

S-440

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1999

VOL. 42
PART 12
JUNE SPECIAL
SESSION
VETO SESSION
3809-4166

kmg

9 004112

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed nay? The aye's have it. The Resolution is adopted. Senator Jepsen.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Thank you, Madam President. From page 2, Emergency Certified Bills. I would ask that the Clerk call SB2001.

THE CLERK:

Emergency Certified Bill SB2001, AN ACT
IMPLEMENTING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS
ACT FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30, 2001. Introduced
by Senator Sullivan of the 5th district, et al.
Emergency Certification is accompanied by Emergency
Certification signed by Kevin B. Sullivan, President Pro
Tempore of the Senate, Moira Lyons, Speaker of the House
of Representatives.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jepsen.

SEN. JEPSEN:

I think it is Senator Crisco who will bring this bill out. But I believe that Senator Freedman has a

kmg

10 004113

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

special message.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Crisco, or Senator Freedman, excuse me.

Senator Freedman.

SEN. CRISCO:

I yield to Senator Freedman.

SEN. FREEDMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. I will exempt myself under rule 15.

THE CHAIR:

The Journal will so note. Senator Crisco.

SEN. CRISCO:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move for passage of SB2001.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage, will you remark?

SEN. CRISCO:

Yes, Madam President. I believe, before I summarize, that the Clerk has Amendment No. 13085. I'd like to call that amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on LCO-13085, which will be designated Senate Amendment Schedule A. It is offered by Senator Sullivan of the 5th district, et al.

THE CHAIR:

kmg

11 004114

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

Senator Crisco.

SEN. CRISCO:

Yes, Madam President. This simply deletes Section 22 of SB2001. And I move its adoption and request a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption of Senate Amendment A.

Will you remark?

SEN. CRISCO:

Yes, Madam President. I stated, just remove Section 22.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption. Will you remark? Senator Genuario.

SEN. GENUARIO:

Thank you, Madam President. Section 22 of this implementer was a provision which would delay the paying of interest on collective bargaining unit arbitration awards, until the time those awards were approved by the General Assembly.

Since those awards, sometimes those awards are issued during the interim, and they're not approved till many months later. There is a difference in the amount of interest that would be due, depending upon whether Section 22 is included in the bill, or whether Section

kmg

12 004115

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

22 is omitted.

To give you an example of the amount of money we're talking about, in 1997 approximately \$190,000 was spent in interest. I think it is fair to say, and there may be legitimate disagreements as to whether Section 22 is good, or is bad.

I think it is fair to say that a vote in favor of this amendment is a vote that favors the collective bargaining units of this state. And a vote that is disfavorable, or unfavorable to the general taxpayers of this state.

A vote against this amendment would be a vote that would be in favor of the general taxpayers of this state. And would be disfavorable to the collective bargaining units.

Madam President, I believe that the amendment should be defeated, and this Section 22, should be included in the overall bill, which will have a savings to the general taxpayers of somewhere in the are of twenty-two to \$190,000 per year.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? Senator Crisco.

SEN. CRISCO:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I

kmg

13 004116

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

have the utmost respect for the opinion of my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, and I wish to thank him for enlightening the Circle in regards to the different perspectives in regards to this amendment.

It was an issue that was discussed fully in the Appropriations Committee. And the Appropriations Committee decided not to pursue this matter. So, I would ask for approval of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

If not, would the Clerk please announce a roll call vote. The machine will be open.

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:

Have all members voted? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked. Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Motion is on adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule A, LCO-13085.

Total Number Voting

31

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

Those voting Yea	18
Those voting Nay	13
Those absent and not voting	5

THE CHAIR:

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

SEN. CRISCO:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the SB2001, otherwise known as the OPM Implementer, was before us last Wednesday. There have been some changes.

Some deletions. Because several passages of the bill were previously adopted in legislation.

There are some technical amendments, and some additions. And, I move for its passage, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further? Senator Gaffey.

