

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB8015 PA12 June Sp. sess 1991

House 1664 - 1684 (21)

Senate 540 - 581 (42)

63p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2012

H-619

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1991

SPECIAL SESSION
JUNE 5

VOL. 34
PART 36
1315-1684

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

Representative Santiago in the affirmative.

The Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Emergency Certified Senate Bill 2011, as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A".

Total Number Voting	131
Necessary for Passage	66
Those voting Yea	130
Those voting Nay	1
Those absent and not Voting	20

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The bill as amended is passed.

The Clerk please call Emergency Certified Bill 8015.

CLERK:

Emergency Certified House Bill 8015, AN ACT IMPLEMENTING THE THOMAS COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, introduced by Representative Balducci, Senator Larson.

The Clerk has in his possession an Emergency Certified form signed by John Larson and Richard Balducci.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Lavine of the 100th.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance and passage of

tcc

27

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

the Emergency Certified Bill.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on passage. Will you remark, sir?

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is similar to the bill we had voted on previous, except in this version of the bill the fees have been removed because there is an assumption that we are going to be voting and passing an entire fee package perhaps later this evening or at some early point in future time.

That being the case, the fees have been removed, but the bill itself is the same with one exception and I am going to yield to Representative Adamo to explain the one exception, the one addition that is in this bill currently.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the bill?

Representative Adamo, do you accept the yield?

REP. ADAMO: (116th)

Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Thank you, Representative Lavine.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, the amendment, as it relates to the Workers' Compensation is somewhat different from the amendment that we passed here in the

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

House when we last did the bill for the Thomas Commission recommendations in one or two basic ways.

It was discovered in going through the Workers' Compensation statute, the new bill 91-339, that inadvertently the dependency allowance had been deleted effective July 1, 1991 and it should not have been deleted until October 1, 1991 when we started to put in place the new 80 percent of net formula.

Therefore, this bill, this amendment as it stands before us today, provides for putting back in place the recommendation for the continuation of the dependency allowances between the period July 1, 1991 and October 1, 1991. As in the past, it corrects other errors and puts in the 80 percent of net formula in two sections of the law that it had inadvertently left out of and with the question of a commissioner, chairman of the commission being elected, we had previously taken out any requirement for that person to be a commissioner. This puts back the requirement for at least two years so that the commissioner who is in fact named chairman will continue to do the CRD work and will have in fact Workers' Compensation experience and I thank once again Representative Lavine for the yield.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

tcc

001667
29

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Lavine.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Madam Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LC08528.
Would the Clerk please call and read.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Will the Clerk please call LC08528, which shall be
designated House Amendment "A".

CLERK:

LC08528, House "A", offered by Representative
Lavine.

In line 2094, strike "58" and insert "57" in lieu
thereof

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Lavine, what is your pleasure?

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Madam Speaker, I would move acceptance of the
amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

The question is on acceptance of the amendment.
Will you remark, sir?

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Madam Speaker, this is a technical amendment which
changes the effective date and I move acceptance of the

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

Will you remark further? Representative Courtney.

REP. COURTNEY: (56th)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO8646, which I would ask that he call and I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Will the Clerk please call LCO8646, which shall be designated House Amendment "B".

CLERK:

LCO8646, House "B", offered by Representative Courtney, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

The gentleman has asked leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection? Without objection, please proceed, Representative Courtney.

REP. COURTNEY: (56th)

Madam Speaker, this amendment would strike from the bill the sections which move the licensure and regulation of family day care providers from DHR to DHS, so the effect of the amendment would be to retain the status quo that presently exists where licensure and regulation of family day care providers presently rests in the Department of Human Resources.

I would move its adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

tcc

001670
32

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

The question is on adoption. Will you remark further, sir?

REP. COURTNEY: (56th)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The bill I think has a good intent which is to try and consolidate the licensure and regulation of day care in one agency. However, I think you could say that the problem with the bill is in a sense that it really doesn't go far enough because what the bill leaves in place is the present situation where DHR will remain as the lead agency for child day care.

The Purchase of Service Day Care Program, the financial subsidy to family day care providers would remain at DHR and the training of day care providers would also remain at DHR, so still even if this bill passed in its present form you would still have a fragmented system of regulation, funding, training and licensure of family day care providers.

Given the fact that the budget that we passed last week includes a commission to study the overall consolidation of social service agencies which I would strongly hope will finally place all day care in terms of day care centers, family day care providers and state-funded day care centers all under the one single tent of one agency.

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

It's our feeling that perhaps we should just leave the status quo which presently exists in place until the commission has finished its work and then we can have true consolidation in one agency. This amendment, again, has the support of the Committees of Cognizance.

I spoke to the Ranking Members on the opposite side of the aisle and it was felt that perhaps we should let this amendment pass, leave the status quo in place until the commission has had its full opportunity to review the entire issue of child day care and I hope the full body would support this effort. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

You're welcome, sir. Will you remark further on this amendment? Will you remark further on this amendment? If not --.

REP. TAYLOR: (79th)

Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

I'm sorry, Representative Taylor of the 79th.

REP. TAYLOR: (79th)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, to Representative Courtney.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Please frame your question, sir.

tcc

34

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

REP. TAYLOR: (79th)

Thank you. Representative Courtney, the move towards Health Services, excuse me, I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, was because I don't think that Human Resources was adequately staffed to handle these functions. Is that not true?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Courtney.

REP. COURTNEY: (56th)

Through you, Madam Speaker, actually the Thomas Commission felt that it really wasn't a question of personnel. It was really a question of consistency of the regulations that are in place. There is, I think, truly a disparity that exists right now between the regulation of centers and home providers that really does create maybe even some unfairness in the marketplace.

