So when it -- if you you'll look at the line that Senator Champagne pointed out, he's pointing out Line 321, where it says no person may be arrested for a violation of this subsection. That, number three in that line 321 is in Subsection B, so what they can't be arrested for are the things in that subsection.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I actually figured it out while we were standing here, sorry about that.

All right, if we continue right where we talked about subsequent offense be guilty of a Class C misdemeanor and go to the next Subsection 2, there's so many subsections here, it's a couple lines down. And it says the court shall evaluate such person and if the court determines such a person is a drug-dependent person, the court may suspend prosecution of such person and order such person to undergo a substance abuse treatment program. Would this would this include drug dependent for marijuana?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I think that the Senator is aware that I will answer these questions as the language suggests. The language does not prohibit cannabis as a drug that one might be dependent on. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'll bring that up again later when I talk about another section. We talk about, you know, when people are -- they don't have the money to pay their fines and, you know, we added, you know, they can use community service.

One of the interesting things is those that are involved in drug dealing use cash, so they don't file taxes. And basically, that would be easy for them to say that they cannot afford it, although I think most would just probably pay it, especially if it goes away after a certain amount of years.

All right, on -- I know we're off about five lines now. So I moved to Page 33, which is Section 18. And through you, Madam President. It talks in Section 18, Under Subsection 2, it says the possession or --- Well, let's go back, I'm sorry, Subsection 1, it talks about the odor of cannabis or burnt cannabis, that would not constitute part or in whole probable cause or reasonable suspicion, and shall not be used on a basis to support any stop or search of a person or motor vehicle. And one of those is the odor of cannabis or burnt cannabis.

And the next one is that basically talks about the fact that the possession or the suspicion of possession of cannabis without evidence that the quantity of the cannabis is, or suspected to be, in excess of five ounces of cannabis plant material.

And I think the question I have is can you, if you if you see a large amount of marijuana and you know it's over five ounces, would that prevent you from making the arrest for the over five ounces, or even the fine?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President, I would ask the question for clarity is, and I'm going to try to operate where the Senator is, I think he's in the original Bill, so in lines 994 through 999 in the version he has, I think, is where we are. Is he asking, does that section that says that there's no

constitutional in part or in whole for probable cause, blah, blah, blah, blah, is he asking does that section which says that once you go over the five ounces, you're no longer -- I guess I might ask him to clarify his question.

Because it seems to me what the section is suggesting is what it says which is, if you had evidence that the quantity of cannabis is or suspected to be in excess of five ounces, that you would be outside of what some people might characterize as the protections offered in that section.

So I'm not sure what the question is, it seems to me that that's what it actually suggests there.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And that's exactly it. Because if I look into the car and I see what I know to be more than the -- well, I suspect to be more than the five ounces of cannabis, through years of being a law enforcement officer, basically, if I don't have absolute proof, I'm seeing a problem here with actually taking any action.

And I look at the next section, and there's no questions related to that. I look at the next section and it says the presence of cash or currency in proximity to cannabis without evidence that such cash or currency exceeds \$500. When I look in there and I see a stack of cash and the top one is \$100 bill, I've got a pretty good idea but do I have proof? Do I have probable cause? Reasonable suspicion? Maybe.

I think we basically are pushing the line on some of these, and that section is going to lead me for later on as well.

Now, one of the points I do want to make is as police or as, I'm sorry, as lawmakers, you know, and I've said this in the past, one of our main responsibilities is public safety. And I think I'm going to jump ahead a little bit to Section 112 and 113. And the reason I want to jump to 112 and 113 is because I pointed this out, and I was basically told that yeah, it'll be taken care of at a later date.

And I knew that there was going to be an Amendment to this, I really was surprised that the Amendment didn't include Section 112 and 113. And what that, those two sections talk about, is when somebody is smoking or inhaling or ingesting cannabis while they're operating a motor vehicle.

If I drive down the road and I pick a beer up, I can immediately be stopped and arrested because it's a crime. Of course, I'll be tested for DUI. But if I'm smoking marijuana, and we go back to that other section, the odor of cannabis or burnt cannabis is not probable cause, and I smell the marijuana. Clearly, they're driving, and I have no other violations, I can't pull the person over.

I can't stop somebody who's driving down the road. It doesn't matter if Main Street is full of people and this person is driving. Unless I have another violation, I can't pull them over. And public safety, that smacks right into it and I just have a problem with that, especially when you throw in just the odor of cannabis or burnt cannabis is not probable cause.

And then I move ahead to another section that actually talks about DUI. And it says in Section 93. It talks about a drug test of an individual that yields a positive result solely for 11NOR9,

Carboxyl Delta 9, tetrahydrocannabinol which is basically THC, shall not be construed without other evidence as proof that such individual is under the influence of or impaired by cannabis.

So even if they have it in their system, I need some sort of other proof. And if I don't have a drug recognition expert around, that may be a problem, especially for a conviction in court. So it's almost as if some of these laws, these sections are actually there to protect the person driving under the influence of marijuana.

And I have a big section -- I have a big problem with that. Somebody asked me, so are you for or against marijuana? I saw you voted against it. I said, I'm against that Bill. I am against the Bill, because it's a terrible Bill, especially when we're not protecting the public.

I have another question, through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Proceed.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you. I know that the money collected off the taxes off of marijuana, can you just tell me where that money goes?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The money I believe gets split between the social equity portion, the general fund and the prevention side that I think all of us are concerned about. It changes slightly,

but generally we're talking for the social equity 65%, the prevention 25%, and the rest the general fund.

While I'm speaking, Madam President, can I clarify a point that was made about smoking and driving and why that section might actually say what it says. So, you know, it says solely for smoking. It is not that one couldn't be stopped if something else was happening, if there was an issue that they were driving and doing something that they would not normally be doing, if they violated one of the laws of the road. Many other things would allow for the actions the good Senator is asking about.

Also, it is true that it's very difficult to say for sure that one is smoking cannabis versus anything else. One of the issues built into the larger conversation is profiling that happens. It is not beyond the pale to suggest that at least in some areas, smoking and appearing a certain way, if you were able to stop someone and arrest them purely for the appearance of a cannabis cigarette, smoking cannabis, could potentially lead to increased profiling.

So while I recognize the commentary about the Bill, I think the Bill is attempting to deal with the legalization of cannabis but also things we've seen in the past and not replicate some of the issues we've had in the past. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I believe I said that, you know, you see somebody smoking and you can sell it, or you can smell it. So you're pretty obvious that that's what they're doing that. If you have no

other violation, you cannot pull them over. That's specifically what I said. And it says that it doesn't matter if you smell the marijuana or the burnt marijuana, and it also doesn't -- it says that if there's no other violations, you can't stop them.

You know, this had nothing to do with profiling. This is strictly about somebody smoking marijuana as they go by you. And especially if I'm standing on Main Street at an event, I'm trying to keep people on the sidewalk, and somebody drives by and clearly they're smoking marijuana, I cannot pull him over without any other offense.

Back to what I was talking about, the funds. So a portion of this goes to the general fund, a small portion goes to -- and it's a small portion to the general fund -- and a very small portion to drug rehabilitation. It's the other 65% that I'd like to talk to you about. Who is in charge of that 65%

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, if the Senator wants to orient me to where exactly he is in the Bill, asking the question, I would be happy to be oriented that way.

But I think he's talking about the Social Equity Council that will be dealing with those monies to enact the provisions that they are responsible for under the Bill. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That's exactly what I'm talking about. And when I look at the makeup of this, the next question is, is this a bipartisan, equally divided panel? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President, I have to get to the section on the makeup but this question was asked during the debate and there are appointments by all of the -- at least in terms of our Chambers, the leaders of the Chamber. But if the Senator wants me to read that again, I will be happy to do it. It would just take me a moment to get there.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

That's okay. You don't have to read it. I basically have it. And basically, and when I looked through the -- when I looked and I compared it, the Speaker of the House is a Democrat; the President Pro Tem, Democrat; Majority Leader, Democrat; Majority Leader of the House and Senate, well, Democrats; Minority Leader of the House, Republican; Minority Leader of the Senate, Republican; Chairperson of the Black and Puerto Rican Caucus, I went through and that's Democrat; four by the Governor, which means that's four more Democrats; Commissioner, Consumer Protection, Commissioner of Economic Community Development, State Treasurer, Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management.

So basically, we have two, two Republican appointments out of the 15 members. That is

definitely not like any other Commission, Committee that I know of. This is basically, definitely I would consider this not bipartisan on the makeup of this Committee, and they're responsible for 56 or 65% of the incomes coming off of the marijuana tax, which is millions of dollars.

And, you know, when I when I heard that this, or the original Bill that came out, actually had a spot saved for somebody for a license, and it was corrected, thankfully, it really makes me think about the rest of this Bill. And I guess I do have some major concerns. And when I put this all together, the public safety, and I could go through this. I mean, I have a lot of pages marked where I have questions.

I'm going to ask at least another one. But you know, I have concerns about this Bill. This money you should not be going to any type of council. This should be coming through the budget process. The money should be allocated through the budget process and the Legislature should be the ones deciding where that money goes from the general fund, not an outside group.

I have another question. This is going to be Section 96. It says no institution of higher education as defined in Section 10A-55 of the general statute shall revoke any financial aid, student loans or expel a student solely for use or possession of less than four ounces of cannabis plant material, an equivalent amount of cannabis product, an equivalent amount of combination of cannabis and cannabis product, and so on.

My question is, does this include possession in the dorms? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President, I don't see anything to suggest that it doesn't include that, Madam President. So again, I will answer the questions as the Bill reads. So as the Bill reads, I think if it's solely for that possession, then those things could not be done, Madam President. I guess that would be the answer.

I just want to make a comment about the Social Equity Council. I think the current makeup of this General Assembly is, as was suggested, I don't know that the General Assembly will always be made up that way and it could be completely flipped, a mix. We not too long ago had 18, 18 in this Senate. Things have changed. They they're mutable.

Not too long ago, Democrats were wondering if they'd ever get a Governor in the state. So this is, we can think of this as the place and time where we currently are but this is going forward. And so the potential exists for a layout that might favor Republicans or who knows what we're going to have in the future. It might favor different parties.

