

Connecticut Public Acts

1999	June SpSec PA#2	HB 7501
Sen:	4131-4149	19
Use	7125-7168	44
Comm:	0	63p.

Pages from the Hearings and Proceedings of the Connecticut General Assembly
relating to a specific public act

Connecticut State Library
2012

S-440

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1999

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

President Pro Tempore, Sen. Sullivan
Speaker of the House, Rep. Lyons

Transmitted under JT Rules.

End of Senate Agenda #2

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Is there further comment on
Senator Jepsen's motion in regard to the Senate Agenda?

Senator Jepsen.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would ask that the
Clerk, at this time, call the only item on Senate Agenda
No. 2. It's the Emergency Certified Bill, HB7501.

THE CLERK:

Emergency Certified Bill HB7501, AN ACT CONCERNING
EXPENDITURES FOR THE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move the Emergency
Certified Bill and urge its adoption.

SEN. JEPSEN:

kmg

29

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

Thank you. Will you remark? Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Clerk has an amendment. It's LCO-20004.

THE CLERK:

LCO-20004, which will be designated Senate Amendment Schedule A. It is offered by Senator Harp of the 10th district, et al.

SEN. HARP:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment eliminates a provision in the bill which would have allowed disbursement of tobacco settlement funds for "such other disbursements or transfers as may be authorized by the General Assembly."

Further, it changes the amount to be disbursed from the settlement fund to the tobacco and health trust fund, from at least fifteen percent of the total funds received in current year from the settlement agreement to \$20 million.

Additionally, it authorized the disbursement of \$5 million in fiscal year 2000 to a tobacco grant account within the Office of Policy and Management. These funds will be non-lapsing and will continue to be available for the expenditure in fiscal year 2001. The secretary of the Office of Policy and Management in consultation

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

with members of the legislature, will make grants from these funds to reduce tobacco abuse through prevention, education, cessation treatment, enforcement, and health needs programming.

I urge your adoption of this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

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

SEN. SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise to support the amendment and offer some explanation in terms of process to my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats in the Circle.

Earlier today the House asked us to take this bill up. At that time it appeared that some, how shall we say, House Republican smoke had gotten in their eyes. And we have been working all day to try to address some of the road blocks that were thrown in the way of the original legislation that was before the House, and is now before the Senate.

While I support this amendment, and express my appreciation to all those who worked on it, particularly Senator Harp and Senator Genuario, I would be remiss in not sharing my concern that we are essentially postponing today, a longer and more important debate

about the future of the tobacco money awarded to the state of Connecticut.

But for the objections that arose this morning among House Republicans, we would be here today authorizing the ability to have legislators and others decide how best to invest these funds in health, safety, prevention, treatment, cessation, and enforcement programs.

That is not a possibility today. What is a possibility, because it's all we have been able to work out, is at least the promise, at least the promise that \$5 million, when the money flows to the state of Connecticut will be immediately available.

Not for a trust fund. Not for a slush fund. Not to be sat on for another year. But to be made available to the many people throughout this state who are ready, willing and able to wisely spend these funds in hoping and helping to reduce the problems of tobacco addiction, and ill health in Connecticut.

Five million dollars, out of three hundred, is a small number. We do have to remember we took action during the regular session to appropriate, thanks to Senator Crisco and Senator Harp, a substantial amount of appropriation directly to these programs. So let's not lose sight of that.

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

We do know that we are creating a trust fund of some \$40 million over the next two years. So let's not lose sight of that. But let's not also forget that our work is only half done.

It is up to this legislature to come back next session, and not only see what good we have done with the \$5 million that is made available, but demand, and pass meaningful legislation that will direct that trust fund both as to earning and principle, and direct the other balance of funds, to the needs of the people of the state of Connecticut, rather than have us sit on it and not see it be used for the purposes for which this state and other states fought so well.

This is not a perfect solution. But it is a solution. It allows us to go forward today. And last, let me repeat again, my appreciation to Senator Genuario, who with me, and then with the leadership of both House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, was at least able to snatch a solution out of what is otherwise been a bad day.