I agree with the basic concept of putting it in once place, but again, I think they're leaving too much behind at DHR with the bill as it's presently written.

REP. TAYLOR: (79th)

Through you, Madam Speaker, again, to Representative Courtney, could we not have or could we not introduce an amendment to move those other functions over to Health Services that you had remarked

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

about and just left Human Resources as kind of the gatekeeper towards allowing people into the system and in advocacy, but the actual operation and oversight of these functions be transferred over to Health Services rather than dumping it back into Human Resources where I, quite frankly, and I have to agree with the Thomas Commission, I don't think that those functions should be lying at this time.

REP. COURTNEY: (56th)

Through you, Madam Speaker, I think it should be in one place. I'm not really sure whether it belongs in Health Services or DHR. I think, frankly, the problem with this action that's being proposed here was that none of the committees -- this bill went to the Public Health Committee and they apparently chose not to hold a public hearing on it.

The providers, I know there's are many providers who feel very strongly that they are more comfortable keeping it a DHR. They know the agency better and this is -- I'm talking about the family providers at this point. They are not happy with the notion of suddenly having their license and regulations shifted over to another agency.

Again, I agree with I think the basic thrust of the bill which is that it should be consolidated in once

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

place. Whether it's DHR or DHS, I'm agnostic on the question, but I do think that the way this bill proposes doing it is kind of a half-baked consolidation.

REP. TAYLOR: (79th)

Madam Speaker, again, through you, to Representative Courtney, was there any transfer of funds in the budget? I mean this is the implementing language. Was there any transfer of funds that also have to be handled as a result of moving these functions back into Human Resources?

REP. COURTNEY: (56th)

Through you, Madam Speaker, the fiscal note is that there is no fiscal impact, so the answer is no.

REP. TAYLOR: (79th)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Representative Courtney. I suppose that rather than have a half-baked move, we probably should walk slowly at this point in time, given the fact that we are going to have a commission to take a look at reorganization, but I would hope that this would be a priority item. I don't feel that the actual operation of the day care centers, you know, their cleanliness and the staffing and all is something that probably should be handled through Human Resources. I believe it does belong in

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

an agency like Health Services and I hope that we can move in that direction, but as Representative Courtney has pointed out, rather than kind of a mish-mosh that for at least a year leaves people really in limbo as to where they should be going, we should probably stick where we are at this point in time and direct a commission to reorganize state government to make this one of their priorities. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on this amendment? Will you remark further? Representative Jones.

REP. JONES: (121st)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise briefly to also support this amendment. I believe the whole area of day care should be under the study and purview of the Commission to Reorganize the State Government and at that time all these functions should be put together. It seems to me that training and provision go along with regulation and I would urge support of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Will you remark further on this amendment?
Representative Bolster.

REP. BOLSTER: (137th)

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

The ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted.

House Amendment Schedule "B":

Strike sections 9 to 11, inclusive, sections 13 to 17, inclusive, and section 63 in their entirety and renumber the remaining sections and internal references accordingly.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Will you remark further on this bill as amended?

Will you remark further? Will you remark?

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I guess I'd like to pose one or two questions to Representative Lavine, if I might, through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Representative Lavine, would it be your supposition that what's contained in this bill is essentially Thomas Commission recommendations?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Lavine.

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Through you, Madam Speaker, I frankly think it could only be characterized as part of the Thomas Commission recommendations, through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. That's pretty much the conclusion I came to that what we are in fact looking at here are adjustments and revisions of recommendations made by the Thomas Commission and looking at line 1893 of the file copy, it indicates that we're going to change the amount we charge communities for resident state troopers for the next fiscal year from 60 percent of their cost to 70 percent of their cost.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is not a Thomas Commission recommendation. A Thomas Commission recommendation is that in fact those who use services should pay for them. What we see in this file is a step in the right direction and I have an amendment prepared that I could offer that would take the percentage up to 80 percent the following year, but I'm not going to offer that this evening.

I would just ask the membership, as we proceed into

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

the next budget session next year and we find that our costs continue to rapidly escalate that at that time perhaps we might want to take and revisit the 70 percent number and think about continuing to raise it until we in fact have equity in who pays for their police protection. Waterbury, Bridgeport, Stamford, New Haven and Hartford don't have their Police Departments subsidized by the State of Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, if I might, another question to the gentleman who brought the bill out -- Madam Speaker, rather.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Please proceed.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Representative Lavine, on line 1929 of the proposal we see a change from three years that you have to be a comp commissioner to be the chairman going to a two-year period where they have to have served. Could you tell me if that's a Thomas Commission recommendation or what was the basis for the need for this particular adjustment?

Madam Speaker, I would like to revise and ask that question of Representative Adamo from West Haven.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Adamo, do you wish to respond?

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

REP. ADAMO: (116th)

Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Belden, when we had done the previous bill, there were corrections that had to be made to the Workers' Compensation Bill revision that we did. The bill that we did that day had in fact taken out the three-year requirement in its entirety.

Upon examining that at a future time, we also found that the Chairman would continue to perform the duties of Chairman of the CRD or the Compensation Review Division. That would necessitate that person having some experience as a commissioner, so subsequently upon conferring with my Senate Co-chair, we decided to put back at least a minimum a two-year requirement and it's two years for a very specific reasons, and I'll be very frank and candid with you and the members of the Chamber. The three-year requirement would have been very limiting to us to the extent that we would very possibly could have had or limited the selection of a chairman to those commissioner that in fact may have brought that particular division of government to where it is today.

So subsequently, this two-year requirement opens up the selection process a little more broadly to some of the younger and brighter minds that have been put on

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

the Workers' Comp Commission in a hope that we'll have a chairman that will move it in the right direction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Representative Adamo for your very forthright answer. That has good points and bad points, I guess, as we're all aware and I did want to get into the record essentially whether there was some specific reason for that.