I think that it was put forward so that whoever's in the minority at the very least, whether it be Democrats, Republicans or whatever else we might have in the future, as you know, that has been party realignment in the past, whoever exists would have a role in this. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I'll respond to that by simply stating that the majority of licenses are probably going to be given out in the next year. And that probably is the most important time in the

history of this and it should be a more bipartisan panel that's picking out who goes where. Especially when we had questions like I said in the beginning of earmarking a license for somebody.

Back to my question on that Section 96, so we talked about the dorm. Can I, as a college student, also have my five ounces in my car locked in the trunk or glove box? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President, I'm not sure what makes the college student different than anyone else when we're talking about the car. I think the laws suggest that in the glove box or trunk, you're allowed a certain amount. I don't think we've made a provision that changes that for a college student. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just making the point again, about how, you know, our laws make it that this law is a drug dealers dream. I am not going to continue through the law, I think I've made enough points on this as to why I'm voting no. And I think I made more than enough points the last time I talked.

But I am going to close with the fact that, you know, when we come out with a law, and we think about the money that's going to be involved in this, which some people are going to be millionaires from this.

And, again, when I think about equitable, I think about fair and impartial. And I don't think this is fair to non-union workers. And I don't think this is fair to the 3.6 million people across the state who've never violated the law, who've never been arrested for drug dealing.

If that wasn't in there, and we started talking about, you know, maybe we need a couple more licenses here and there, you know, for the poor. I could agree to that. But one of the statements that was made during the opening, I have to find it.

But when we talk about this, this isn't, like I said this law is terrible, 65% of the funds being controlled by a very partisan group. We had questions about this originally. We tried to correct some of the problems that people had when we added in an Amendment that says okay, Members of the General Assembly cannot get licenses for two years. Which covers you know, basically, I don't know if that was put in there because of what happened originally or not.

But you know, one of the points that was made was that points weren't given to drug dealers, but there's a section of this Bill that specifically states that, that specifically states that there's preferential treatment above and beyond. And I can't find it. I'll find it after that. Oh, I'm sorry. I do have two more questions.

THE CHAIR:

No worries. Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you. Sorry about that. In Section 30, it talks about for those wanting to get licenses, that they need -- a criminal records check is required. There it is, 1467, Line 1467.

Got it. All right, so basically it says that a criminal records check is required. But I'm wondering, what crimes prevent somebody from getting a license?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I am just getting there. And I want to check both because I know that the Senator is in a different version. Just want to check both so that, you know, so that I can actually answer the question. So if you give me a moment, I will do that.

THE CHAIR:

You can certainly do that. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I believe that that section connects to the next section as well, and the section after that. And so it talks about the background check in Section 30. And also in Section 31, where it talks about background check. And then it also goes on, Section 32, to talk about regulations.

And so I think this is a part of building the industry and figuring out which things should be appropriately barred in terms of a history. So I don't think the Bill lays that out in the way perhaps that the good Senator would want it. But I think it lays out the ability to get there using the expertise of those who would be the experts here. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Well, I find it odd that we're going to do a criminal risk history, records check and we have no crimes that we would exclude somebody. I think I read somewhere else that the Commissioner had, one of the Commissioners had something to do with that. But this is a pretty long Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I'm sorry, I missed your question.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne, was that a question?

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

It was not. I thought he was just talking. I thought he might have had an answer to my last question so I was going to give him that opportunity.

All right, something I was talking about before this, this is more of a statement than anything. And he talks about the licenses and creating programs to and I'm reading from, I pulled it out of the middle. But it says creating -- it talks about the social equity applicants and it says providing for expedited or priority licensing processing for each license as a retailer, hybrid retailer, cultivator, micro cultivator, product manufacturer, food and beverage manufacturer, product packager,

transport and delivery service license for social equity applicants.

And I think that was what I was trying to come up with before, that we are providing for an expedited or priority license processing. So when this whole thing starts, we're actually giving somebody an edge up in the process, because we're going to expedite certain licenses over other licenses.

And like I said, you know, everybody should have an equal opportunity at this. We're providing for individuals that come from certain communities, which is fine. But now we're going to provide for expediter or priority licensing processing, 3.6 million people and we're going to say that I'm sorry, this group of people not only has an opportunity before you, but we're also going to rush their information through.

And when you say why, and you say, well, you know, they were arrested for dealing drugs. That's why they get the license before you do.

Madam President, I'm going to stop there. I could probably go on for a couple hours. There's no need to I had my turn before and I made a lot of these and I'm going to basically say, again, this has nothing to do with legalization or not legalization, and everything to do with this bad Bill.

We are bringing money into the state of Connecticut and we are not putting it in the general fund. And we are allowing a partisan group to spend that money. It is not offsetting the costs to the taxpayers, the taxpayers who pay more taxes than most people in this country. Instead, they get to spend it however they want. And I believe that is wrong.

I'm always against raising taxes. So, at that, I'm going to say that I'm hoping that people will vote against this Bill. And thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Good afternoon,
Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President, it's good to see you again in a Special Session. I rise to affirm my previous statements in the last debate, literally a week ago, on the debate related to marijuana. Although it is a different Bill, I want the record to reflect the comments I made and I remain consistent to them.

What I'd like to do in this conversation is be able to offer some context more specific to what has happened in additional news since a week ago. And I want to be able to offer an opinion piece that was written by Mr. Robert Corry, C-O-R-R-T. Mr. Corry is a Stanford-trained lawyer, well respected attorney who worked in Colorado's Department of Revenue. And he was indeed the chief architect on Amendment 64 in Colorado, which legalized marijuana and set the stage for a lot of the templates that we're referring to when we talk about legalization in this country.

California follow suit. But Amendment 64 is the point of inflection that that we will base it on, and Mr. Corry had a significant part in drafting that language.

But we fast forward from 2012, in which that language was drafted. And Mr. Corry wrote an impassioned op-ed, which addressed the lessons he has learned since that fateful passage in Colorado in 2012. In fact, since that passage, and since his advocacy, Mr. Corry has been disbarred. He has been arrested for being under the influence. He has lost a significant standing in community and a law career.

And in that reflection, I presume, he recently wrote an op-ed that was dated June 9th, 2021, in which he referenced what the State of Connecticut is now considering. And he wanted to give us some input, some feedback, some insight of what legalization could possibly do, based upon the experiences of someone that has already done so in Colorado. And I'm going to quote some of the comments that he made. And I welcome anybody to read the entire op-ed, to get a real sense of the power in the statements that he learned of the mistakes that are made in Colorado, that I hope the state of Connecticut will not repeat.

That being said, he said, quote, "Nearly a decade later, Colorado has a commercialized, for-profit, elitist, government-protected, privileged, monopolistic drug dealing industry that perpetuates itself, and its profits to the detriment of the public good and the planet." He also talks about the black market, competing on par with the taxed and regulated marketplace.

He talks about the perils of what the premise was originally, that if you're doing this for revenue, it is not sustainable. It is not viable. And ultimately, the black market that you're trying to attack, the black market you're trying to undermine, has found a way to capture the marketplace.

Another quote that he cited is here, "That the percentage of Colorado's overall state revenue from marijuana is minuscule and the jobs are mostly low end and dangerous." And he talks about the societal cost of treatment, lost productivity, and other externalities of increased intoxication and addiction plus harm to children have skyrocketed and Colorado.

Colorado's previous image as a beautiful and clean mountain paradise has been defiled, turning it into

a national joke. Marijuana has been a net loss for Colorado.

In fact, he filed a lawsuit against the marijuana corporate entity that has taken over the industry. In fact, progressive Democratic legislators have filed suit against the takeover of a major, well-intentioned legalization process, and to no avail. The lobbyists won. The power of money, influence, have won out and impacted policymakers' desire to put the genie back into the bottle.

But to no avail. That Bill was never called and the frustration of lawmakers that nearly ten years ago touted this as the new norm, the new salvation, a new social equity solution, are now searching for answers and wishing they could put the genie back in the bottle.

And in closing, he wrote in his op-ed, "And perhaps licensing marijuana, and its most detrimental long-term damage to the American people and our respect for the rule of law is that state and local government, in its passage of legalizing marijuana, aids and abets federally illegal criminal enterprises."

Now it sounds really harsh when he says that, but the reality is, marijuana is an illegal federal product. It is a Class 1 narcotic that is banned by federal statute. And so when we look at this, when state and local government legalizes it, it is literally operating, and openly operating, in public view for people to see that laws do not matter.

And maybe I'm going too much to an extreme. But unfortunately, this kind of dichotomy, this kind of irony is for all to see. Children see it. Studies confirmed that this type of acceptance, this type of normalization of not following federal law, normalizes children to marijuana to the point, I see an eerily similar story many years back in history

when we talked about tobacco, when we talked about vaping in recent generations.

It is a kind of acceptance, that this is an alternative form, that it is a move toward progress. But unfortunately, we take one step forward and three steps back. And this is what Mr. Corry's op-ed has in essence told us. That we should learn the lessons of someone who so passionately advocated for legalization but unfortunately, is dealing with the perils and the dangers and the failures of legalization.

And in fact, not only has the State of Colorado has suffered in his op ed, he himself has also struggled and suffered with illegal use and addiction.

So I offer that as an editorial comment that, again, the advocates have been passionate, the advocates have been very effective. And I may be on the losing end of this vote but I want to be on the record to share that I hope I am dead wrong. That ten years from now that we as a state do not reflect on back like Mr. Corry, that we have made a mistake that we could potentially avoid.

The second point of reference that I want to make is the fact that it just hit the news today, yesterday. That California, another innovative state that thought it was a forward-moving progress to legalize marijuana, is now offering \$100 million to rescue its struggling legal marijuana industry.

It's talking about the fact that it is losing money to the illicit marketplace, and that the guidelines and the guardrails and the environmental regulations have been so prohibited along with the taxation, that normal, acceptable standard legal provisional licensees have not been able to convert into a provisional in the standard bearer licensure. They're failing.

Not to even mention the idea of revenue, the State of California is now looking to inject \$100 million to keep the legal marijuana business going. So for all of us that are engaging in this debate, talking about revenue, talking about the ability for this money to be able to address social equity ills that have been here way before this revenue solution has been brought about that should have been addressed by this institution and placed far more priority and funding, which I readily agree.

But marijuana revenue is not the answer because it is a false premise. And if we've not learned the lesson, that the illicit market that you're looking to attack is more nimble, more adaptable, and they will win. And what is that left with our societal costs for us and state municipalities to pick up?