SEN. GAFFEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of the bill. And in particular would like to comment on Section 18 of the bill, which provides more funding for our vocational technical high schools, and also for our open-choice interdistrict program.

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

These are two programs that, goes without saying, how important they are to our state's educational system, our vocational technical high schools. Now with this addition, for this session, have done very, very well.

Considering the fact that they now will be placed under the regular school construction list from the state Department of Education. They have had appropriated in the budget that was adopted additional positions for teaching.

This now adds another \$150,000 for personal service agreements where they could hire even more teachers. And under the interdistrict choice program, this bill allocates additional funding over and above what had been agreed to during the budget adoption.

And it's something that I worked on very hard with Senator Herlihy, and Senator Sullivan. And I'm very glad to see it in the bill, Madam President, and would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further?
Senator Peters.

SEN. PETERS:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for a point of legislative intent. Through you to the good Senator of

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

the Appropriations Committee. In Section 24, the section that addresses the Tourism Council, says that the Tourism Council can review the tourism districts' budgets.

Does this section, in any way to your knowledge Senator, change the current law which simply, or does it just simply codify the existing practice?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Crisco.

SEN. CRISCO:

Thank you, Madam President. Through you to Senator Peters, that is correct. It does not change, it just codifies existing language.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Peters.

SEN. PETERS:

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you for that response, Senator Crisco. Just simply before I sit down, I'd like to applaud Senator Crisco and all those that have worked on this.

There are certainly areas of this particular implementing budget that I am strongly in favor of. I am happy to hear the remarks about the funding for the votech school. That was a concern of mine earlier in this session as well.

Delighted to see the Pequot funding language that speaks to the Ledyard issues, and the jobs language speaking to the Fort Trumbull project. And once again, I want to thank the Senator, and I strongly support this proposal.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? If not, would the Clerk please announce a -- excuse me. Senator Prague.

SEN. PRAGUE:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, just briefly. I want to say through you to Senator Gaffey, how happy I am that some money was put back in for the votech schools. I think the votech system is our best magnet school system.

And I was happy to see that some of that money that was cut was put back. I'm also happy to see that some of the money for the state library was put back. So all in all, things look pretty good in this implementer bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator Bozek.

SEN. BOZEK:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this

kmg

18

004121

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

particular time period, today, setting aside this special appropriations that we're going to act on today, is one of those areas that summarizes the frustration that we have here with regard to, there's a few good things, and there's a few poor things, that face some of us here.

In my situation, there's definitely a few items on this bill that if I had the magic wand, I would not place them on here. They're the types of things that, unfortunately, sneak their way on.

They get on this particular rider because of the influence. They're unable to get their way through the system. And what happens is, at the last minute, okay, they're placed on just similar to we had last December when we placed the football stadium in here.

It didn't go through anywhere. It couldn't make it anywhere, so it went on. Having said that, I want people to understand that when these particular things occur, they happen, they're disappointing to us as legislators.

And sometime they're most often, of course, they're out of our control or reach. We just don't have that leverage and control. But I want to stand up amongst all the items that were on here that I'm quite satisfied that are here, are the added improvements, as had been

kmg

19 004122

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

stated by my colleagues, for the vocational technical schools.

A number of us up here are very strong supporters of votech education, and what it portends for a lot of our state residents and youngsters who have ambitions of trying to succeed in some trade.

I dare say that the votech education system itself, could be improved. And by way of bills that I supported this year, unfortunately, didn't make it, will lack that particular improvement.

And I want to add that within votech I did have the support of votech educators and directors. Hopefully in the future, what we see this year having been approved for vocational technical schools, along with what was done in the prior budget, that we will see the improvement and necessary help that will guide us in underwriting a stronger foundation and system for vocational educational schools.

I just want to reiterate, restate that so that the public, who may hear us, those of us who are in the Circle here will here it mentioned a number of times. It's so very important in this area of our educational climate to support the vocational technical schools in our state, because they help our students, not only our regular students, and our middle class, our lower

kmg

20 004123

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

middle-class students who not only, but who largely, who participate in these programs, they do successfully underwrite youngsters who go through these schools, find jobs.