I think we would agree that we need to have that opened as much as possible, but I also think that whoever is going to be the chairman should have some reasonable experience, overall experience in the operation of the system. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on this bill as amended? Representative Tiffany.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The noise level in here is fairly high, but I thought I heard Representative Lavine say there were no fees in this bill. Is that correct?

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Lavine.

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Through you, Madam Speaker, I think there are some licensing costs in here, but the fees essentially have been put into the fee bill. I think there are several licensing costs still in here.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Thank you. Following up on that, there are some fees in this and I would call your attention to Section 42 on Page 40 of the bill which does impact --.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

(Gavel) Representative Tiffany is quite correct. It is getting a little noisy in here. I would suggest that those of you who wish to carry on a conversation take the conversation out into the lobby. Please take the conversation out into the lobby. I apologize, Representative Tiffany. Please proceed.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Thank you. I'm not sure that this particular section of the bill is well-drafted. I would also indicate that I don't believe that this particular section is a recommendation of the Thomas Commission. Rather it's a recommendation of the department together with what few farmers, dairy farmers there are left in

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

the state.

What it amounts to is a self-imposed registration fee of \$25 and my point that I'm trying to make is that in the past it's been merely a registration and the expiration and registration dates have been somewhat flexible and it's done when you get around to it and by alphabetically. They've merely added a \$25 fee to this and have not truly put in the timeframe period, and as you can see on lines 1393, that these registrations are renewed annually any time during the first six months of the year and my question, through you, Madam Speaker, to Representative Lavine is, I would assume that these fees will not be collected until after January 1st. Is that a fair assumption?

REP. LAVINE: (100th)

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Thank you. Madam Speaker, I would indicate that I would hope in the -- you know, in ensuing session and years I think these registration fees should be tied to a more specific date.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Will you remark further on this bill as amended?
Will you remark further? If not, will all members please take their seats. Staff and guests to the well

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, August 29, 1991

of the House. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

Members to the Chamber. Members to the Chamber please.

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted and is your vote properly recorded? Have all members voted? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Emergency Certified House Bill 8015, as amended by House Amendment Schedules "A" and "B".

Total Number Voting	132
Necessary for Passage	67
Those voting Yea	131
Those voting Nay	1
Those absent and not Voting	19

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

The bill as amended is passed.

REP. FRANKEL: (121st)

Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Frankel.

S-327

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1991

JUNE SPECIAL
SESSION

VOL. 34

PART 14

318-673

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

6
aak

SENATE AGENDA #2

1. BUSINESS FROM THE HOUSE

INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE BILL

Emergency Certification

HB8020 AN ACT CONCERNING CERTAIN DUTIES, SERVICES
AND EXPENDITURES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL
RETARDATION, THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES AND THE
COMMISSION ON HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CARE, AND CLARIFYING
CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE LIVING WILL STATUTES

9/4 House Passed with House A, B, C, & D

Transmitted under Joint Rule 14

END SENATE AGENDA #2

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, returning to Senate Agenda #1,
Item #2, Business from the House, Emergency HB8015, AN
ACT IMPLEMENTING THE THOMAS COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS.
The bill is accompanied by Emergency Certification. It
was passed by the House on August 29th and the Clerk is
in possession of amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. The Chair would

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000541

7
aak

recognize Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Thank you, Madam President. I would move adoption of HB8015 in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Harper. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of 7 amendments. And I would inquire as to whether or not there is any special order in which the proponents would like them called.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harper, do you have any...are any of these yours?

SENATOR HARPER:

No, not to my knowledge, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Could the Senate please stand at ease for a moment until we find out whose amendments these are and the order in which they wish to have them called.

THE CLERK:

LC08273 which will be designate Senate Amendment Schedule "A". It is offered by Senator Case of the 14th District.

THE CHAIR:

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000542
8
aak

Thank you very much. The Chair would recognize
Senator Case.

SENATOR CASE:

Madam President, could the Senate stand at ease for
a moment. I would like to find my copy.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Case, are
you prepared, sir?

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Robertson.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Madam President, I think the LCO was 8273, I would
move adoption, seek leave of the Chamber so that I
might summarize?

THE CHAIR:

Is that correct? Let me make sure with the Clerk,
is that the correct LCO number.

THE CLERK:

LC08273.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Thank you. Besides moving adoption, Madam

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000543

9
aak

President, what the amendment does is a very simple change. I know that the Thomas Commission recommended that in the case of Public Housing in local communities that there was no need for public hearing. A number of us thought that such a critical issue as public housing that to deny the public of the automatic access to a public hearing would be wrong. Therefore, this amendment changes it and would therefore require public hearings to be held. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Would anyone else wish to remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "A", to HB8015? Are there any further remarks? If not, then, please let me know your mind. All those in favor of Senate Amendment Schedule "A" please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Those opposed?

SENATORS:

No.

THE CHAIR:

The amendment fails.

THE CLERK:

LC08675 which will be designated Senate Amendment

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000544

10
aak

Schedule "B", offered by Senator Case of the 14th
District.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Case.

SENATOR CASE:

Thank you. I move for adoption of the amendment
and leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed. This will be Senate Amendment
Schedule "B". Please proceed, Senator Case.

SENATOR CASE:

Madam President, with the passage of this amendment
it would permit those individuals who are over the age
of 65 and who are required to pay a fee to the State of
Connecticut for an occupation license to be permitted
to pay at a lesser rate of \$50 so long as their income
from their profession was less than \$5,000. Now, Madam
President, I believe that there are a number of
individuals in the State of Connecticut that are
currently practicing that must practice through way of
a license who are unable to do so as a result of the
very high fees that they are required to pay by the
State of Connecticut. There are individuals who are
required to pay a fee of \$450 who are not earning or
are earning very little about that amount and because

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000545
11
aak

of their age and because of the small income that they make from their profession they are forced to give up their license.