The third point that I will raise is just yesterday. We had community clergy leaders stand up and speak out on the peril and the end result of devastation that has wrought damage by drug use. And they have spoken passionately and loudly yesterday, as they have done many, many, many times, but not been heard. That legalization of marijuana will be a scourge on their community in the people that they work with.

Where is that voice being heard? We talk so much about social equity. We talk so much about the disproportionate impact by marijuana in communities, it's quite evident. We have community church leaders coming out and saying we don't want this legalized. We do not want this the impact or community, impact our children, impact our families. But are we listening to them? But at the same time, we're talking about here's revenue to help address the social ills that you deal with.

In my previous debate, I talked about ironies. It's another example that in our passionate and righteous advocacy, and I admire and respect the passionate advocates, and I even supported the easing of the

records and decriminalization. But a clear legalization runs counter to some of the approach, some of the solutions purported to be offered by this legalization.

So again, I reaffirm my no vote on the Special Session Bill. But I hope that these voices get heard from community church leaders, from advocates that had previously supported the legalization in states that are been ahead of us by many years, and dealt with the lessons of that to say no, learn from our lessons, Connecticut, and I hope it's not too late.

I don't know if we have the votes to defeat in the Senate. But I certainly hope that the House of the people will hear these kinds of voices in argument and look in their heart and their conscious to understand there is a better way. This is not the way that we want to hang the legacy, the record of our tenure in this Circle to leave.

And I hope I am wrong, to not have to apologize to the people we represent ten years from now and say, "I'm sorry. I'm sorry for all the challenges and troubles and the perils that you are now encountering. I wish we knew about the lessons learned."

I have no questions for proponent of this Bill. I give him great respect and advocacy. But on my heart, and based upon the rationale that I just shared, I hope people will see my rationale, why I cannot support this Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'd ask that the Chamber stand at ease.

THE CHAIR:

The Chamber will stand at ease. Senator Duff. Good evening, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I would like to yield to Senator Winfield, please.

THE CHAIR:

And Senator Winfield, do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. To continue, sorry for the delay. The Clerk should be in possession of an Amendment, 10928. Madam President, I ask that it be called and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, if you could please call LCO 10928.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10928, that would be Senate Schedule "B".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment deals with the issue we dealt with in an Amendment earlier. What it does is it takes those persons who we talked about as having interacted with law

enforcement and it puts the -- it makes -- it ensures that the economic cap in that section applies to them as well. I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Great to see you again. I have no objection to this Amendment and I think it's a modest change to the underlying Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm standing simply because I didn't quite understand what this Amendment does. I did not have a copy of it until I just got it in my hand. I guess I do have a question through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Sadly, I don't have my glasses on so I'm trying to read this as best as best I can. The social equity partner for this, it says 65%. What is the change from the original Bill? What was the original Bill on the percentage?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This doesn't change the percentage. The percentage was always 65%. The only thing that this is changing is that where social equity comes into play, the qualification requires that you have the economic component, which is 300% of the median income of the last three years. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So anybody, even if they if they come from an area, both of those qualifications have to take part? So it has to be living in a distressed area for nine years and they have to be 300% below the poverty line? Did I get that right?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. I may have missed your question, but I think I'm going to hit it, and I'm happy to answer if I don't. So what this Amendment says is that for the individuals who have been, as an adult or a juvenile arrested, all of that language, that that is connected to the language above which says had an average household income of less than 300% of the state median household income over the three tax years immediately preceding.

So what we what we started off with, I know it's going backwards, right but just to explain, what we started off with before we added in the language about those individuals was a Bill that said that you would have to have a household income and be a resident of the disproportionately impacted area and had two different ways you could potentially be a resident, whether it was dealing with the last 10 years or being the fact that you were essentially raised in that area.

This says that you would have to have the average household income that we spoke about, and be the resident, as we had suggested before. And then it also ensures that the adults that we added in and have that household income. That is the point of this Amendment. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. With this language, does this exclude anybody for any other licenses? Or does this just take care of a certain amount of licenses?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

That's a broad question. I'm not sure I understand. So it would, I guess, it would exclude those who are in this category over that median income for three years at 300%, yes. But I'm not sure if that answered your -- I'm not sure what the question is asking.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The question is, is for individuals that qualify for the 300% and from distressed areas, do those individuals only have a certain amount of licenses or is this for all the licenses available? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

So in terms of what we're talking about, social equity only deals with half of the program. So we had a discussion earlier, when we spoke about the 50% for social equity, none of that has changed. Those are still the same parameters. The only thing that this Amendment deals with is the economic cap on a portion of the social equity, that when we adopted the Amendment, we didn't attach that cap to. It was attached to a portion of the people but not to everyone who came under the definition. This makes it so that it attaches to everyone. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. What I think this does is personally, if they have to have three years at 300%, it's almost as if they're picking out certain individuals within that certain area. And instead of including everybody within that distressed area, it's actually going to eliminate some people as part

of this 50% licenses, if I understand this correctly.

And so 50% of all licenses are going to be a select group of people, and those licenses will get preferential treatment, as I've read before, which means they're going to be put at the front of the line and basically capture more of that market.

And again, you know, when I think about this, I think about, you know, somebody who sits in jail for three years is going to come out and could possibly qualify for these licenses before somebody who's followed the law for most of their life, living in the same town, in fact, neighbors. And I just feel that that's wrong, because obviously, you're going to be the 300% below, sitting in jail, you're not going to make a lot of money.

And, you know, I think this really disqualifies quite a few people out of the 3.6 million people that live in our state. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SOME MEMBERS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed?

SOME MEMBERS:

Nay.

THE CHAIR:

The ayes have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as further amended? Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you very much, Madam President. You know, we have this Bill before us once again. It was here last week. We had an opportunity to review it, to vote on it and then actually had the opportunity to go back to our districts and hear what Connecticut thought about what transpired here in Hartford.

I know in the district that I come from and in my neck of the woods, I heard a lot about the concerns of what this means for not only Connecticut, but our future and particularly, our children.

There were a lot of concerns that now, should this Bill become law, what we're going to have are situations where anybody who can light up a cigarette can now light up a joint. That could be, you know, as you're walking into a restaurant, it can also be at places of recreation, like the beach, or park. And, you know, many people were saying that they didn't know whether or not that's a good policy.

I tended to believe last week that it wasn't a good policy. That decision, that vote, that perspective has not changed.

As a matter of fact, since that time, what we've heard, and you heard this both from Senators Kissel, Champagne and Hwang, that there were proponents of this in states like Colorado, I think we had the attorney who actually wrote the law for the state of Colorado, Robert Corry, who talked about how recreational marijuana started out, albeit appearing

to be a good thing. Something that people wanted, something that seemed to be a good policy, and it was done with the best intentions. But now, armed with that experience, he recognized that it was the wrong policy to make.

Same thing is true in California, where we see news reports that the State of California, keep in mind this is California, they need \$100 million bailout for the industry. This has, you know, California, Haight-Ashbury, the home of the Grateful Dead, and they have a struggling marijuana industry. If they can't do it there, where can it be done?

I mean, I understand the proponents' argument that well, they overtax it in Colorado. But that drives to a point that I made last week, where I said, wherever the government is involved, and wherever government regulates an activity and taxes that activity, it becomes expensive. And when something's expensive, guess what? The marketplace will be filled by people who do not follow those regulated activities. Apparently, here, it's so.

And so what we're looking at is a policy that was debated and discussed this year, not based on whether or not this is good social policy, whether it's good for our community. It was largely discussed from the perspective of revenue.

Even got questions today from the press, where we were queried, you know, what, you know, we're losing revenue to the states around us, because that's what this has been pitched as, is a revenue enhancement or a budget item. And I think our kids deserve better than that.

The thing that I found most striking in this whole discussion is the silence. The silence of children's advocates in the state of Connecticut, and that silence is deafening.

When this was brought out at public hearing, we knew that the medical experts, the people that we trust, the people that helped us get through the COVID-19 pandemic, doctors, nurses, medical professionals, all came out and talked about the science, the science of what this does to children. Whether it's the Connecticut Children Medical Center, the Health Hospital Family Foundation of Connecticut, or the Connecticut Medical Society, they all came out and said that this is not good. That physiologically, this is going to do harm to our children.

The science said it's bad. And yet, what did we hear from the state's children's advocates? Yep, that's what we heard. Nothing. Nothing from voices for children, nothing from teachers and their unions, nothing from the state's child advocate. Nothing from the Center for Children's Advocacy, nothing from DSS.

But we did hear from DCF. Now, they weighed in and said that this was a good thing, because it was going to be legal and safer, despite the science saying it's bad and harmful. How dare they sell our children short? This is one of the most significant public policies to come before this Chamber in my tenure here. This is going to decide which way we go as a state and what the impact is going to be on our children and their future. And our advocates are silent.

Unbelievable. Unbelievable that they would take a walk on our kids, not even have the decency to take a position. Because they couldn't explain why this policy is good for kids. Because the fact of the matter is the science of the matter is it's not.

As I said last week, I love my kids. I love everyone's kids. I want our kids to have the best and the brightest future. I don't think this is the road that gets the kids there.

So, Madam President, we have heard for the last 15, 16 months, ever since the COVID pandemic came to Connecticut, that we were going to be guided by the science, follow the science, and where the science goes, the state should go. Well, the science has spoken loud and clear on this issue. The science says this is not good for our kids, and I believe and trust that science. I believe that that is good for our kids, and that we should be listening to the science on this.

So Madam President, the doctors, the scientists are saying no to this measure and so will I. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you. On the Bill, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, as amended.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Speaking in support of the Bill, as amended, Madam President, we've heard the concern about what has this done to our children. But I think what we need to look at is a little bit more of a historical view, is what has been done to our children in arresting them, incarcerating them and branding them with criminal records for decades over possession of small amounts of marijuana and blighting their whole lives. That's the harm that's been done to our children by our current regimen of laws.

And in the Bill, as amended before us, Madam President, this is not being looked at primarily as a revenue source, because if it were, it might be closer to earlier Bills that were introduced, including the administration's Bill earlier this session that was going to use the revenue from this as a municipal revenue source.

But because the Bill has been reworked, and we have this entire section that Senator Winfield has explained with great clarity and at great length in response to questions regarding social equity applicants, and targeting opportunities for entrepreneurship and in inner-city areas, creating opportunities for people who have been harmed by the previous legal regimen regarding marijuana, to be able to be employed in businesses related to it.