And many of them become entrepreneurs and businessmen. So, let me restate the positive side of one of the items on here, which is Section 18. And hopefully, into the future when vocational technical school issues arise and go forward, that we will have some support to strengthen them in the future. Thank you, very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? If not, would the Clerk please announce a roll call vote. The machine will be open.

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:

Have all members voted? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked. Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

kmg

21

004124

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

Motion is on passage of SB2001, as amended.

Total Number Voting	31
Those voting Yea	31
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	5

THE CHAIR:

The bill is passed. Senator Crisco, my apologies.

I believe you were standing, sir, and I called the roll call vote and could recognize you once the roll call had been entered.

SEN. CRISCO:

Thank you, Madam President. I guess that's the result of being only five-six.

THE CHAIR:

No, actually it's the result of having a lot of other people standing right around you, and I didn't see you, sir.

SEN. CRISCO:

Madam President, just for the purpose of legislative correctness. In the bill there are references to the current session. And, really, it should read, to the regular session. Just for legislative correctness. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Senator Jepsen.

H-818 CONNECTICUT GEN. ASSEMBLY HOUSE PROCEEDINGS 1999
VOL. 42 PART 20 JUNE SPECIAL SESSION VETO SESSION 7083-7184

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

CLERK:

The Emergency Certified Bill Number 2001, AN ACT IMPLEMENTING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30, 2001. Introduced by Senator Sullivan and Representative Lyons.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Shawn Johnston. You have the floor, sir.

REP. JOHNSTON: (51ST)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I move passage of the e-cert emergency certified bill before us in concurrence with the Senate.

SPEAKER LYONS:

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

REP. JOHNSTON: (51ST)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. What we have before us, Madam Speaker, is what we commonly refer as the OPM implementer bill. I'm going to give a very brief summary and overview of the bill and then I'm going to move into the Senate Amendment that's been adopted and after adopting that, I will go into further detail on the bill.

This bill, Madam Speaker, clarifies language in associated statutes to conform to our budget the we had

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

previously adopted this week. It makes many technical changes to statutes. It makes revisions to the budget agreement that both sides of the aisle and both houses of the Chamber have agreed upon.

It is certainly a compromise amendment to fully implement the budget. And at this point, Madam Speaker, the Clerk has in his possession, LCO Number 13085, previously designated Senate Amendment "A".

May he call and I be allowed to summarize?

SPEAKER LYONS:

The Clerk has in his possession LCO 13085. Would the Clerk please call and the gentleman has asked leave to summarize.

CLERK:

LCO Number 13085, Senate Amendment Schedule "A"
offered by Senator Sullivan and Representative Lyons.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Johnston.

REP. JOHNSTON: (51ST)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the amendment before us strikes Section 2 in its entirety and renumbers the document in accordance.

Section 22 - my correction, Madam Speaker - strike Section 22.

Basically by striking Section 22, Madam Speaker, we

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

are keeping in place what has been current policy in this state to pay interest on awards and I would move that now is not the time and the place to make this change to policy at this moment and I would move for adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER LYONS:

The question before the Chamber is on adoption. Will you remark? Will you remark on the amendment that is before us?

If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?

Representative Johnston.

REP. JOHNSTON: (51ST)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the bill before us, as amended by the Senate has 50 provisions. I certainly am not going to bore the Chamber walking through each section throughout the bill, but I would like to highlight on some of the areas in a quick overview.

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

In Section 2 we allow state agencies to accept payments for licenses by credit or debit card.

In Section 3 we have the language that goes along with the additional \$50 million that we've added to the Mashantucket Pequot Fund to maintain that fund going back to our municipalities at \$135 million.

In Sections 8 and 9 we require the Secretary of the State to use money as provided in the budget to convert campaign finance statements to an electronic format. And to make these statements available on the internet.

In Sections 11 and 12 we codify the money that we've added to the pilot program which would raise the reimbursement levels to each of our municipalities and this is a pilot for state property and also the pilot for colleges and hospitals.