These individuals could be of assistance to other members of their profession if they were permitted to hold their license but because of the high fee schedules we have imposed upon them they are unable to do so. I think it's a tragedy, I think it's a shame to force an individual who is over the age of 65 who may wish to go into semi-retirement but wishes to continue to practice to be forced to the sidelines, be unable to practice his or her profession because of the amount of fees that the State is imposing. So I would urge adoption of this amendment and I would like a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Case. Would anyone else wish to remark?

SENATOR HARPER:

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Thank you, Madam President. I would simply urge rejection of the amendment as I just don't feel at this

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000546
12
aak

time that we can afford anymore losses of revenue.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Madam President, I rise to support the amendment. I agree with Senator Case, but this is another one of those instances, you may find out that this is a money earner, not a loss, because at the ridiculous rates that the State of Connecticut has taxed the professions under the guise of a fee and a licensing fee and that type of thing, you know, I like to use the old duck test. If it walks like a duck, talks like a duck, swims like a duck, in Connecticut it's a tax and I say this is another one of those things that \$450 for a person who would like to go into either semi-retirement or for that matter even retirement, they certainly won't carry on their license.

Now, I have had many of the older members of various professions...

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will please come to order.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

...that like to work at their own leisure and go into many of these volunteer programs, and I am talking the full scope of professionals in our state. But if

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000547
13
aak

they have to carry a full license at anywhere from \$300, \$400 or \$500 you know darn right well they can't do it. Now, there is another item here that you want to keep in mind. We have a study committee that is coming up...how can we take the underinsured or non-insured people of the State and possibly get help for them? You know that either the semi-retired or the retired doctors in this State might very well be one of the answers that we have to take and consider and all I can tell you, you take these fees and in order to maintain a license and without a license, incidentally, your hospital privileges are suspended, and in fact, once you give up your licensure you might very well have to take and go through a testing process in order to get a real license, even though it might be for a year or two.

So this is a good solution, you are still going to pick up \$25 from these people over 65. It's better than getting nothing and there might be surprises of an awful lot of retired doctors out there that would be happy to pay the \$25 but will not pay the \$450 and these exorbitant fees that we charge in the State of Connecticut.

It's a good amendment, we should pass it.

THE CHAIR:

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000548

14
aak

Thank you very much, Senator Gunther. Would anyone else wish to remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "B", LCO8675? Are there any further remarks? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you please make the necessary announcement for a roll call vote.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. The issue before the Chamber is Senate Amendment Schedule "B", LCO8675. The machine is on. You may record your vote. Have all Senators voted that wish to vote. Have all Senators voted. The machine is closed.

The result of the vote.

16 Yea

20 Nay

0 Absent

The amendment fails.

THE CLERK:

LCO8661 designated Senate Amendment Schedule "C",
offered by Senator Case of the 14th District.

THE CHAIR:

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000549
15
aak

Senator Case.

SENATOR CASE:

Thank you, Madam President. I move for adoption of the amendment and wish to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR CASE:

Thank you, Madam President. The purpose of this amendment is to provide for reimbursement of the Connecticut Medical Examining Board, the State Board of Examiners for Nursing, the State Dental Commission by the Department of Health Services. Madam President, I find it incongruous that tonight we are going to increase a number of fees that we are going to impose upon the people of Connecticut, yet at the same time we are imposing these new and greater fees we are asking members of various professional organizations to come and administer examinations on behalf of the State of Connecticut and to do it for no reimbursement at all.

I think these people provide a very important service to the State of Connecticut and I think they are entitled to the minimal reimbursement of their services that they have been giving in the past. I would urge adoption of this amendment and would ask for a roll call vote.

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000550
16
aak

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Case. Would anyone else wish to remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "C", LCO8661? Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, I would urge rejection of this amendment. I think in these difficult times these very dedicated individuals wouldn't mind at all continuing to serve without such reimbursements. My understanding is most of them like to serve on these boards and would continue to do so without much complaint, so I urge rejection.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Harper. Would anyone else wish to remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "C"? Any further remarks? If not, Mr. Clerk, please make the necessary announcement for a roll call vote.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. The issue before the Chamber is Senate Amendment Schedule "C", LCO8661.

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000551
aak

The machine is open. You may record your vote. Have all Senators voted that wish to vote? Have all Senators voted? The machine is closed.

The result of the vote.

13 Yea

23 Nay

0 Absent

The amendment fails.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LC08326 which will be designated Senate Amendment Schedule "D", offered by Senator Genuario of the 25th District.

THE CHAIR:

The Chair would recognize Senator Genuario.

SENATOR GENUARIO:

That may be withdrawn.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. Senator Genuario has indicated that he wishes to have it withdrawn.

THE CLERK:

LC08641 which will be designated Senate Amendment Schedule "E", offered by Senator Genuario of the 25th District.

THE CHAIR:

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

18
aak

Senator Genuario.

SENATOR GENUARIO:

That may also be withdrawn, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, Senator Genuario has indicated to have that withdrawn.

THE CLERK:

LC05184 which will be designated Senate Amendment Schedule "F", offered by Senator DeLuca of the 32nd District.

THE CHAIR:

Senator DeLuca.