All of those sections are focused on social policy, not on economic policy, not on generating revenue. Although it will, we hope, of course, generate some but the focus has been on social policy.

And it could have been structured in a way that related far more directly and clearly to merely economic gain, as other states have done, if we hadn't put the care and attention into this. And I want to commend Senator Winfield and Majority Leader Rojas and the working group that worked on the equity piece with such great attention, and giving it such great priority.

That's what this Bill is all about. It's not just a new revenue stream, although it is it is a revenue stream. But the focus was not that; the focus was on doing more than what other states have done, building social policy in a way that other states have not done.

In this, by not being the first to go in this and by looking at what other states have done, we are seeing what works and what does not work in what other states have done. And this I think is a much

better Bill, and is likely to be considered a national model, because it is not just narrowly focused on creating a new revenue stream out of a new saleable product.

Also, Madam President, as we discussed last time, a respected and effective criminal law has to be one that commands the assent of the overwhelming number of members of society; it can't be something that is 60/40, 70/30, 80/20, even 90/10. But it has to have the assent of an almost unanimous view of society in order to be enforced and respected. Otherwise, it invites disobedience, invites jury nullification, invites public corruption as we saw what happened during the dozen years or so of prohibition when people did not believe that that was a just law. And we had all of the speakeasies, all of the illegal breweries, all of the illegal distilleries, all operating outside the legal system and generating enormous illegal profits that were then plowed into other criminal enterprises once prohibition was ended, when that social experiment came to an end.

And remember that the people who undertook that social experiment did so with the best of intentions. They were in fact responding to a social problem, the harm caused by alcohol in society. But unfortunately, they chose a remedy that went against human nature and human will and human interest and human preferences.

And so we should now do what we already do with alcohol and with tobacco, legalize it for those who are adults, regulate it, and tax it.

And in fact, Madam President, as we all know while alcohol, especially wine of some kinds may have some salutary health effects when taken in moderation, and we know that there's medical documentation that medical marijuana is helpful for certain people in certain conditions in terms of stimulating appetite, and those that may be undergoing cancer treatments

or dealing with pain mitigation where they haven't been able to get help in other ways, and relaxation and muscle spasms. So while there are medically approved uses for marijuana, and for alcohol, in moderation, that's not the same at all for tobacco.

There's no one who makes the case that tobacco in even the smallest amounts, is in any way helpful to people. In fact, secondhand smoke will harm people who are nearby if they're not even smokers. And yet that product is legal, that product is sold to adults legally, it is taxed.

This is a less toxic product than tobacco and so it should be treated in the same way as alcohol and tobacco, put in that same category and regulated and controlled in that way.

And as I said, for decades, Madam President, we have done more harm by the legal system we've had that has punished and cast a blight on the lives of many young people, and often that has been done on the basis of race and class. Senator McCrory, speaking on the decriminalization Bill some time ago, spoke powerfully of affluent, mostly white college students smoking marijuana in their dorm rooms with impunity, while on the streets below, young African American and Latino kids were being arrested for doing exactly the same thing and having their lives blighted.

So Madam President, this is a matter of social justice and equity. It's a matter of responsible regulation. It's a matter of responsible quality control. We hear all the people who were sickened and killed by marijuana laced with fentanyl. This is now a product that will be brought under legal regimen.

That's again another parallel to what happened during alcohol prohibition when all of the people who died because they were drinking unregulated

liquor. So another social harm to be dealt with when we passed this Bill.

So Madam President, I just I urge people to reconfirm their vote from last week, and let us move forward on this issue. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Looney. Will you remark further on the Bill, as amended. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? If not, I will open the voting machine. Mr. Clerk, would you please call the vote?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. This is Senate Bill 1201, as amended by Senate "A" and "B". Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 1201, as amended by Senate "A" and Senate "B". Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 1201 as amended by Senate "A" and "B", AN ACT CONCERNING RESPONSIBLE AND EQUITABLE REGULATION OF ADULT USE CANNABIS. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 1201 as amended by Senate "A" and "B".

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? If so the machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, would you please announce the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1201 as amended by Senate "A" and "B":

Total Number Voting	31
Necessary for Adoption	16
Those voting Yea	19
Those voting Nay	12
Those absent and not voting	5

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) The legislation passes. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Clerk please call Senate Joint Resolution No. 75?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Senate Agenda No. 1, Senate Joint Resolution No. 75, RESOLUTION CONVENING THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN SPECIAL SESSION.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President This is a Resolution convening the General Assembly in Special Session. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption. Will you remark? If not, will you remark? Mr. Clerk, would you please call the Resolution? We do have to have it on the board.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. This is Senate Joint Resolution No. 75, RESOLUTION CONVENING THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN SPECIAL SESSION. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered

in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution No. 75, RESOLUTION CONVENING THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN SPECIAL SESSION. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution No. 75, RESOLUTION CONVENING THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN SPECIAL SESSION.

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 locked. Mr. Clerk, please call the tally on the Resolution. Thank you.

CLERK:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 75:

Total Number Voting	30
Necessary for Adoption	16
Those voting Yea	29
Those voting Nay	1
Those absent and not voting	6

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) The resolution is adopted. Could we have quiet in the Chamber so that we can give our attention to Senator Duff?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President would the Clerk please call the next item, that would be Emergency Certified Senate Bill 1202.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Senate Agenda No. 1, Senate Bill No. 1202, AN ACT CONCERNING PROVISIONS RELATED TO REVENUE AND OTHER ITEMS TO IMPLEMENT THE STATE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30th, 2023.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark, Senator?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I know that there is a minor Amendment coming up but I will talk on the underlying Bill just a little bit and wait for that Amendment to come forward.

This Bill essentially provides an ability to implement the state budget for the biennium ending June 30, 2023. It's a relatively simple piece of legislation, although it's rather long. And it does a variety of things.

THE CHAIR:

Excuse me, Senator, it is getting very loud in here and hence difficult to hear your remarks. So I am going to ask those in our Chamber to please keep it down so that we can pay attention to your remarks. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. And perhaps people would be tired of listening to me so far over this last week, when the Appropriations and Finance Committee are directed towards their part of the budget. So there are many sections of this budget.

For example, let's start with Section 1. Section 1 converts a forgivable loan to a grant from the CDF to Alliance. This was a something that happened in 2002 and this clears up the books for an organization that is no longer around and has been subsumed by another organization. This also delays the bond premiums for projects until fiscal year '22.

And in case anybody is wondering, I'm not reading each one of the sections so I'm going to skip off along the way. This provides for the a couple of cleanups relative to annual reporting for the use of funds by the Board of Regents, something that many people had asked for.

It does a date change on the inmate phone calls to make sure that we know when that is going to start, correcting it from October to July of '22.

It provides a -- just making sure -- treasurer is fixed to STIF, it brings in, i-lottery will now be used for, have a debt-free college diversion, which would be around \$14 million a year, effectively providing a standard funding stream as we had often talked about for i-lottery.

It also exempts volunteer fire companies from the criminal history record check fee, causing a minor small blip in revenue coming in. But many volunteer companies don't have the funds necessary to do these record check fees. It still allows for the record check to happen, just belays them having to pay the fee for that.

It also makes -- it ensures that we have an election monitor in Bridgeport. It provides for, that the Roberta Willis scholarship will have the software necessary for them to handle the program.

It clears up and clarifies for the future in the Teachers Retirement death benefit clarification. It provides the necessary language for us to have the personal need allowance increased from \$62 up to \$75.

It provides a little bit of funding for the nursing home so that they can ameliorate any dips in their funding for those who are given less than the costs actually are for those nursing homes. It also provides \$25 million in year one and \$25 million in year two to help out the DMAS providers as they were impacted negatively by the settlement that the administration made relative to private providers.

Again, I could talk about each one of these in great length, but I'm trying to just pick up the ones that have been most impacted.

It leaves magnet school funding on kept as we do not want to see the return of students and magnet schools not allowing those students to return based on what happened during the pandemic. Allows regional school districts to roll over 2% of unexpended funds if allowed by those municipalities, just like municipalities do.

It continues and allows for the open choice PILOT expansion as was called for in the budget for Norwalk and Danbury.

It clarifies both MERSA and PILOT and how it will be paid for in an agreement with the administration. Increases the VOLAG statutory grants to reflect the budget increase.

Those are some of the key items that I would call out today and I'd be happy to answer any questions

on the underlying Bill while we're awaiting the Amendment. That will remove five sections and have two technical fixes. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on Bill? If not, we will stand at ease.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Can we stand at ease, or are you going to -- Just to be clear, this is on the underlying Bill, awaiting the Amendment. So if you want to speak on the underlying Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Through the Chair, thank you, Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

I'm sorry, Madam President. I apologize.

THE CHAIR:

They are waiting on an Amendment and so we will stand at ease.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Madam President, if appropriate if the Senate could come back?

THE CHAIR:

The Chamber will come back to order. Senator Osten, you have the floor, Madam.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO No. 10933. I ask that he call that Amendment and I seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

The Clerk is in possession of LCO 10933. Senator Osten has asked leave of the Chamber to summarize. Will the Clerk please call?

CLERK:

Senate Amendment No. 10933 of the Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten, you have the floor.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, this Amendment is very simple Amendment. In line 2339, we strike 2022 and insert in lieu thereof 2023; and line 2359 we strike 2023 and insert in lieu thereof 2024; we strike in its entirety section 95. We strike and renumber the remaining sections and internal references accordingly.

We strike sections 207 to 220 inclusive in their entirety and renumber the remaining sections and internal references accordingly.

We strike sections 2024 in its entirety, and renumber the remaining sections and internal references accordingly.

We strike 2026 to 2029, inclusive in their entirety and renumber the remaining sections and internal references accordingly.

In line 22373, insert, and after the semicolon. In line 22381, strike semicolon and insert period in lieu thereof, strike lines 22382 to 22384 inclusive in their entirety. Strike sections 490 to 495 inclusive in their entirety and renumber the remaining sections and internal references accordingly.

And strike sections 501 to 5112 inclusive in their entirety and renumber the remaining sections and internal references accordingly. I ask that the Circle support this Amendment. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

And you've moved adoption, Senator?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Yes, I move adoption. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on adoption. Will remark further on the Amendment before us? Senator miner, you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If I might through you, just trying to follow along here with the net effect of the Amendment that's been just presented to us so on line 22373, what is the net effect of changing the language in the Bill please? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

One minute, if the Senate could stand at ease for one second?