We should have done this this morning. The House should have been able to do this this morning. The objections raised this morning, should have been raised over the weekend and last week when a bipartisan work group worked on this legislation.

I'm sorry that those objections were not raised until too late today. But at least we have been able to come together. And at this point, do something, and we ought to do that, and now get out of here as quickly as possible.

THE CHAIR:

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

SEN. GENUARIO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I also rise to urge support of this amendment. I wasn't going to comment on it, but I would like to remark briefly on at least our perspective as to the process, and why we are here by virtue of an amendment.

It appeared to some of us in both the House and the Senate that the legislation combined with an amendment that was proposed earlier this morning, would have given the trustees of the proposed trust fund, the ability not only to spend interest and income from that trust fund on the purposes intended for tobacco prevention and tobacco cessation.

But also to invade principle of up to twenty-five percent of the fund. Now, I remind the Circle that this is a trust fund that will have contributions made to it over the course of some twenty to twenty-five years.

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

And there will be a time when that trust fund may well have up to five hundred or \$600 million in it.

Or could possibly have that much money in it. The result of the legislation before us this morning would have been to allow non-elected representatives to propose, by way of a block grant, admittedly subject to veto by certain committees of the legislature, though not the legislature as a whole, to spend upwards of \$125 million somewhere down the road with virtually no accountability.

To our mind, that was not an acceptable decision to be made at the last minute this morning. Or even if it was discussed a few days ago, on a few days thought. I completely agree with Senator Sullivan that this is only the beginning.

And we have a very significant process to go through next year. And that process will include, if we choose to set up a trust, the powers of the trustee, and the standards by which the trustees must govern themselves.

There may, in fact, be a different standard for the invasion of principal than for the expenditure of interest. It may well be that there is a proposal before us at this point hypothetically in which we want to engage in a three-year campaign that is going to cost

a certain amount of money.

And that we are happy to allow principal to be used for, but we may not want to abdicate the responsibility of the elective legislature for all time, to make decisions in the first instance as to how to spend very, very substantial amounts of money.

And make no mistake about it, that over the course of twenty years there will be very, very substantial amounts of money in this trust fund. And it should be spent for the purposes that have been enumerated by Senator Sullivan.

But the issue to a large extent, who is going to make those decisions. To what extent those decisions will be controlled. Under what situations trustees, or who ever is charge of those funds will be able to invade principal. And to what extent principal shall be invaded.

Also keeping in mind our efforts this year to keep an overall level of state funding for programs under control, the issue of what expenditures will be counted towards our constitutional cap on spending, is a significant one that needs to be debated.

These are all very, very complicated issues. And in my view, and in the view of many in my caucus, they were not thoroughly debated this year. And we were

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

asked to vote on a bill without what we considered to be a thorough enough debate that would have put, and asked to vote on a bill that would have set legislation in place for twenty years down the road.

I believe this legislature will grapple with those issues, and will make the right decision, and will allocate this money for the purposes that we have discussed, and are discussing here today, next year.

But under proper procedures and proper controls that give due deference to the right of the taxpayers of the state of Connecticut, and the fiscal watch dogs of the state of Connecticut, as well.

And I'm very, very pleased about that. I am also very pleased that notwithstanding the need to take time in setting up that process, if you will, the constitution of this new board of trustees.

Or the bylaws of this new board of directors, defining their powers. I am also very pleased, and thank Senator Sullivan, as well as Senator Harp, that while we wrestle with that process, we are not depriving those who would want to immediately start on anti-tobacco programs from doing so.

The amendment before us that we have all agreed to, allows for virtually the same amount of money for the next fiscal year to be available to those who would have

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

used it under the original bill, in the same time frame that they would have received it under the original bill.

So the process of us taking some time today, the results of us taking some time today is as follows. Those who would like to propose and present programs to combat the use of tobacco, for particularly tobacco amongst our children, will be able to do so with the same amount of resources, and the same, within the same time frame as they would have always been able to do that.