SENATOR DELUCA:

I move adoption of the amendment, waive the reading and ask permission to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR DELUCA:

What this amendment does is it eliminates the increase from 60% to 70% the portion that towns would have to pay for resident troopers. I think that the night of the great budget debate someone mentioned the fact that some of our problems relate to the fact that the federal government reduced grants to the states and this is an incident where the state is reducing the

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000553
19
aak

amount of money that they have given to the towns, and I think if it's wrong, although I don't agree with it, for the federal government to do it, it's equally wrong for the State to do that to the towns, because it is not a savings to the State, it is a transferrance of monies to the towns and we know what impacts upon, the property taxes, and I think that is unfair, so I would urge adoption of the amendment and ask for a roll call please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator DeLuca. Would anyone else wish to remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "F"? Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Thank you, Madam President. I would simply urge rejection of this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Senator Fleming, do you wish to remark?

SENATOR FLEMING:

Yes, Madam President. Darn, I was hoping that Senator Harper would support this. Madam President, I stand to support this amendment, not only because I think what it does is it shifts costs down to our local property taxpayers, but I believe there are very few

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000554

20
aak

things that government, perhaps, especially state government, legitimately should be providing to their constituents, but most certainly I think there would be very little disagreement in this Circle that public safety is at the top of that list and to some of the very small towns around the State of Connecticut this is a very important bill, especially in light of some of the reductions we have seen so far to our small communities.

This enables them to affordably provide public safety to the residents of these small towns and I realize there is a fiscal impact to this amendment, but it seems to me in the last couple of days, actually last couple of hours, some of the proposals that I have seen made in this building about shifting costs from one fund to another and suddenly finding money in the budget to pay for it, is astounding. This, I think, is a legitimate use of state dollars and it is an effort to prevent a cost shift onto our municipalities and whether you represent a large or a small town I would ask you to take that into consideration when you vote on this and support it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Fleming. Would anyone else wish to remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "F"?

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000555
21
aak

Senator Freedman.

SENATOR FREEDMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. A question through you to Senator Harper. If I am reading the fiscal note correctly this would not take effect until July 1, 1992?

SENATOR HARPER:

Through you, Madam President, yes, it would be effective for the next fiscal year.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Freedman.

SENATOR FREEDMAN:

So we would be acting on something tonight that would built into the budget a year from now, the 1992-93 year. Through you, Madam President.

SENATOR HARPER:

We are essentially changing what amounts to a rather simple formula in the statutes that determines the percentage of reimbursement. Correct. It would effective for the next budget year. This budget year they would get the 60%. And they would be required to reimburse 60%.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Freedman.

SENATOR FREEDMAN:

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000556
22
aak

Yes, so that ample time, as I am reading this, would be given to communities to prepare the change from 60% to 70%. Again, through you to Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Through you, yes.

SENATOR FREEDMAN:

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Anyone else wish to remark? Any further remarks on Senate Amendment Schedule "F"? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you please make the necessary announcement for a roll call vote.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. The issue before the Chamber is Senate Amendment Schedule "F", LC05184. The machine is open. You may record your vote. Have all Senators voted that wish to vote? Have all Senators voted? The machine is closed.

The result of the vote.

15 Yea

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

23
000557

21 Nay
0 Absent

The amendment fails.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LC08167 designated Senate Amendment Schedule "G",
offered by Senator Gunther of the 21st District.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. The Chair would recognize
Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Madam President, really I am going to withdraw this
particular amendment, but I would like to comment a
bit on it, or I can take and introduce it and then
withdraw it, but I do think this would actually
eliminate the Hospital Cost Commission in the State of
Connecticut and right now we are talking about saving
millions of dollars. We could save millions of dollars
to the State in the Commission, we could save millions
of dollars to many of the people who use the hospital
facilities in this State and this bill would, this
amendment would do it, but I will withdraw it in hopes
in HB8020 in the hopes they retain the Commission and
don't have the hospitals take and pay their way, so I
do have another amendment on that bill, which I will

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

24
aak

introduce if necessary.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Gunther. Mr. Clerk, the Senator has indicated that he wishes to withdraw the amendment. Do you have further amendments, sir?

THE CLERK:

LC08165, which will be designated Senate Amendment Schedule "H" offered by Senator Robertson of the 34th District.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Senator Robertson.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the amendment, LC08165, I would seek leave of the Chamber to summarize and I would ask that when the vote be taken it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Certainly sir, you may proceed.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this amendment is offered to correct what quite obviously was a mistake. It's really very simple. It came to light in going through something which I believe was given out at the Governor's office today which was the packet of information going from the Commissioner of

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000559
25
aak

Revenue Services out to employers and in the explanation as to how much they will deduct from people, employees, what they are deducting is the straight amount of income minus the exemption, which means that the State will be overcharging citizens of the State through their employer by not recognizing when having the deduction from one's check they will not be granted their earned income credit, which was a major part of the bill which came out of here, and so what this amendment does, it very simply indicates that the Commissioner must adopt regulations which will allow for earned income credits to be deducted. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Senator DiBella.

SENATOR DIBELLA:

Thank you, Madam President. I think that the amendment is well intended, but I would oppose the amendment on the basis that in the fiscal year 1991 which we are in right now, there is no penalty in April of 92 for underestimation of withholding, so if the individual does not underestimate withholding or does underestimate withholding they will not be penalized. However, in 92 the deduction process must be tailored by the employer to ensure that the amount of money

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000560
26
aak

taken out reflects the proper dollars withheld, otherwise in April of 93 those people will find themselves with a penalty if the withholding does not match up with the individual's actual withholding in the fiscal year 92.

So that my understanding that the provision would be tailored in the withholding pattern, the withholding scheme that would be proposed by the Department of Revenue Services to the employer for that individual.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator DiBella. Does anyone else wish to remark?