In Section 15 we allow the Treasurer's office to be -- we make the Treasurer's office responsible for the debt service for our CHEFA bonds. We are just transferring this from the Department of Social Services to its more appropriate place for debt service to be paid and that's through the Treasurer who has the expertise.

In Section 18 we make minor revisions to the budget including putting back \$350,000 in each year of the biennium for the statewide data program, Statewide Data

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Base Program in our State Library which was an inadvertent mistake when putting the document together.

We add \$300,000 in fiscal year 2000 and \$250,000 in fiscal year 2001 to the Conservation Fund for environmental conservation programs.

And we move \$300,000 in fiscal year 2000 to be used as follows: For \$150,000 for receiving towns in the Choice Program. We feel that this will provide an extra incentive for receiving towns and it will also tie into the transportation piece of the Choice Program that we've been trying to bring cost under control and I think due to many advocates in this Chamber on behalf of the vo-tech system, we have a slight bit of movement adding \$150,000 back into personal services for vo-tech system and I would like to thank Vinnie Tonucci for some of his loud yelling on this matter and I think he brought our attention to it and I certainly think it's a worthwhile change.

In Section 19 we provide additional flexibility in the LOCEP funding. Our new LOCEP dollars going back to our communities and one of the areas with this new flexibility would allow for computers in our public schools if such municipality chooses to avail themselves of this use of the money.

Sections 23 and 24 makes technical changes

regarding the review of tourism district budgets that are presented to the Tourism Council and allows for a review of those budgets and not just a submittal to the Tourism Council.

In Section 33 through Section 35, Madam Speaker, we provide additional funding for one new youth service bureau and we also increase the minimum level of funding for youth service bureaus across the State from \$12,000 to \$14,000.

Sections 38, 39, 40, and 41, Madam Speaker, provides salary increases for Superior Court judges and family support magistrates on April 1st of each year of the biennium.

Sections 42 and 43 allow the Commissioner of the Department of Revenue Services to enter into managed audit agreements. In the future if the managed audit compliance program is successful and significant audit staff resources can be re-directed to other taxes, then an increase in revenue to the State may result from this. And I think it certainly gives the Commissioner added flexibility.

Section 46 implements a provision in the budget by providing an additional \$1 million as included in our budget for the Circuit Breaker Program.

Section 49 concerns a reporting requirement for the

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Teachers' Retirement Board to report back to the General Assembly and the Office of Policy and Management when they have implemented a change.

And Section 50 simply makes the State troubadour a biennial position.

And I move for its adoption, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Eberle.

REP. EBERLE: (15TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would request permission to leave the Chamber during discussion and vote on this issue because of a potential conflict.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, Madam. The Journal will so note.

Will you remark on the explanation of the bill that is before us? Will you remark?

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, just for the record. There's a scribner's correction. I would just like to note. It's on line 1389. I know we talked about this last week, but it should indicate the 1999 regular session rather than the current session of the General Assembly.

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

I have talked to LCO about it and they will make that correction at the appropriate time.

Just while I'm standing here, there is a little bit of everything in this particular bill. I just wondered, I don't know how many -- we know a cat has nine lives. I'm not sure how many lives a troubadour has. It's been in and out more times than I have fingers.

But I guess at this point here we are after the regular session is over finishing up and the gentleman did summarize a number of sections here. I think he kind of passed over a few others that perhaps more relate to the finance side that are in here and I just want to indicate that I do plan on supporting it even though there are a couple of things in here that I don't care for and I'm sure that probably the same thing applies for many other members, but this is the compromise that is before us.

Thank you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

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

Representative Beamon.

REP. BEAMON: (72ND)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. To echo Representative

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Belden's concern that many sections were skipped in Representative Johnston's overview of the bill, Section 47 also was not mentioned and in Section 47 there is a call for a non-binding referendum by municipalities in order to assess how they will choose their local legislative body.

This is here for a few reasons. One reason why it's here is that the former chairman of our Charter Revision Commission in Waterbury, Marc Ryan who is now the Secretary of OPM insisted that this provision be put into language in some way to allow the City of Waterbury to deal with this issue.