THE CHAIR:

The Chamber will stand at ease. The Senate will come back to order, please. Senator Osten, you have the floor.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Madam President. And so the net effect of the lines 11, 12 and 13 is that we deal with an issue where if we had left lines and continued on 22382 to 22384, it would have resulted in a double payment to the Council of Governments. And so we end and insert "and" after the semicolon and insert a period versus a semicolon to end that discussion there and strike the lines. So all three of those are coordinated together. Through you, Madam President.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Senator Osten. You have the floor, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So the net effect is that that eliminates the double payments that were not contemplated in the budget? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. That would be accurate.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Madam. You have the floor, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, my understanding is there's a date change also, and I can't remember what the section is. I've been told that it might be Section 63, and I've got to go back and just take a look and see what the line is in Section 63.

But if the gentlelady knows, has the date in Section 63 been changed? And for what reason? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Section 63 is relevant to an elimination of mascots, or actually not elimination of mascots, but not using the fund if mascots are kept, and there was a date change, because the intention of that was to give people time to react to that, a year to come up with a plan and allow them another year through our request through the Office of Policy and Management to deal with that. And this puts that out not to the -- it said fiscal year and this puts it out to '23 and then 24, relevantly speaking. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. You have the floor,
Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And so in that same section with the date change contemplated in the Amendment, in the circumstance where there is a regional school system and there are three separate communities, or in a school system where a community may tuition in their students. Does this date change affect any of the long-term outcomes? Are the requirements within that section still in place, and are school systems still required to get authorization to use a likeness, let's say of a Native American? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. To your second part of the question, they would still be required to get that likeness. The total dollar amounts in the two regional school systems that are in this, is for one is \$4,000 and the other one is \$11,000. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. You have the floor,
Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And so if they don't adhere to the dates, the new dates for the authorizations, then those are the funds that are at jeopardy, not the funds that would have gone to the municipality separate of the regional school system.

Is that what I'm hearing the gentlelady say?
Through you, Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. It would be the respective municipalities and they can call on the regional school district of which they all have representatives on to make, to effect the change. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. You have the floor, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the gentlelady for her responses. I have no issue with the changes that are made in the Amendment. I do have some concerns about the underlying Bill, as they may still exist even after the Amendment, but I'll reserve those for a point at which this Amendment has been adopted. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SOME MEMBERS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. (gavel) The Amendment is adopted. Well, you remark further on the Bill as now amended? Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I stand ready for questions, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, madam. Will you remark? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. First of all, there are a number of items in the implementer that have nothing to do with the budget, and I think that's a true statement unless someone can correct me. And that's, that's part of the issue that I have with this process.

Receiving, I guess it's in excess of 22,000 line implementer today, and looking for the first time that some issues that never came before the Senate. Issues that to my knowledge, were never the subject of a public hearing, to my knowledge may never even have come publicly to the Legislature this year. We found a way -- not we -- someone found a way to get them into this document.

And unlike some implementers in the past, when there was a lot of collaboration in an effort to implement the budget, I would have to say that this document is not such a document. In fact, someone from the press corps asked today if you voted for the budget, what would the reason be not to support the implementer?

And the first thing I teed off on was Section 63. And then went on to Section 322. And now in the time that I've had to review this a little bit

further, I could probably add to that list. I certainly could add to that list.

And I think it's unfortunate. The Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and I have a long history, of disagreeing and agreeing on things. But we have a longer history of communicating about ideas, and sharing our perspectives, going into a vote whether it's in the Committee, whether it was on the Labor Committee, today it's here on an implementer. And I find it frustrating that after all that time, after all those years, that the majority would choose to act like a kingdom.

That somehow between the Governor and the majority, pretty much what they want to have happen is going to happen. And that's true. I can't tell you that is getting any easier for me in the minority. But I can tell you that it is true, and the truth, the proof of the pudding is 544 sections now renumbered to something less than that.

There are sections in here that have to do with the domestic workers grant program. I didn't see any language in here that requires anybody to share information in someone's native language. Maybe I missed it. I haven't had all that much time. Certainly nothing to do with the budget. I guess someone could argue that there is a grant program and therefore that's what it's supposed to fund.

Salary increases for judges, Sections 11 to 14, SB 5, various sections in this document.

Section 63 where three of the communities that I represent, Warren, Morris and Goshen are now put in the untenable position of having to, I guess negotiate with some sovereign group, the leader at this point, I'm not sure has been the leader. I don't know how broadly they're recognized by the body, I know that there are many individuals in the district that are part of the Schaghticoke tribe.

But nonetheless, as a superintendent said to me, now we have this dropped in our lap. Someone might take the position that it's time has come. But I think there were other ways to do it. I think a phone call would have been nice. It's not the first time I haven't gotten a phone call. But I have to tell you in a circumstance like this, especially given the fact that the date has been amended, I might have advised on taking this out and let's work towards a resolution next year as part of a public discussion, public hearing, where people can come and be heard. I'm not sure people even know who to call.

But if I understand the language, as I read it correctly, it's not even the matter of a phone call, it's got to be a document that's been approved by someone here with the state, which I don't have to tell you, or at least I don't have to tell the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, most small communities don't particularly care for the City of Hartford and the Legislature telling them what to do. That's going to be the first hurdle.

So I've made it clear to them that this wasn't my idea. I'm going to do the best I can to try and see if we can accomplish this. But nonetheless, the language in the change certainly makes it easier, or at least more logical that it could be accomplished in the upcoming year as opposed to the upcoming weeks. And I'll just assume that was a mistake.

Section 101 to 158, I think it's section 108 requires unpaid leave for voting. I have no idea whether anybody here knows what some businesses operate like, but I can tell you, most self-service gas stations in the community that I serve have one person on duty.

So this was one of the issues when I was on the Labor Committee when we dealt with this. I don't know what's contemplated in here, I guess somebody just puts the key in the door, and says the state of

Connecticut passed a Bill, and the Bill says I can go vote and I'm entitled to unpaid leave, and I'm going to take it. And so somebody's business is going to be shut down. But that's what happens in the dark and night on a weekend when nobody has any communication. That's what happens.

Madam President, Section 196, I'll probably draw the ire of more than one restaurant owner. Unless I'm wrong, this codifies the COVID decision, Executive Order and I understood it then, I understood what the Governor was trying to do. Communities understood it, health districts came to understand it. But in this section, as I understand it, there is no sunset, unless someone can correct me.

So once again, the city of Hartford, the General Assembly, has determined that they know better in your community what should be done with regard to outdoor dining.

So let me say that again. When people were dying at a rate of 20 a day, 30 a day, 40 a day, the Governor of the state and the Legislature understood why we shouldn't be inviting people into close quarters. We allowed all sorts of things to happen. It made sense. It allowed the economy to function. No one would say flourish, they would say function.

And then in the Bill this spring, we codified that until April of 2022, and now the implementer makes it perpetual. So no matter whatever the reason was that you thought it made sense in April, now you're saying to your local zoning authority, you're saying to your local chief elected official, you're saying to your local health authority, not so much. We know better than you. We got this.

In the city of Hartford, under the gold dome, we've determined that outdoor dining no matter what the relationship was in the community that you lived in, whether it was on a sidewalk, whether it was in a road, whether it was in a driveway, whether you had

written permission or you didn't, we know better. So tonight we're going to codify that.

Doesn't implement the budget, doesn't have a doggone thing to do with a \$42 billion, \$43 billion that we're going to spend but somebody thought it was important to stuff it in here. And then it became somebody else's job to find it. No sunset. No sunset.

There's another section in here, Section 203, a taskforce for retiring employees. Look, I think it's high time somebody spent some time looking around the state of Connecticut and trying to figure out what we're going to do here. We are going to be in one heck of a mess, because I think there's a lot of historical information in the heads of a lot of good men and women in this state that are going to leave next year.

But because we didn't have time, or because we didn't think it was a priority, now it's in an implementer. Made it through the House but now it's in an implementer. Nothing to do with the budget.

Section 206, maybe I'm wrong on the number, Madam President. There's a section in here that allows agencies of the state to enter into agreements with other states, allegedly for efficiencies. I don't know how many people were around here at the time we made arrangements with a couple of southern states to send prisoners down there. But my recollection was lickety split, they came back. It didn't work out so well.

So I don't know what somebody is thinking about in this section. It allows the agency heads to enter into those agreements. I would argue it allows to do it without legislative approval, because this is our approval. A yes vote on this is a legislative approval for that authority. So I guess if the Governor of Massachusetts decides that he wants to institute TCI, the Commissioner of DEP can sign on

with the state of Massachusetts. And if they have a higher fuel rate in Massachusetts, we will have a higher fuel rate. I guess that's acceptable to some people.

I see what it was, it was Section 221. I'm not sure that was the subject of even a Bill anywhere. At least I don't remember hearing it.

Section 322 was a subject to some comments that I made today. Sure looks like pay as you throw to me but it sure could be any number of other things, Madam President. Maybe they're good ideas, I don't know. But when you match the word Commissioner of DEP with shall develop and shall implement, I don't know about you, but the hair on the back of my neck stands up, and it doesn't ever go down.

There are things that that agency has wanted to do in this state for some time that have not been good for business, they can't turn a permit around. We had to extend the time on digesters, because they didn't want to be bound to a period of time. So I don't know what that means.

I've been told that was the language that was developed, so that we could transfer the money collected on the nips in the budget, or in the Bottle Bill to municipalities. I was never asked, not one phone call, not one text message. But my statement was, if I was drafting that section, I would make this look a lot less like pay as you throw and a lot more like something else if I was trying to put people's mind at ease.

I think some kind of a tire program could go in there. Certainly there were some other issues that came up in the Environment Committee during the course of last session that could go in there. Some of them are good. Some of them I supported. Some of them I would support today if they were a standalone Bill, but not this kind of a carte blanche.

Madam President, there was another section here, and I can't remember which one it was. I'm going sit down for a little while and I'll probably make a few more notes. But again, it all goes back to communication.