But those of us who were concerned about the process for the next twenty years will also be able to take the time to set that up correctly. This is a good amendment. It could not have happened without Senator Sullivan's cooperation. Speaker Lyon's cooperation.

Minority Leader Ward's cooperation. Senator Eads' cooperation, and that of many, many others, as well as our staff. I'm happy to support it. It's the right thing to do. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SEN. ANISKOVICH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I too,

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

rise to support the amendment. And would like for the record to make it plain to the members of this Circle, and to the members downstairs, why many of us in the Circle believe we are here for very positive reasons acting on this amendment.

While I would associate myself with most of the remarks of Senator Sullivan and Senator Genuario, I would take exception to the suggestion that somehow objections thrown in the way or road blocks thrown in the way by one caucus, the House Republican caucus, is the sole reason that we are here debating this amendment.

I would suggest to the members of the Circle, and to those downstairs that if this was merely road blocks put up by one of the three caucuses, we wouldn't have to do an amendment.

But I would suspect that the objections that were lodged this morning by many in this Chamber and downstairs, led to a reevaluation of where we were with respect to this issue, of how and to what extent these funds would be spent.

And to that extent we have an amendment before us because it was determined by all four caucuses that changes needed to be made. Otherwise, we wouldn't be here discussing this amendment. Mr. President, I

believe that this amendment preserves to the full General Assembly, the full committee process, the full public hearing process, and the scrutiny that attends to that, the decision of whether and to what extent we will spend this money.

And most importantly, how we will spend it on particular anti-tobacco abuse programs that might be put in place in this state. And it's for those very positive reasons, for the full light of day must shine on this issue.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the appropriations process this year was the extent to which this tobacco money, before it was even certain that we would get any of it, was already gobbled up by an Appropriations Committee process with little regard to the issue of anti-tobacco prevention programs in this state.

And I think that next session, when the full committee process, with the benefit of input from the public, and allowing both chambers to act intelligently, rationally, and in a time of deliberation, will produce better programs for all of the good public policy goals that we share.

And to suggest that we are here doing something other than that, I think is a disservice to the programs

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

themselves, and to this process. I support the amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Sullivan, for the second time.

SEN. SULLIVAN:

Thank you, for the second time. Only one clarification. I do appreciate Senator Aniskovich's objections to the budget that was presented by the Governor. And the budget that was ultimately adopted by the Appropriations Committee.

Which, in large measure followed the recommendations made by the Governor to substantially spend tobacco money on anything but tobacco programs. It is to the Appropriations Committee's credit that it did take action to direct more of those funds than the Governor had into tobacco cessation prevention, and health related programs.

THE CHAIR:

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

SEN. CRISCO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I support the amendment. In regards to the Appropriation Committee process, I believe on a bipartisan basis, we added to the

Governor's recommendation, and tried to use every single dollar we could that was health related, with a health related purpose.

And, perhaps it's the wrong month, but I don't believe it's Thanksgiving time where we're gobbling up appropriations. It was done in a most appropriate and thoughtful way. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Crisco. Is there additional discussion on the amendment? Will you remark further? If not, we'll try your minds. All in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

All opposed nay? Thank you. The aye's have it. The amendment is adopted. Back on the bill as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule A. Is there further discussion on the amendment, or on the bill as amended?

Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just to give you a very short overview of the bill as amended. This bill implements certain aspects of the Public Health Department's budget. It prorates \$300,000 for one year

only to local health departments. It distributes \$200,000 in funding for dental clinics.

It allocates \$350,000 to the Department of Public Health for Saint Francis Hospital, and Yale New Haven Children's Hospital for programs for sexually assaulted children. It licenses nail technicians in the next fiscal year, and grandfatheres acupuncturists and marriage and family counselors.

It prohibits body piercing of minors without parental consent. It updates the Department's policy regarding maintaining the purity and adequacy of the public drinking water.