Madam Speaker and members of the House, as other members have had an opportunity to be very expressive about issue which were a concern to them, this issue here is a very large concern to many of the constituents who happen to be African American within my district in the City of Waterbury.

So, I would like to discuss this a little bit because it reminds me a little bit of the time when we had Jim Crowe laws and I know I'm not saying this to be very demonstrative. I'm saying this because over the last 20 years there have been many, many efforts by the African American community to put this on the ballot to either vote it up or vote it down.

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

And if I had my drothers I would rather see the Charter Revision Commission in the City of Waterbury come with a charge to go directly on the ballot to vote this issue up or down. But for some strange reason, despite all the work of many community organizations and individuals, this has never reached the voters of our city.

But this is, as Representative Belden mentioned, a compromise. And so even though the Clerk has an amendment LCO 12095, which would call for the City of Waterbury or any other municipality to delete the word "non" and just have a binding referendum, I will not call that amendment and the main reason why I will not call it is it's because the City of Waterbury could do this anyway.

But there again, for some strange reason, they won't do it.

Over the weekend I watched our last day of session again on the public access channel. And I watched Representative Dyson and his impassioned plea and he said that his grandfather had taught him something and that was the expression, "What's good for the goose is good for the gander." Well, my grandmother taught me an expression, and that expression was, "how many bubbles were there on a bar of soap." I know it may not sound

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

familiar to many of you, but that was one way that Black individuals in the south were denied the opportunity to vote based on literacy tests. Oh, you can answer everything. You could answer how many moons there were going around the sun. How many moons. You can answer that right. You could have a Ph.D. from the old segregated south, but when they wanted to stop you from registering to vote, what they would do is ask you a question, according to my grandmother, God rest her soul, how many bubbles were there in a bar of soap.

So what they would do is they would tell each other the answer, 505. And the registrar in the south would say, it's 507.

So the answer was wrong. Then the next individuals would walk in and they would answer 507. And they would say it was wrong.

Do you know what's wrong here today is that this community has asked for this so many times and when our editorial department of The Waterbury Republican says that if you pass aldermen by district, Waterbury's local government would be like Washington, D.C., but one thing the editorial writer did not write was the fact that at that time the City Council in the District of Columbia's president was caucasian. And it wasn't until we took the so-called Black face off this issue that citizens in

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Waterbury started to listen to various individuals who were coming to the Charter Revision meetings.

And I did not want to speak on this issue back in Waterbury, but today it's here in front of this house. And it's important for all of us to know the legislative intent of what we do.

This says "may". In line 1341 - 42. It says a municipality may do this. But I understand what "may" really means because if you look -- last week, last Thursday's Waterbury newspaper, there were two articles about this issue. One was that we would have a non-binding referendum coming by way of a Senate amendment and the other article in the Waterbury paper addressed the fact that in 1997 the Charter Revision Commission approve the elimination of the Comptroller's office for the City of Waterbury and in that approval, gave some guidelines to the Board of Aldermen to come back with a plan to implement a new finance director within the city. Nobody throughout the whole city was asked to go to a public hearing, to public hearing, to public hearing, five public hearings, but they asked our Black community and other members to come to five different public hearings to talk about aldermen by district.

I think that's wrong. Again, the bar was changed. How many bubbles in a bar of soap? Same analogy again.

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

And today, I am supposed to stand here and accept this because you will accept anything. We're getting toward the issue now. We're getting close to this. We may put this -- we may put this on the ballot for you. Nothing in this amendment nor this language says the City of Waterbury will institute aldermen by district or a referendum period. Be it binding or non-binding.

In addition, what good is a non-binding referendum because to me "non" means no or we have nothing else to do with it. It's nothing but a public opinion poll at taxpayers' expense and I don't think that's right and I will tell my members of this house and those who are watching today, yes, I am a proponent of aldermen by district, but I also would like to see this issue - just vote it up or vote it down.