Oh, I know what it was. We had the DOT Bill. And we had an agreement between Senate Republicans and Senate Democrats on a seatbelt change. We had a commitment. We had a commitment not to call an Amendment on that Bill and then it would be in the implementer. And being a Chamber of individuals of their word, I left that night knowing it was going to be properly taken care of.

I didn't come in this morning thumbing through, I don't know how many lines we got here, looking for the language. But I was told can't do it, won't do it. Won't do it, because the administration won't do it. And so now, probably for the first time, for the first time since I've been in this Chamber, in this building, I'm left in a situation where I'm not sure I can trust a deal.

And so tonight will be the first night that I'll go home, feeling that way. And in 21 years, I got to tell you, as an individual that works on a lot of policy, policy that he agrees with, policy that he doesn't agree with, but policy nonetheless, under his commitment to the state, and committees, he knows that it's all about our word.

I'm not saying that my friend Senator Osten is not a person of her word. I want to be clear, she never made that commitment to me. But people know who did. And unless somebody can show me in this Bill where it is, my position is next year is going to be pretty bumpy. And it's going to be pretty bumpy because it's hard to imagine that people are going to be able to keep their word. And that's unfortunate.

So I'll sit and listen to the rest of the comments. I do appreciate the friendship and the relationship that Senator Osten and I have had and will continue to have. But it sure would have been nice to have a conversation with people over the weekend about some of what is proposed in this 300, no 540 section Bill. And it's just unfortunate that that didn't happen. Again, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the Bill? Yes, Senator Sampson, you have the floor, sir.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I rise to express my dissatisfaction with the legislation that is before us, and possibly even more so the process that brought us here. We are here to discuss Senate Bill 1202, which is an emergency certified Bill that myself and my Republican colleagues had not seen or heard of until around 3:00 a.m. today.

This is known as the budget implementer. And the idea behind the budget implementer is that it is the companion policy legislation that goes with the budget that was voted on last week. I want to start by saying first off that I aligned myself with the comments of Senator Miner. He covered a lot of the same material I would have, but I will leave that alone.

And I will also say that I am extremely pleased to have voted against the budget already. My remarks today are going to be largely focused on the process as I mentioned, and the so-called implementer Bill before us.

However, I do want to give a very quick review of the remarks that I gave during the budget speech

because I believe they are relevant to this document.

The first thing I would like to point out is that any claim that this state budget and this implementation language that goes with it is a no-tax budget is simply a bold-faced lie. I clarified this in great detail last week. Yeah, I have noticed that colleagues including colleagues in both parties, and the press continue to refer to this as a no-tax budget. And that's just not true, Madam President.

A no-tax budget would not include nearly \$2 billion of federal aid that was paid for by taxes, and call it a no-tax budget. The budget removes surcharges, several of them, most notably the corporate surcharge on businesses in the state, who are counting on the fact that they were going to cease paying an exorbitant tax to operate in Connecticut, obviously, as this impacts our ability to attract businesses, to create jobs and grow our economy, and it is definitely a new tax.

When you tell someone their tax is going to expire, and then you say, no, it's not, that's a new Bill. And of course, there's taxes that are outside of the budget itself. Gaming, marijuana, which just passed this Chamber earlier today, the highway tax, all of these things are going to generate revenue for the state of Connecticut that will be spent, in large part because of the words on this implementer policy that we're debating right now.

Not to mention that there are actually very simply new taxes in the budget, there is a tax on the conveyance fee, when you make a payment to the state of Connecticut for a license, and you use a credit card, there's now going to be a tax on that. It's actually somewhat insulting, since the fee that you're paying to the State of Connecticut is already a tax. But now we're going to add a tax on top of a tax.

But the easiest way to identify whether taxes is going are going up or not, is just to look at the bottom line spending figure. Because the government doesn't generate any profit, it doesn't generate any wealth, it doesn't produce money, all it can do is spend it. So if the spending number is going up, and in this case, it's going up dramatically. By this time, two years from now, when we are debating the next budget, the increase in spending will have been 6.5%. That's one of the largest two-year increases we have ever had. It may in fact, be the largest one.

So don't tell me there are no taxes when you're spending 6.5% more money. And it only can come from taxing the residents of your state or taking it from the federal government, who tax the residents of your state. There are more taxes, it is not a no-tax budget.

I point out also that there are massive, massive expected deficits at the end of this budget cycle. Think about how irresponsible it is to draft a budget document to get us through the new next two years, knowing full well that at the end of that cycle, there's a deficit projected, with no plan to address it other than, oh, gee, we're going to have to fill in the hole left by that federal money that we got more or less for free. But was not free, because taxpayers paid for it.

As I explained at that time, during that debate, that the vote we were taking on the budget itself, which was one of the shortest budgets I had ever seen here, because it was only the spreadsheet that covered the numbers, and not the actual policy is that that's what it was really just a big spreadsheet showing the money.

I am even more pleased now that I voted no on the budget after seeing the implementer document. This morning, I was very happy to join my Republican

colleagues at a press conference calling attention to what I consider a really disgraceful abuse of the majority's power that this document represents. The main point of the press conference was that this is a huge document, number one, and well beyond simply implementing the budget.

And it is a huge document, Madam President. It is 137 pages on top of the 73 pages that was the spreadsheet showing the money. The first budget that I can remember that if you drop it on your foot, you're going to break your toe. It's a good way to define what is too much for a budget.

In contrast, the budget from 2019 which included the budget and implementation language was around 500 pages. This is twice that and as I said it was delivered to us three in the morning. And many of us didn't see it until we woke up this morning, seven, eight o'clock and got our first chance to look at it. And then we were brought in here and told that we would have to vote on a brand new version of the Marijuana Bill, which was also 300 pages.

So listen here, minority Republicans. I know we didn't give you a whole lot of warning on this document or what's in it. But you have plenty time to learn your 837 pages of new policy while you're studying and voting and debating on marijuana. This is another 300 pages of new information. It's obnoxious, Madam President.

As Senator Miner mentioned, the implementer bill is supposed to be the policy that is directly related to the budget itself. And that's in here, no question about it. And we should be debating the merits of it. But a lot of it is not policy that directly implements the budget. And not all of that is bad policy. Some of it might even be good. But a lot of it is bad.

I was going to take this document, this giant document and go through it section by section, 544 sections before the Amendment. I think it comes out to 538 or 539 now. But I only made it to line 11,000, Madam President, out of nearly 25,000 lines in a document with only hours to digest.

But just looking at the summary, you can see that there are numerous items that don't have anything to do with the budget here. Sections 15 through 19, a huge expansion of HUSKY A; 58 through 60, new policy affecting crumbling foundations. The Native American mascot issue was already addressed, that's Section 63. What exactly does that have to do with the state budget?

This is policy that should have gone through the Committee process. Someone should have put in a Bill, it should have went to a Committee, it should have received a public hearing. It should have gotten public input, it should have been debated by a Committee, it should have been voted on in Committee, it should have been amended if necessary before it ever came here. It should not show up in a budget implementer, emergency certified a week after we finished our business.

Sections 161 through 195, I think, it's referred to in the summary as modernization. But this is policy that essentially creates the ability to continue remote meetings rather than in-person meetings for the state and municipal governments. This has nothing to do with the budget but it has everything to do with the process that we have faced this session which has limited the ability of the minority to operate and do its duty.

Senator Miner already mentioned 196, which is the outdoor dining piece, which we understood the purpose of, but again, has nothing to do with our state budget and does not belong in this document.

Section 339 speed cameras, Section 221, which was already mentioned also, this is a policy that is extremely concerning. I read through it several times worried that I was going to miss finishing the rest of the document because I was trying to understand that thoroughly. But what it does is it allows agencies of the state to embark on and arrange contractual agreements with other states.

It's like a progressive dream, Madam President. The purpose of having three bodies in our government is so that the legislature makes the policy and writes the laws. This goes right around the legislative body and gives the Executive Branch and the bureaucrats that they hire the power to make arrangements with other states without input from us, us who happened to be the Representatives of the people of the State of Connecticut.

There's also plenty of items in this budget document this budget implementer that failed during the legislative session. I serve as the Ranking Member of the Government Administration and Elections Committee and as a member of the minority. My job is to support good policy and stop bad policy. That's my job. Stop bad policy. Work with the majority, figure out what's good, try and come up with bipartisan solutions, pass what we can, but stop bad policy.

I left here on sine die, which is the final night of our Session last Wednesday at midnight, very proud of myself, that I stopped what I thought was bad policy.

I stopped it by working hard, by offering amendments, making cogent arguments, making the majority uncomfortable with the policies that they were putting forward because I was raising public opinion against them. And these Bills, many of them died. That's the expression we use here, Madam President, those Bills died. That means that they did not become law because they did not go through

the full process of passing both Chambers and being signed by the Governor. That's an achievement you can have in the minority.

But those Bills, and I'm referring to Senate Bill 5 and Senate Bill 901 in particular, two Bills that I debated in this Chamber for hours. And when they were not able to be passed through the other Chamber, they came back here and through there, added as Amendments, the last several days of the session in a desperate attempt by the majority to get them past and become law. And you know what? They failed.

They failed because they didn't use their time properly and they knew that they would take more time to go through this Chamber again and through me. That is the achievement I had, Madam President, representing my constituents and stopping bad policy. And yet, those items are in this document today, this 900-page behemoth.

We had our Republican Caucus this morning for the Republican Senators. And the most common statement I heard around the table was I thought that Bill was dead. I thought that was a dead issue. Bringing these Bills back to life after the end of session, in a budget implementer document, emergency certified without a hearing, is wrong, Madam President.

I understand that this might be a little bit in the weeds for citizens that are watching this so I'm directing these comments now really, at my colleagues in both parties. They know it's wrong. They know it's wrong, that when we go through the process of having Bills proposed and having them taken up by Committee, it's work to get people to listen to you, even in the majority, to get them to take up your Bill. To get people to testify on it, to get it through the process, to get it to be heard because you're competing with hundreds and hundreds of other Bills.

When a Bill is stopped by Members of the minority, it's for good reason, because we worked very hard to make that happen. It's wrong to subvert the idea that we have a legislative session that begins on a day and ends on a day and that we are supposed to follow a set of processes to get to the end.