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Yes, Madam President, if I might.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Robertson.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

I am sorry, I will yield to Senator Freedman if she is about to speak. Madam President, Senator DiBella, evidently doesn't understand the intent. I am not concerned as to the fact that there will not be a penalty for underestimation. What I am concerned about is in a recessionary economy ladies and gentlemen we have to be concerned about their being enough money in people's pockets to pay for food and here is a mistake,

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

27
aak

here is a quite honest mistake where the employers are being told by the Commissioner of Revenue Services to deduct more than he should or she should, whomever the employer might be.

I mean, in the cover letter it suggests that they, the employer can tailor their withholding up or down to reflect their own circumstances. It seems to be that an EB, which has 23,000 employees, UTC has how many employees in the State, 52,000 or 53,000? Are they going to sit down with each and every employee and tailor their deductibility? Of course not, they are going to take the form that Governor Weicker's Commissioner has sent out which basically is saying let's rip the people off more. I am trying to give the Senate an opportunity to right a wrong. The world's worst time to be extracting more money out of the private economy is a recessionary time and what we are saying is we are going to deduct more from people's pay than we need to. We are going to deduct more from people's pay than they legally have to pay and now we are going to come to some gobbildy-goop as to why we can't accept this amendment, so I will sit down and hear the gobbildy-goop.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Freedman.

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000562
28
aak

SENATOR FREEDMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. I hope this isn't gobbildy-goop but in view of Senator Robertson just pointed out I feel the timing of this particularly for this year beginning in October and coming just before the holiday season will probably have a greater impact this year than maybe it would next year when people start in January and DRS has worked out its system more orderly, but to go for a general form right now and take money out of peoples' pockets I think we should be taking the bare minimum and at least accommodate their tax credit as we begin to get into this process. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

I don't believe that it is too late to right wrong nor necessarily does it require an amendment to do so. I agree that the Tax Department, the Revenue Services Department has erred in not informing employers and therefore taxpayers of their ability to anticipate the impact of credits, at some risk, obviously in the future years of over-estimating or under-estimating. I think the correction, however, can come administratively because it is not too late to do so

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000563
29
aak

and to ask as I intend to do tomorrow morning when I can reach the Commissioner to reconsider this communication that has gone out to include with the information the information on credits and to indicate that that is one of the items that can be used to adjust liability just like the other five or six items that are listed in this document as adjustments.

I don't think it's too late. I don't think we have to have a bill to have the Tax Commissioner do what I think we all intended and what the Tax Commissioner has the authority under law to do and to do right now for the current tax year and for the future.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Would anyone else wish to remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "H"? Any further remarks? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you please make the necessary announcement for a roll call vote.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. The issue before the Chamber is Senate Amendment Schedule "H", LCO8165.

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

30
aak

The machine is on. You may record your vote. Have all Senators voted that wish to vote. Have all Senators voted. The machine is closed.

The result of the vote.

17 Yea

19 Nay

0 Absent

The amendment fails.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LC08723 designated Senate Amendment Schedule "I"
offered by Senator Robertson of the 34th District.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Robertson.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Madam President, I would move adoption of LC08723.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

I would also seek leave of the Chamber so that I might summarize and I would also ask when the vote is taken it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. You may proceed.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000565

31
aak

Madam President, the previous fault in the passed income tax evidently will be solved by a phone call to the Commissioner. I am hoping that maybe we can make the same phone call but I think this would have to require a change in statutes. It is my concern that whatever way we tax be done as fairly as possible and quite obviously though maybe in the furor of getting this income tax and the fact that it was done at 3 o'clock in the morning in this Chamber, one assumes that some mistakes were made, some oversights were made and this is another obvious oversight that evidently needs to be corrected.

Very simply it says, and I will give you an example, a married couple at an income of \$40,000 or \$50,000 or \$60,000, let's pick \$40,000 and it's just a husband and wife and they are going to be paying a certain percentage of that \$40,000 in the form of taxes to the state of Connecticut. Take someone living next door, earning the same \$40,000, married couple but they have five children. The federal government takes into consideration before one pays their taxes, takes into consideration that it costs more to feed five people or six people than it costs to feed two. Therefore, the federal government allows an exemption.

We quite obviously made a mistake, we did not

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000566
32
aak

provide for that exemption. Further we have allowed for an exemption of up to \$19,000 for a head of household. Again, a head of household with one child, versus a head of household with five children. There is a difference, but they still get the same exemption. Let's take a single person making a certain amount of money. What happens if that single person is a divorced partner and is paying substantial amounts of child support, is allowed to deduct those children that he or she is paying child support for on his federal income tax but not here in the State of Connecticut. I think those are inequities, I think that they are inequities that we can correct with one vote right here. I think it is an inequity that cannot be corrected with a phone call, regardless of who is making the phone call.

I would move adoption. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Senator DiBella.

SENATOR DIBELLA:

Thank you, Madam President. I would ask if the proponent of the amendment has a written explanation of where the revenues will be made up in the budget process.

THE CHAIR:

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000567
33
aak

Senator Robertson.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Madam President, I would ask that we stand at ease. We have not exercised that request at all this complete session but it would take all of about 30 seconds to write it.

SENATOR DIBELLA:

I was asking if he had it in his possession, that's all.

THE CHAIR:

Do you have one?

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

I have one in possession in my mind, but not in written form. We have not exercised that all as I recall this session.

SENATOR DIBELLA:

Well, we have not had requests, Madam President, for \$34 million in loss in 91-92 and a \$65 million loss in 92-93. Thus far in the Session.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Madam President, I would ask that we stand at ease for approximately one minute.

THE CHAIR:

We will stand at ease for one minute. Senator Robertson.

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000568
34
aak

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Yes, Madam President, I do have it.

SENATOR DIBELLA:

Could we have a copy of that Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Robertson, could we have copies? Senator DiBella.