What will non-binding give the residents of the City of Waterbury who went to the meetings? What will it give them? Tell me, what will it do?

All it will do is say guess what, Waterbury couldn't do it so the Legislature could. We're telling you now you have an opportunity to vote for non-binding referendum. By the way, and Madam Speaker, because of that if I may ask a question, through you to the proponent.

SPEAKER LYONS:

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. BEAMON: (72ND)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Line 1342. I know we heard this a little bit last year at this time when we heard about a word "it". What "it" meant. But through you, Madam Speaker, the word "may" through you to Representative Johnston, basically what does that mean?

Through you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Johnston.

REP. JOHNSTON: (51ST)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I do not have a dictionary definition of "may" in front of me, but I think as we use in this Chamber quite often, there is a big difference between the word "shall" and the word "may" and I think the word "may" connote allowing. It means enabling. It means permitting.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Beamon.

REP. BEAMON: (72ND)

Thank you and I thank Representative Johnston for his honest answer because all this is doing here is allowing the City of Waterbury, with no safeguards, to implement a non-binding referendum. I know that's very

gmh

31

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

important to implement this budget today, very important.

I guess there are a few ways of looking at this. One way is everything is alright, that government can, despite all this running around, despite all this dog and pony show throughout our city, that government will take care of your concerns. Oh yes, we will. We'll take care of your concerns, Waterburyians. We'll do that for you. We're going to give you a public opinion poll at taxpayers' expense which will not even begin to answer the question of why we should have this type of government or why we should not have this type of government.

That's the reason why I will not call my amendment because I do feel that Secretary Ryan and some of the members of the charter revision commission, not just one, but commissions over the years really felt that they wanted to see this go either up or either go down.

And I really, really would like to think, Secretary Ryan, while he's in the room for at least addressing this issue to our African American community and Waterbury at large. Because this has been back and forth and back and forth for over 20 years.

There is nothing in this proposed statute that will say the City of Waterbury will adopt this. Now, we've

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

got a lot of individuals who are saying if this passes, the City of Waterbury will initiate a non-binding referendum this November. We had that. It's been promised. And by faith, once again, we're probably going to prove this.

And then those politicians in Waterbury, democrats and republicans who see this as a threat may stop again and pull the soap a little more and get another bubble on that soap. Because there's nothing that says that they shall do this. This is the closest in 20 years that our community has come to getting this legitimized on the ballot. And it's just a shame that it has to come to this Chamber, to this house, in order to deal with this because those five public hearings and those letters to the editor and all those talk shows and cable t.v. shows all that meant was that's very nice that you gave us this opportunity to speak. That you gave us an opportunity to participate in government. Oh, it was great, but now I understand why people don't vote the way they should vote because you led them around and by leading them around, giving them a sense of false hope again, how many more bubbles in the bar of soap, then you're going to figure out well, gee, we shouldn't even do this. Or how will we implement this?

I blame both the parties today. I really do. And

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

I'm not proud of it, but I blame of them because there's never been an issue in our city for which people were told they had to show public support in order to get it on the charter revision. For them to say yes or no, never. And it was only because of the activism in the African American community, my district, that individuals started talking about this issue.

I wrote an editorial in 1976 just asking the question. I almost lost my job. I was working for the Mayor of the City of Waterbury who was a democrat and he said, "we don't want that in Waterbury. No aldermen by district. We don't want that and if you write that, that might be a denial of my first amendment rights."

So I wrote the editorial anyway. That at least we should be able to look into it and yes, Madam Speaker, I'm impassioned about this issue because I do not like seeing our citizens, those who want to participate in the system in some way being led astray.

All of us are elected from districts. We're not elected at large. I am not going to debate that. That's what makes this Chamber so great that we're all different. And that we all come from different areas. Nothing made me feel better than a couple of Saturdays ago when we had almost a meta-noa day here as we discussed racial profiling. For those of you who don't

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

know what meta-noa means, it's a Greek word. It means reflection. We reflected how we felt about each other. The love we had for each other. The passion that we have for each other. And nothing was more illustrated of that than yesterday when Representative Tom Conway could have been home with his brand new granddaughter, could have been home with his brand new granddaughter, but he came to a Black church with me and he stood with me as we sang hallelujah together. Why is that important today? What does that mean for what we're doing today?