And makes other technical changes to our drinking water statutes. It increases from ten to thirty, the number of needles and syringes that can be exchanged at one time. It allows the Department of Social Services to raise the income guidelines for the Connecticut Aids Drug Assistance Program.

It expands the role of the Office of Child Advocate. It makes the child fatality review panel members permanent. It asks the Department of Public Health to conduct a study on prostate screening for the uninsured.

It asks the Department to train medical providers, give them HIV training. It, as well, makes routine and

universal the testing of pregnant women for HIV. It creates a pediatric AIDS registry.

It develops a pool for acute hospitals, a loan program pool. And it makes our pharmaceuticals a year 2000 compliant. It establishes a new serious sexual offender prosecution, and increases penalties for those convicted of sexual offenses.

And with that, I would urge that your support of this bill, it is very comprehensive. It hits on many public health issues through all the departments that are overseen by that subcommittee. And I urge your support.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Harp. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Sullivan.

SEN. SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just quickly to commend one on the Circle who has taken a leadership role in having a section included in here which I don't know that Senator Harp had an opportunity to point out.

Our friend, Senator Nickerson, mindful of the terror that occurred last year in the streets of Greenwich, when out-of-towner's came to buy Powerball tickets, has responded with strength and vision by having Section 10 included, which will allow the

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

declaration of a Powerball emergency and certain steps to be taken at the state level to deal with that.

I think this is wonderful. Not since the blitz has such a problem been faced by a community in this world.

And to paraphrase the prime minister of England at the time, never have so many, done so much for so few.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sullivan. Will you remark further? Senator Nickerson.

SEN. NICKERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm delighted to have an opportunity. I thought I might have to miss. This bill is the perfect reciprocal of the Regional Assets bill.

You may recall the Regional Assets bill suffered from the defect that it was a program without funding, i.e., a car without gas. Today we have the perfect reciprocal. We have funded the tobacco health trust fund, but there is no trust fund. So we have gas without a car. I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Nickerson. Will you remark further? Senator Freedman.

SEN. FREEDMAN:

Yes, I just wanted the record to note, on the Powerball part of this amendment. We have worked

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

carefully to make sure that when one sector of the county closes down, the whole county won't be impacted at one time.

I believe it's for a twenty-four hour period only. And I think that needs to be made clear for residents who could be impacted by this. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Freedman. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, the Clerk will 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? Have all the members voted? Have all members voted? Please check to make sure if your vote has been properly cast. Machine will be closed and the Clerk will take a tally. Clerk, please announce the tally. .

THE CLERK:

Motion is on passage of Emergency Certified Bill HB7501, as amended.

kmg

46

Senate

Monday, June 14, 1999

Total Number Voting	24
Those voting Yea	23
Those voting Nay	1
Those absent and not voting	12

THE CHAIR:

The bill is passed. Senator Jepsen.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move for immediate transmittal of this item to the House of Representatives.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, it will be so ordered. Senator Jepsen.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Mr. President, this concludes the business on our Calendar today. I understand Senator LeBeau may have a point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SEN. LEBEAU:

Madam President, you certainly have changed. Good to see you there, Senator Looney. I was -- point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, please proceed, sir.

NO. 818 COMMENTARY HOUSE PROCEEDINGS 1999
VOLUME 20 PART 20 JUNE SPECIAL SESSION WETO SESSION 7083-7184

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**

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

THE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Clerk has in his possession Senate Amendment LCO 20004. Would the Clerk please call?

SPEAKER LYONS:

And would you care to summarize, Madam?

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

And I request permission to summarize.

SPEAKER LYONS:

The Clerk has in his possession LCO 20004. Would the Clerk please call? The lady has asked leave of the Chamber to summarize.

CLERK:

LCO Number 20004, designated Senate "A" offered by Senator Sullivan and Representative Pudlin, et al.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This amendment is compromised language worked on by all four caucuses concerning a number of concerns about the issues

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

concerning the settlement of the establishment of the tobacco trust fund.