SENATOR DIBELLA:

Thank you, Madam President. The description in writing is that the money will be added to the lapse. I don't believe that meets the intention of Rule 30 in our rules and I think that is out of order, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. I will entertain comments from Senator Robertson.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Madam President, I believe there are a couple of rulings, one from then Lieutenant Governor Joseph Fauliso dated April 29, 1987, I believe there is another one somewhere in here that was done by the then President of the Senate, Senator Phillip Robertson, also indicating that Senator DiBella's movement is out of order.

THE CHAIR:

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000569

35
aak

Thank you very much. I have in front of me, Rule 30, which as you probably know is the subject of this debate. I shall read to the Chamber, "any member who offers an amendment originating in the Senate which if adopted would reduce state revenues or increase state expenditures shall have available at the time the amendment is offered, in addition to a fiscal note, an explanation in writing in the decrease in expenditures or the source of the increased revenues required to balance the budget". I would find that based on what's in front of me on the yellow sheet of paper and I would interpret this to mean that there had to be some scheme, I find, Senator Robertson, that you don't have a scheme here to show the source of the increased revenues required to balance the State budget, merely there is a reference to lapses.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Would you entertain the explanation in the one sentence written there? It has been common practice in the 15 years that I have been here, the lapsed line item basically is a line item in the budget which requires the Administration to save. I believe the lapse in the budget right now, God, I don't remember what the figure is, but it is somewhere in excess of \$77 million. I am suggesting that if there is a loss

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000570
36
aak

of revenue as there would be of \$34 million, you then add that to the lapse figure, therefore requiring the Administration to save \$34 million. It is a legitimate fiscal way of solving the budgetary problem and I don't think the Rule suggests that the fiscal way of solving the problem is what is to be debated.

The fact is that adding to the lapse is a very legitimate way of solving a budgetary problem. It is done every time a Governor has an order of a cutback. The money is added to the lapse, so it is a legitimate way to solve this problem, though I don't think that Rule 30 indicates that we ought to have a debate on the legitimacy of the fiscal way in solving the problem.

THE CHAIR:

It was asked here whether or not I was in agreement. I gave you my ruling on it. You may move to have the Chair overruled, but I would say that it was out of order based on Rule 30.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Madam President, I would regretfully challenge the rule of the Chair, realizing that it is absolutely absurdly wrong.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. You now have in front of you a motion by Senator Robertson to overrule my ruling for

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000571
37
aak

the effectiveness of Rule 30 insofar as he has handed out a piece of paper with an explanation of the source of revenues for his amendment. I will entertain debate on that issue. Senator O'Leary.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, my reading of Rule 30 indicates that the intention of the rule and it was always our belief that the intention of the rule went beyond simply scratching a sentence on a piece of paper that indicates that we would expect to find the revenue in the lapse. If that were sufficient there would clearly be no purpose behind Rule 30, because every budget has a lapse. If you want to consider a lapse a revenue, but I wouldn't consider it a revenue, but if you choose it as a revenue then you could forever meet the requirement of Rule 30 merely by saying that the money would be found in the lapse and that would completely undermine the intention of Rule 30 making it utterly meaningless, and therefore, I think that your ruling is a good one and I would urge the membership to sustain it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Senator DiBella.

SENATOR DIBELLA:

Before the vote, would you clarify the vote no is

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000572
38
aak

supporting the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

That is correct. The vote yes would be in favor of Senator Robertson, a vote no would support the Chair. Senator Robertson.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Yes, Madam President. It is difficult to explain budgetary process in a matter of a couple of minutes, but I think what you are seeing in the written note, though you haven't seen it, by suggesting that if you are losing \$34 million in revenue there is one way to counterbalance that in a budget. My suggestion is you cut spending and this hour at night after being here since 4 o'clock waiting for the Majority Party to call us into Session, some 8 1/2 hours later, my suggestion very simply is you add it to the lapse, you force the Administration to find \$34 million. I won't cite you the number of times the O'Neill Administration did it but they did it on at least four occasions in just the last five years. It is the most legitimate way, in an emergency situation, a late night situation, it's the most legitimate way.

Maybe the Administration is incapable of finding \$34 million worth of cuts, but certainly any rightminded individuals would be able to find it.

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000573

39
aak

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Senator Genuario.

SENATOR GENUARIO:

Thank you, Madam President. I would speak in support of the motion to overrule the Chair's ruling and the reason is twofold. First of all it seems to me that the quality of the writing which supports the amendment, the underlying amendment goes to the issue of whether the amendment should pass, but not the Point of Order. It seems to me that a writing having been tendered with a legitimate explanation certainly in the proponents mind as to where that money can be raised, that the procedural rule, the procedural rule has been met. If there are those that wish to challenge the substance of the explanation as to where the funds will be generated then that is proper for debate on the substance of the amendment, indeed. By tendering the writing, Senator Robertson has explained at least in support of his position where those funds can be made up.

There may be members in this Chamber that disagree with that method of the making up of those funds, and that is the proper subject of debate on the substance of the motion. I believe as far as the procedural

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000574
40
aak

question is concerned, however, that the Point of Order is not well taken, that Rule 30 has been satisfied and that there ought to be a vote on the motion. I would also cite to the members of the Chamber, Ruling 120 in our rule book which a similar motion was made and indeed not when a writing was tendered but that an explanation was given that the revenue reduction would be considered in the next year's budget, Fauliso, April 29, 1987, a rule that the amendment was in order and overruled the Point of Order challenging the amendment.

While that one dealt with a fiscal note, as opposed to the specific issue in Rule 30, I think the analysis is similar and would suggest that it would support an overruling of the Chair's finding in this case. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Senator Fleming.

SENATOR FLEMING:

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Speaking...I guess I would have a question of the Chair just so I am sure what the ruling in fact was. If that is permissible, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

You certainly may, Senator Fleming.