What's important about that is that we had an opportunity to participate in the system and when there's a flaw in the system, when something is wrong at its core, we should work to eradicate it.

I apologize to my members of the House that this issue even has to be here today. I apologize. It shows the only individuals that care about this issue are here in Hartford, Secretary Ryan. He cares about this issue even though he doesn't support it. I give him a lot of credit for even bringing it up. He didn't have to do it.

What good is a non-binding referendum? What hope and opportunity does that give to the residents of the City of Waterbury to vote this up or down?

Well, here at twenty after three on the last day. I'm not sure. But I am willing, I am willing, Madam

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Speaker, to give this process a chance.

It reminds me a lot when we were told if you go and fight for the north, you'll be free.

We were told if you fight in World War I, you would be free. And between World War I and World War II, if you fight, you would be free.

You could participate and between World War II and Jim Crowe, we were told you could participate.

I get very -- forget about all the other wars. Hopefully, we were participating. But after the passage of the Civil Rights legislation, we had hoped that we would have an opportunity within our community to vote this up or down. And I really, really say it from the bottom of my heart. I thank Secretary Ryan for the third time for bringing this because they've done everything within this City of Waterbury to kill people's hope, to kill their opportunity to malign those individuals who happen to be African American who brought this issue in front. They did everything.

But just as we survived the middle passage, we will survive this, as well.

We will survive it. And the purpose of legislative intent is to allow those who come after us to see exactly what we meant by what we are about to do. That was the purpose of legislative intent.

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

And I don't intend to vote for this without that stipulation that "may" can become a "shall". If not, we're sending the wrong signals. We're sending false hope, false opportunity and we're basically saying who cares if you come to meetings. Who cares if you write editorials. Who cares, we'll give you a non-binding referendum and guess what, you'd better be thankful you get that because without it, you get nothing. And I think it's wrong.

Madam Speaker, members of the House, I would just like to thank you for allowing me a few moments to discuss this most important issue, this issue of empowerment in my community.

Thank you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Representative Johnston.

REP. JOHNSTON: (51ST)

Madam Speaker, though we may not be any closer to finding the solution to counting bubbles on a bar of soap, we certainly understand the situation in Waterbury all that much clearer and I think that the section that Representative Beamon spoke so passionately about is an indication that we, in this General Assembly in both

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

houses take the situation in Waterbury very seriously. We have acted and we have given the power to Waterbury on this local governance issue.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir, for your remarks.

Representative Jarjura.

REP. JARJURA: (74TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And Madam Speaker, I will be very brief in that this is a parochial issue and don't want to take up too much time from the members.

As many members of this Chamber know, I've had a longstanding passion for referendum and initiative. I've tried to get those rights established in the City of Waterbury. In my four terms I've tried four different times up here to no avail because there's a lot of passion against referendum and initiative rights.

This is something of a different yolk in terms of this is dealing with a - as Representative Beamon said, more of a public opinion poll regarding a specific issue and the issue being whether or not the local governing body, the local legislative body of the City of Waterbury should be elected as it currently is at large, all fifteen members run citywide. I'm not even quite sure what type of ward or district system is going to be

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

proposed, if one will be proposed, depending on the results of the public opinion poll.

But I will say I will support this today. I believe in democracy in action. I believe in the right of people, the citizens, the ones who do the electing to be expressed. I think this is a vehicle for getting the citizens at will expressed in a very formal sense. I can imagine the public channels, the cable channels, the radio, talk shows and the papers will be filled with this issue and I think that's a good thing, Madam Speaker. I think any time we can engage, those of us that are elected -- those of the citizens that are doing the elected and issues of public policy, I think is a very, very good thing.