It creates a tobacco settlement fund which is a separate non-lapsing fund and also asks the Treasurer to invest \$20 million a year in the Tobacco and Health Trust Fund.

I move acceptance of the amendment.

SPEAKER LYONS:

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the amendment. Would you remark? Would you remark on the amendment that is before us?

Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the amendment and I think I would be remiss if I didn't share a little history of how we got here this evening on this amendment.

As you recall, this bill was before us on Wednesday evening at a few minutes before midnight. When the bill was before us at a few minutes before midnight, it had in it funds for a tobacco trust fund. And it was precisely that, a trust fund that the Council then set up to administer the trust could not expend the principle of that trust, but could only expend on an annual basis, the income of the trust except in any year

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

that no additional principle was added they could only spend half of that income.

Madam Speaker, I've been accused by the Senate President of having smoke in my eyes. I'm pleased to report to the Chamber that the smoke is not so thick that I can't tell when a bill changes from Wednesday night at midnight until Sunday afternoon when I read the revised draft and I don't feel bad about raising the issue of the change in the trust fund because I think the trust fund is a critical issue facing this state.

What we have before us is an amendment that restores or at least leaves for another day a serious discussion about how the trust fund will be operated.

The language that was before us that, in fact, I raised concerns about when I reviewed the bill, raised them this morning and raised them in my own mind when I read it for the first time Sunday afternoon and again Sunday evening to be sure I understood it, would have allowed 100% of the principle of the trust fund to be spent every single year.

Now, I would ask you, has anybody ever heard of a trust fund that's intended or authorized to be fully dissipated in any one year? Is that a responsible way to deal with the very serious issue of children smoking? Or is the concept of a trust fund the way to deal with

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

it which says you spend the income?

I don't think any of us think that in a year or two the problem of young people beginning to smoke and then adopting it as a lifelong habit, will go away. If we thought that spending \$30 million in each of the next two years that problem goes away, then I think we would all vote to do that in a fair and open process.

I doubt anybody really believes that that's what happens. But, in fact, believes that it would be an ongoing and continuing educational process.

This amendment starts us down that road. This amendment says that we can authorize the expenditure of \$5 million as it arrives from the tobacco settlement funds in the first year of the biennium, that all of the remaining money gets set aside into a trust fund.

It's oddly missing some language. It doesn't say how you spend any of the money out of the trust fund because, in fact, no mechanism is being set forward.

I, and I am sure many others, would have just as soon worked that out today. In fact, we would have just as soon passed the language that was in the amendment on Wednesday evening on this issue.

The leadership on the democratic side upstairs said no, that was too much to take up today and way too much to talk about. That's fine. We're prepared to work in

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

agreement to defer that decision until next year.

But I think it is important to state that least for myself and I think for a majority, overwhelming if not unanimous majority of my caucus, the sense that trust funds ought to be honest and ought to be there and not allowed to have the principle spent quickly and then dissipated and then gone.

And so that I support this amendment because it does just that. It puts money in place for programs to start under a little but cumbersome mechanism and a little bit odd that it's a combination of 14 legislators in cooperation with the Secretary of OPM. I'm sure that we will be able to work cooperatively, but it's a little bit -- it sounds like compromise language from a special session. It doesn't sound like the usual way that we do things.

But I do support it as a way to make sure that first \$5 million as it comes in gets going and I do support the fact that we set the rest of the funds in the trust fund and stand ready and able to work as we have in the past on many issues with people on both sides of the aisle to determine how best to spend it.

But I did think it was important to set forward a few minutes even though I know we're all anxious to be done with this special session as we were anxious the

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

other night, to have people understand because I think a lot of the rank and file, maybe a dozen, understand just what the discussions earlier were.

And what I'm saying to you from my perspective is an abiding belief that we not allow trust funds to be dissipated in the very bill that creates them. Then simply don't call it a trust fund. Just say we're appropriating it and the money is gone.