SENATOR FLEMING:

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000575

41
aak

My question is when I read Rule 30, it says as Senator Genuario has pointed out that an explanation in writing must be available. The rule does not address the merits of what might be contained in that writing. I would point out that Rule 30 also mentions that in addition to a fiscal note you must have in writing an explanation of the expenditures or increases in revenues. My concern in this and the reason I would like a clarification is to exactly what the ruling is from the Chair is that I don't think that this Chamber wants to get into the issue of addressing the content of either a fiscal note or of something submitted in writing in compliance with Rule 30 for an explanation of expenditures or increase in revenues.

Many times around this Circle people will disagree on what is in a fiscal note, but if you have a fiscal note you comply with the rule. It is not a question of what the fiscal note says. I think this is the same case, so my question to the Chair, to the President, would be, is it a question of whether or not there is something in writing here before the Circle or is the Chair questioning the content of what was included in that document submitted by Senator Robertson.

THE CHAIR:

I think, Senator Fleming, in response to your

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000576
42
aak

question, I interpret this Rule to mean that there has to be some sort of a scheme set forward either as to expenditures or the loss of revenues, because otherwise you would not have this requirement on an amendment and whether or not if the source is coming from lapses or whether it is coming from someplace else, the fact that you have the Rule and the language in the Rule indicates to me a demand for some sort of scheme or depth of explanation of the source of that and a one line statement saying that it was going to come from a lapse account in a year where a budget situation is so incredibly fragile in terms of the revenues being raised and the needs of the State for additional revenue that to toss it all with one sentence. Whether it is lapses or whether it comes from some other account, I have no argument about it, I am not here for that, but I think that this Chamber is entitled to a much fuller explanation of what the source or loss of revenues are in Senator Robertson's amendment and that is the basis for my ruling.

Are there any other remarks or comments on Senator Robertson's motion to overturn the ruling of the Chair?
Senator Freedman.

SENATOR FREEDMAN:

Yes, Madam President, if I understood what you said

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

43
aak

correctly, you are taking issue with what is being written on the piece of paper as opposed to the piece of paper being there with something written on it? I thought the Rule said there had to be an explanation. He has given an explanation and do I misunderstand you that that explanation because it doesn't meet certain criteria then defaults the Rule?

THE CHAIR:

I believe that it is not a satisfactory explanation in terms of how I interpret Rule 30. Are there any further remarks? Any further comments on Senator Robertson's motion to overrule the ruling of the Chair? Are there any further comments? If not, the Chair would exercise its own request and own privilege to ask the Clerk to make the necessary announcement for a roll call vote.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. The issue before the Chamber is a motion by Senator Robertson to overrule the Chair's ruling as regards Rule 30. A vote

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

44 000578
aak

yes would be in effect to overrule, a vote no would be
to sustain the Chair. The machine is on. You may
record your vote. Have all Senators voted that wish to
vote? Have all Senators voted that wish to vote? The
machine is closed.

The result of the vote.

16 Yea

20 Nay

0 Absent

The Chair is sustained.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, there are no further amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. You now have before you
HB8015. Are there any remarks now on the underlying
bill? Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Madam President, I think most members of the Circle
are familiar with the bill based on what appears to be
a series that attempted to undo a number of sections,
but very briefly, this bill enacts a number of revenue
gains and cost savings through the establishment of new
fees and increases...through establishing a number of
new fees and increasing certain other existing fees,
eliminating reimbursements for expenses for members of

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

45
aak

health related licensing and examining boards. As previously mentioned, increasing towns' contributions to the cost of resident state troopers from 60% to 70% beginning in FY93.

It creates a Consumer Protection Enforcement Fund or places the Well Drilling Board with the Plumbing and Piping Board, it requires the Office of Policy and Management and the Department of Public Works to study procedures for meeting agencies' facility needs. It creates a Board of Trustees for the Department of Veterans' Affairs, abolishes the Commandants position at the Veteran's Home and Hospital and allows rather than requires qualified veterans to be admitted to the Veterans Home and Hospital.

It requires a commission on Hospitals and Health Care, it requires the Commission on Hospitals and Health Care regulations dealing with the schedule for reviewing hospitals' certificates of need and requires a Sheriff's Advisory Board to establish minimum qualifications for courthouse security personnel. Places restrictions on computer purchases unless they comply with statewide agency plans. It eliminates a requirement that the Connecticut Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission pay to transport intoxicated people who cannot pay the hospital for treatment and makes changes

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000580
46
aak

in the Workers Comp Reform law passed in the Regular Session.

House "A" corrected an inconsistency in the effective date. House "B" deletes provisions transferring regulation of family day care centers from the Department of Human Resources, to the Department of Health Services.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Harper. Would anyone else wish to remark on HB8015? Are there any further remarks? Any further remarks on HB8015? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you please make the necessary announcement for immediate roll call.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. The issue before the Chamber is HB8015. The machine is in. You may record your vote. Have all Senators voted that wish to vote? Have all Senators voted that wish to vote? The machine is closed.

The result of the vote.

WEDNESDAY
September 4, 1991

000581
47
aak

31 Yea
5 Nay
0 Absent

The bill is passed.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Disagreeing Actions from the House, Emergency Certified SB2012, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, ETC. The Senate passed the bill which was passed in the House and the House amended it with House Amendment Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Thank you, Madam President. I would move re-adoption of this bill, this time in concurrence with House Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Would you wish to proceed further?

SENATOR HARPER:

The bill has been previously explained in this Chamber. I would simply note that House Amendment "A" makes provisions dealing with the Teachers' Health

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB8015 PAID June Sp. sess 1991

House 1664 - 1684 (21)

SENATE 540 - 581 (42)



63p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2012