I, for one, will probably be engaged on the opposite side of my good friend and colleague, Representative Beamon. I think when you begin to divide up a city and elect people by wards, what you do is you begin to divide that city that should speak with one voice. You get very parochial. I'm well aware of the concerns that led this proposal forward and that was minority voice on the Board of Aldermen, but I can tell you that currently we have two out of fifteen, we have a woman African American, a male African American. We have a male Hispanic, Edwin Rodriques, Debby Lewis, Larry

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Butler currently serving on the Board. We've had Gary Franks, the former U.S. Congressman was on the Board of Aldermen. Many people have gotten elected citywide, both minorities and non-minorities.

So I don't want to leave anyone in this chamber with the impression that the City of Waterbury does not get behind and elect minorities.

There is another issue that's going to have to be decided in the City of Waterbury and that is right now we have a guaranteed minority representation. On a 15-member board, 9 are reserved for the majority party and usually the majority party is the party that wins with the Mayor, being a democrat or a republican. And there's a set aside of six seats for the non-majority party and many people feel that that set aside has worked very well to protect the citizens, if you will, a vocal non-majority party watching the majority party at work.

Under this alderman by district proposal, one result could be you could have 15 members of the democratic party, 15 members of the republican party, depending on how they set it up.

But I'm going to end there, Madam Speaker. I understand and respect the passions of Representative Beamon. I know Secretary Ryan has served on our Charter

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Revision Committee and has a lot of passion on this issue. I would just end by saying to the people back home that this issue is not a panacea in my mind, but I am and always have been for the right of the people to be heard and I look forward to the debate back in our city.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on the bill that's before us? Will you remark further?

Representative Mattiello.

REP. MATTIELLO: (65TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I feel compelled to rise to just offer a few comments on Section 19 which is the section extending LOCEP's dollars - availability of those dollars for the purchase of computers and computer software for public schools.

And I do so based on a couple of questions that were directed to me as ranking member of the Education Committee by members of this caucus and what they can advise their superintendent as a result of passage of this particular section.

And let me first say that I was pleased to be part of spreading the word about this and the importance of

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

this. It is logical extension of LOCEP dollars and I think it is going to prove to be very useful to municipalities, but I want to make it clear to members that are listening that this is not a substitute for the bill that we considered in the General Assembly this year which coming out of Appropriations was \$5 million in the first year and \$10 million in the second.

Those are monies going directly to boards of education. If you're familiar with LOCEP, it is a reimbursement program. You should be aware of that, that districts will have to go out and make the purchases first. Secondly, this will be through OPM and going to municipalities.

And so superintendents or the boards of education, you can advise them of the extension under LOCEP, but I would make certain that they understand the process involved and that they will have to work with municipal elected officials.

So again, I just want to make clear that we ought to, as a General Assembly, revisit our investment in technology, but this was a good extension for LOCEP dollars and to the extent that's helpful to members, I appreciate the Chamber's time.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?

Will you remark further?

If not, would staff and guest please come to the Well? Would members take your seats? The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. Members to the Chamber. The House is voting by roll call. Members to the Chamber, please.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Would the members please check the board to make sure that your vote is accurately recorded?

If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Emergency Certified Senate Bill 2001, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A" in concurrence with the Senate

Total Number Voting	134
Necessary for Passage	68
Those voting Yea	134
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	17

gmh

43

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

SPEAKER LYONS:

The bill, as amended passes.

The House will stand at ease for a moment as we await action by the Senate.

(Chamber at ease.)

SPEAKER LYONS:

The chamber will come back order.

Representative Pudlin.

REP. PUDLIN: (24TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, at this time I would make a motion that the House stand in recess.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Without objection, the House stands in recess. The House of Representatives recessed at 3:30 o'clock p.m. to reconvene at the Call of the Chair.)

(The House of Representatives reconvened at 8:30 o'clock p.m., Speaker Lyons in the Chair.)

SPEAKER LYONS:

The House will please come to order. The House will please come to order.

Clerk, please call House Bill Number 7501.

CLERK:

House Bill 7051, AN ACT CONCERNING EXPENDITURES FOR HB 7501