Year after year, I watch the process get worse and worse, Madam President. I often comment in this Chamber that all we do is pass titles through Committee now. The Committee process is where we're supposed to fine-tune Bills before they come here. The Bill is proposed. It gets a hearing, the public provides input. The Committee debates it, they're supposed to fix it. No, no, no. More times than not, Madam President, the Bill leaves committee as a work in progress and then it comes to this floor or the floor of the House and the very first thing you hear the proponent of that Bill say is, Madam President, or Mr. Speaker, I have a strike-all Amendment.

It's a disgrace. It basically says the Bill that you pass through the Committee is irrelevant. It's been replaced with something else. All that really mattered is that we passed a title by a name that we can use for something else entirely and pull the wool over the eyes of the people of the state of Connecticut.

Why even have a session, Madam President? Seriously, if you can just go through the whole process, ignore what we're supposed to do, ignore the Committee process, ignore the Amendment process, do emergency certification when necessary, cut off debate when necessary. Or, after the session, throw it all in a giant Bill.

Why not just have one Bill, make it 50,000 pages long with your giant wish list of everything you want? Because that's the way the majority is treating the minority in this state and it's wrong.

We have only one strength in the minority and that is time. The fact that there is a deadline for the majority to pass the legislation that they want. That's all we have. And this process, bringing these Bills back to life after the fact, takes that away.

And Madam President, I don't care about me. I don't care about me at all. But what I want the majority to understand, and again, I am talking to Members of the majority who should know what's right and wrong about this process, is they're not taking anything away from me. They are taking something away from the people I represent, the 100,000 people in my district that I represent. The people that elected me to come up here and stand for them, you have taken their voice away from me, because you've taken any ability I have to affect the outcome of policy away. And it's wrong.

The majority knows, they know that they have gone too far with this monster Bill. They know it. I can only hope that the press is as honest about it also. The people of Connecticut deserve to know the details. They deserve a thorough and honest debate, where all the parties had a chance to participate in the production of policy, were at least given enough opportunity and afforded the time to be able to digest and understand the policy that we're debating and voting on.

They deserve a fair and legitimate legislative process, something that has been worked upon since day one of this session using COVID as an excuse, impacting the ability of individuals to testify. We had a Bill this year where thousands of people were told that they were not going to get the chance to testify on it because it was going to be not in person but in Zoom and there was going to be a deadline.

How do you call yourself a representative government if the people that you represent you ignore? Like they don't matter? They are the only thing that matters, Madam President.

Those people also deserve a budget and policies that benefit the future of this state. And this budget and this implementer will only carry us much farther in the wrong direction. It fails to make our state more attractive or affordable. In fact, it does the opposite. I vote no, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further? Good evening, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President for the second time. Madam President, I just want to go back to Section 221, authorizing agencies to contract with other states. Madam President, this section starts out making what I would say language changes, wordsmithing, to properly recognize either his and or her duties. But on Line 9820, it says each department head may adopt regulations in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 54. And then it goes on to say may enter into contractual agreements, including but not limited to contractual agreements with other states.

I spoke about this briefly before, Madam President, and I'm familiar with the regulatory process. I think I'm very familiar with the regulatory process. And my read of this is unless something in statute is specifically prohibited, this is going to open the door for any administrative person, that would be a department head, to adopt regulations that the administration wants to have adopted, including but not limited to contractual agreements with other states.

Now, I'm not familiar with every statute, some people may believe I am but I'm not. And I'm not familiar with every passage of every statute. But this is not just a slight crack in the door. I cited TCI before, I cited whether or not we ship inmates to another state for certain types of incarceration. I would argue that this might even allow us to send people that have mental disabilities somewhere if that was in the best interest as felt by the department head. No legislative authority, no legislative oversight. No Committee responsibilities.

We heard Senator Sampson talk about the process. In my view, Madam President, Lines 9820 to 9823 in there, maybe even past that, this opens the barn door.

Now, I would be making the same statement, if we had a Republican Governor. I don't know that there was anyone more critical of some of our former Republican Governors than me, as a Republican.

But I will tell you, if someone thinks this isn't going to be an opportunity for fun and games, after we go through the whole budget process, and the whole legislative process, I'm asking you to remember 816 and today's date, because this didn't just fall here by accident. Those words didn't get underlined on Line 9823 by accident.

Somebody, probably in high water pants, thinks this is a good idea. Some brain trust somewhere is decided there's an opportunity here. And Madam President, if there's a reason to vote no on this implementer it's in Line 9823. And there are others. And so I will be voting no, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further?
Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Madam President, I rise for one specific reason, and that is to talk to Senator Miner. And quite frankly, apologize for not calling him over the weekend. He is right on that component of things that we have a relationship where we can talk. And quite frankly, the time got away from me, but I wanted to extend him an apology just for that one reason. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I didn't think it was necessary, but I certainly do accept it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you very much, Madam President and good evening.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, sir.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

I rise, and before I actually start speaking, I would just like to thank my colleagues for their comments here in the Circle, both Senator Miner and Senator Sampson, for many of the things that we were able to learn in the short time that we've been able to spend with this document.

This document, a whopping 837 pages, I mean, the weight, the sheer weight of that bill, is amazing. And to think that we just got this today, this morning and, you know, it took, you know, probably since last Wednesday to start pulling this together to get us to where we are today.

The majority does have the numbers. They do have the control of the agenda, to use like a football analogy they have -- they're on offense. They're in the huddle, and we play defense. So we don't have the luxury of the play that's called. We see it as it comes on the field.

And when you get presented with something of this magnitude, I think we need to evaluate the process and the procedure. Because I don't think this is what our constituents expect. I don't think they are looking for us to be presented with 851 pages and to be able to read them, understand them. Think about it, and to evaluate what the impact of that written document is on so many different areas of life in the state of Connecticut.

Mind you, it's now eight o'clock; Session was called for 11. And in the interim, we had to deal with the Bill, dealing with the legalization of recreational marijuana in itself, a 300-page Bill. So you're looking at almost 1,200 pages. And to do that at a time when you're divided, not only looking and dealing with the legislation that's before us, and from my perspective, a very substantial and significant piece of legislation that's going to impact the children of our state for decades to come. And there's nothing worth fighting for more than the future of the state of Connecticut, and the great children that reside here.

So to have to be able to watch that legislation, deal with that legislation advocate for those kids. At the same time, we have to read a document that's 851 pages is either going to be a disservice to the future and kids of the state of Connecticut, or

you're not going to have the opportunity to look at this document. In either instance, it's not the way to legislate, especially in a Special Session, when we can call this at any time.

This Bill could have been prepared today could have been presented to us today. We could have had the debate and the argument maybe Thursday, Friday, next Monday. But to rush this, I don't think is the proper process. And there albeit may be very good intentions in here. But it's unclear.

And I know that I've had my colleagues speak about this before me, but I know there are a couple one is the authorization for state agencies to be able to contract with other states. Now on one hand, we might be looking at using the intellectual property of our state agencies that may do the backroom operation of state services and be able to look to offload those to other states and derive a revenue stream for our state.

On the other hand, is it a backdoor towards the TCI initiative and a gas tax? I don't know. This document is unclear. There's also the use of a 1332 waiver to do Medicaid expansion for HUSKY-A participants, albeit not saying that they are not worthy of quality, accessible and affordable health care. But that's a discrete population. And utilizing the 1332 waiver under the Affordable Care Act, states are allowed one. One.

And Connecticut right now sits on the, I'm going to say the precipice of being able to utilize the American Relief Funds for the next two years. And if we use the 1332 waiver for a reinsurance program, we could bring premium relief to all families that are buying health insurance in the state of Connecticut up to 30% reduction.

When you look at the fact that the average amount a family in the state of Connecticut pays for their insurance for healthcare, it's \$2,000 a month,

that's almost \$600 of real money in a family budget. That is a game changer. But the policy here is not to use the 1332 waiver for something that would help more people, and all people know we're going to use it for a Medicaid expansion program. Connecticut is unaffordable right now. It's unaffordable. And adding more folks on Medicaid is going to make it more expensive for the state government to operate.

I think a policy choice that utilized or included not only the Medicaid expansion, but also a reinsurance program that even the Governor advanced would have been the prudent and reasonable way to go forward. Wasn't considered, despite the fact that we had that before the Insurance Committee.

The Governor had that before the Insurance Committee. Our Bill never got out of Committee. The Governor's did, but then the conversation died, probably because we're using the 1332 waiver for this rather than for reinsurance. And this, Madam President is where I think we miss the mark.

So looking at this, I mean, we -- just, it's an amazing document. I think if you brought this back and I walked down Main Street in Stamford and said, look, this is what this is what the majority thought I would be able to read in a couple hours while I'm also legislating the passage of recreational marijuana, they would laugh. They would be like, no, seriously, that's what they -- that's what you do up there in Hartford? I'd be like, yeah, this is what this is, what they asked us to do today.

And I just don't think that's the expectation of any voter. And it's certainly not I don't think the expectation of legislators either. And I think that that's something that needs to be considered, certainly in future years. But I think this process is a process that needs to be evaluated. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the legislation before the Chamber? Good evening, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President, the Senate will stand at ease.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to yield to Senator Hartley, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley, do you accept the yield?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, indeed. Thank you, Madam President. And thank you, Senator Duff. I rise just for some very brief comments. But I first of all would like to recognize the yeoman's job and the work that was done, actually, on the heels of this session last week, that we are back again, today with regard to the budget implementer.

And I just want to also note that, in Sections 317 to 320, we had the opportunity to spell out the Small Business Express program, which was unanimously supported throughout the process, which

really helps the state of Connecticut to pivot in 2021. So that we are not competing with the banking industry, but in fact collaborating with it, and at the same time, leveraging our state resources to help our most important sector of the economy, that is small business.

But Madam President, if I might, for purposes of clarification with regard to Section 523 through Section 533, these are sections which implement revisions to our Bonding Bill. And part of our Bonding Bill, as we know, that we adopted was an entity called the Community Investment Fund 2030. And it was a targeted piece of legislation to address and deal with projects involving human services, workforce development, mental health, and also things that impact youth and adult enrichment.

And part of the initiative is to build the state's economic BIA being an adjunct to developing the state's economic action plan. And so for purposes of clarification, I would like to address a question to Senator Fonfara. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, please proceed. Senator Fonfara, prepare yourself.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you Madam President. Madam President. I'm wondering if Senator Fonfara, the distinguished Chair of the Finance Committee, could explain briefly what in fact a social impact bond might be? Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hartley. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Good evening. Senator Hartley, a social impact bond is a construct that is used throughout the country to leverage private sector investment to address traditionally what would be considered a government responsibility to - - it's also termed the Pay for Success initiatives, where there are metrics established to invest in a particular social economic outcome.

Initially done to address recidivism in certain communities, those coming out of prison. The private sector invests in efforts to reduce recidivism. If those metrics that are pre-established are met, then the private sector would be compensated for that investment. If the metrics are not met, then the private sector would not be compensated. The government would be the compensating entity.

The theory being that, that government and society are better off if those metrics are met, less cost to the government, better outcomes for the individual better outcomes for the community, better outcomes for families. It's used quite extensively now in areas regarding early childhood education. Utah has used this extensively and with very positive outcomes, where children in a cohort that had high percentages going into special ed outcomes with respect to a social impact bond investment in Utah, which doesn't have a state-run program the way we do, or a state-funded program the way Connecticut does. But the social impact bond has reduced, that initiative has reduced the number of children in percentages that are going into special ed.

And so the social impact bond is a way to fund programs that maybe we can't or won't fund to the extent that we might invest, and have private sector funds invested, private funds invested with a social and economic benefit. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Fonfara. That is very helpful in understanding the construct of the social impact bond. And so understanding what that objective is in the social impact bond would be, in your estimation, would such a construct, would a social impact bond be an appropriate tool that may be deployed through the Community Investment Fund? Or, in addition to that, and/or in addition to that, the deployment of our economic action plan which is also about the deployment of bonds for the economic and social benefit of the residents in the state of Connecticut? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, Madam President, I do believe so. I think that the objectives and the use of these funds would qualify or would allow for social impact bonds to be considered as a tool, as a means by which private sector funds, partnering with public sector funds, are allowed through this initiative with bonds. Or the bonds could be used as the means of compensation if the metrics were met in whatever they might be for, again, recidivism, early childhood education, a host of other ways.

There is currently a social impact bond at work here in Connecticut with Department of Social Services, addressing some aspects of women who may be in trouble in terms of advanced in their lives, I'm not familiar with the exact use of those funds or that initiative, but there is one currently operating here in the state.

Boston has with an organization called, I'm forgetting their name now, actually, but they are operating a social impact bond to address youth, youth who might be on the edge of violence or it risk of entering activity that could end up in prison or what have you. And that social impact bond is funded by Goldman Sachs, which is a probably the leader in the country. They kicked this off many years ago, and addressing recidivism rates, and they continue to be active in the space.

And so I do believe that this would be an eligible use of the funds in my interpretation of what the bond funds could be used for, as well as the types of things that are enumerated in the Bill for addressing underserved communities, which is, I believe, the foundation of the initiative. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

And thank you, Madam President, and thank you for that explanation, Senator Fonfara. That is particularly enlightening in view of the fact as we launch these new initiatives, and particularly the Community Investment Fund, and also the state's economic advancement plan, that we deploy every tool that we have, and in particularly recognizing the fact that we ought to be encouraging partnerships with the private sector, so that we do indeed leverage our state dollars to the benefit of the state and those people who make this possible. That is the taxpayers of the state of Connecticut. So with that explanation, I thank you, Madam President, and urge adoption. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Hartley. Will you remark further? Senator Duff. Good evening, again.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, just wrap-up comments, I wanted to thank Senator Osten, Senator Fonfara, Members of the House, our staff, Senator Looney, for their work on the Bill that we have today.

There are a lot of sections in the Bill. I think that there are good sections in the Bill here that are will do a lot of wonderful things for our state, and move our state forward. I know that there have been folks who have toiled on this for many weeks and days, especially over the last few days. They have worked hard, and we need this budget implementer to implement the budget that we adopted before, which is why these Bills are very long. And they've traditionally always been very long over the years.

But I think that if we're going to be able to move our state forward, we're going to have the policies in place that adopt how we're spending our money, we need this very important budget implementer today.

So Madam President, I rise and again thank Senator Looney for his leadership and his work, Senator Osten, Senator Fonfara, members of our staff in the House also who have worked so hard on this and certainly would urge adoption of the implementer tonight. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further? Good evening, Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Good evening, Madam President, rising in supported emergency certified Bill, as amended. Madam President, last week, we adopted a budget by a vote of 31 to 4 in this Chamber, by a substantial vote also in the House of Representatives. And this Bill is the Bill that makes that budget workable.

So all of the people who voted for that, in fact, were waiting for this document to make it operational. So for that reason, we obviously need to pass this Bill this evening to get us on the way to enacting the two-year budget that was adopted so overwhelmingly last week.

And I would like to begin by thanking Senator Osten for her just a heroic level of effort throughout the Session, both on the budget and on this Bill, and so many other things. I left her a message last night after midnight, I had a question on a section of the Bill. I got a response from her at 4:10 this morning. So that's an indicator of the kind of hours she keeps and the kind of work that she does on behalf of all of us here and on behalf of the State of Connecticut.

Senator Fonfara, also a veteran of the General Assembly who has served here since 1986, is our expert on public finance, more than anyone else, I think, in either Chamber. And we're so fortunate to have him in the position that he holds as Chair of Finance. Representative Walker, obviously extraordinary work in partnership with Senator Osten, Representative Scanlon, the House Chair of Finance. I want to thank the leadership of the House as well, and Senator Duff. Obviously we're going through all these late nights, evenings with staff, and especially of course I want to thank once again, Vinnie Morrow and Courtney Coleman and Teresa Covert and Manny Marisota. And also Dina Berlin, who does so much work on health care and insurance-related issues as well.

So as much time as the Legislators are putting in, the staff was putting in as much and in some cases more, along with their House counterparts. So this effort was in the works before the session ended, but then picked up with accelerating pace on Friday morning, and virtually non-stop through last night and into today.

Just a few sections I wanted to mention, Madam President. Again, there's so much here that authorizes the work that we believe to be so important in the budget. A section that designates ARPA funding of \$10 million to DSS to provide one time grants to support nursing homes with issued rates that are lower than calculated rates.

Another section designating ARPA funding of \$25 million in each of the fiscal years to DEMAS to establish grant programs for contracted private providers to enhance employee wages.

A section designating \$15.4 million in state Medicaid funds to DSS for the purpose of adjusting nursing home rates for facilities that provide enhanced health care, and pension benefits for facility employees. Increasing the minimum per diem bed rate for intermediate care facilities to \$501. As we know, more and more intermediate care facilities are going to be a growing part of our health care options.

Reducing the copay under the state-funded Connecticut homecare program from 9% to 4.5% of the cost of care, very important.

So there's elements in this Bill that are particularly attended to the needs of seniors, those who work with seniors. Also, at the other end of the life scale, we increase the benefit amount paid to families for children born while entitled to the Temporary Family Assistance Program by eliminating the family cap provision. Again, so we are paying

attention to the needs of our very young children and the needs of the frail elderly.

This is a responsible budget, as we said the other night, and this is a responsible implementer because it puts us in line to make that budget operational. So Madam President, I urged support of the emergency certified bill as amended.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further on the legislation before the Chamber? Will you remark further? If not, I will open the voting machine. Mr. Clerk, would you please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. This is Senate Bill 1202, as amended by Senate "A". Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 1202, AN ACT CONCERNING PROVISIONS RELATED TO REVENUE AND OTHER ITEMS TO IMPLEMENT THE STATE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30 2023. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 1202, as amended by Senate "A". Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1202, as amended:

Total Number Voting	30
Necessary for Adoption	16
Those voting Yea	23
Those voting Nay	7

Those absent and not voting 6

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) The legislation passes. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would like to yield for a -- the Senate stand at ease for a moment, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I have my old friend back here again to close out the night. Hello, Rose. I move for immediate transmittal of all items that need to be acted upon by the House of Representatives, please.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I would like to yield for a point of personal privilege to Senator Flexer, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer, good evening.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good evening, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Do you accept the yield?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

I do accept the yield. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise for a point of personal privilege before we wrap up our business for the day, and hopefully at least for the month.

Madam President, we all know that those of us that have the privilege of serving in elected office wouldn't be able to do the work that we get to do on behalf of our constituents, if it weren't for the amazing staff that work with us. And I have been blessed for the last two-and-a-half-plus years to work with the wonderful Sara McHale, who has served as my legislative aide and serves the people of the 29th District incredibly well, over that period of time.

And in a few weeks, she will be leaving us. She's decided to go to law school, which is a decision I know you, Madam President, can appreciate much more than I can. But I know that she will excel at her studies, and will be an amazing, amazing addition to the bar and continue to serve nobly once she's done with those three years of law school.

But I just can't say enough about Sarah and the wonderful work that she's done. This has been a really hard time to serve in public office. And it's been a really hard time to try to meet the needs of our constituents. And over the last year-and-a-half in particular, there have been people with a lot of challenges who were looking for help. Their lives were upended in ways they never could have imagined. And people in northeastern Connecticut couldn't have been luckier to have Sarah McHale answering their phone calls.

THE CHAIR:

And where might she be going to law school, for those of many lawyers amongst us who are curious?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

She is going to be attending Suffolk University. But I do just really sincerely, Madam President, just want to emphasize people called our office and were distraught. They emailed us and not only did Sarah deeply care about the crisis that that particular person was enduring, she would not take no for an answer when it came to getting people the help that they need.

So not only did folks from Northeastern Connecticut who called our office get a caring ear, they got someone who was going to answer their problem as well. Sarah works incredibly hard. Our district will be less off without her. And it's a real loss but I know that that caring, that hard work ethic that dedication that she's had working with us here in the Senate over these last several years, will get her far in life with her law school studies or without.

Her deep love the state of Connecticut too is something to really appreciate. And even though she may be going to that state to the north, it's okay for a few years. I know that she'll come back because her heart is truly here in Connecticut and my heart will always be with her. So thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you best wishes to you, Sarah McHale.
(applause) Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Are there any other points of personal privilege or announcements?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I have a journal notation. There were several Republican Senators out of the Circle today due to family commitments, and one, Senator Champagne, had in-district business to attend to. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. The Journal will so note, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I see no other points of personal privilege or announcements. I move that we adjourn subject to the call of the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Are we adjourning sine die or subject to the call of the Chair?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Subject to the call of the Chair, please.

THE CHAIR:

Excellent. Well, we are adjourned. Go forth, govern and enjoy the summer. (gavel)

(On the motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 8:55 p.m. adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.)