This compromise is much better than the bill that was before us on our desk this morning in the e-cert bill and I strongly support the amendment although I would have been happy to support the version that was here late Wednesday evening when it came to the tobacco issue.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

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

Representative Flaherty.

REP. FLAHERTY: (68TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I'd like to rise also in support of this amendment.

I think when we all got here, those of us who didn't have the chance, probably a majority of this

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Chamber. I would dare say a majority of the Senate not having had an opportunity to pick up the bill or see it over the weekend, probably expected a very quick and most of the people in this building, we'll have a quick session, we'll take up the bills that were left on Wednesday night, acknowledging, perhaps, there would a change in one or two of them, but then we push them through pretty much as they were presented to us.

And it was amazing. We looked through the bill, we realized there was brand new language regarding how this trust fund, as Representative Ward very capably stated, could be sapped and could be drained with no limits at all, as least as it was presented to us and I understand that in our effort to try and ask those questions, I will tell you, some of the discussion were like, oh, my God, did you know - it was already starting. The republicans were stopping this and we were somehow trying to suggest that this money and these programs were not worthwhile. And I think what you see today is a recognition in this legislation by all parties that some changes needed to be made.

What is a trust fund? The trust fund is something you set up that guarantees a future payment, that guarantees that money will be there in the future.

It isn't something like all the other funds we set

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

up and that we spend. The beneficiaries of this trust fund will be the people of the State of Connecticut. We, in this action, are their trustees.

And I feel very confident, Madam Speaker, with what this legislation will do. It certainly allows \$5 million to be spent in a very quick process and I acknowledge and have had some discussions with some of the advocates out there today that wanted us to do more of that in the budget. I can understand that.

But at least what we're doing now is not getting into setting a precedent by depleting a trust fund as we're setting it up. A trust, again, is a reliance on future payment. That's what this is. It is unlike other financial instruments that we've set up and I'm at least pleased today that so if there are future trust funds settled or dealt with by future legislatures, if we can at least resolve this next year, I believe it was said upstairs that there was bad news that we delayed until the next session the mechanism for how this fund is going to be used. I sense it's certainly good news compared to the file that was on our desks, Madam Speaker. And I think that we'll all be well served.

When we get back in next year and we have the discussions on how this -- I think we're already hearing a preview of pretty much what some of the concerns are

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

in this building and it isn't just on this side of the aisle of how we treat these trust funds.

If God forbid something happens to endanger this money coming from the tobacco companies, don't you think it makes sense to hold onto that principle? Don' you think it makes sense to do that? I certainly do. I think most of the members of this Chamber do and I think this amendment will do that.

I certainly urge its support and thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

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

Representative Nardello.

REP. NARDELLO: (89TH)

Madam Speaker, I rise to support the amendment, but I do want to bring the Chamber's attention to the fact that Section 27 which was in the original language is no longer in the new amendment.

And I have concerns about that because what Section 27 did is it actually established the purpose of the trust fund. And it said that it would support an encourage development of programs to reduce tobacco

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

through prevention and education, that it would support and encourage development of programs to reduce substance abuse, and most importantly, it said it would develop a plan to meet the unmet physical and mental health needs in the State of Connecticut.

I think that many of us have spoken before this Chamber and said that our budget often cuts in those areas. The advocates sitting outside in this room when they are there also know that when we make cuts, we make them in public health.

Having been in this field for almost all of my lifetime, I think that it's time for us to begin to look at planning, health care planning in the State of Connecticut. We have the most opportune moment to do it now that we're going to have these monies before us and I think that when we go onto this next year that all of us must make the commitment to say that monies will not be expended without a plan.

So, I bring the Chamber's attention to that and I do hope it will be considered in the discussions next year.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, Madam.

Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Representative Dillon.

gmh

E4

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, just a housekeeping matter. I believe I moved acceptance and not adoption of the amendment. And I want to clarify the language.

Second, I want to thank the members of the minority. No one in this Chamber has made any accusations about anyone and I guess I want to simultaneously agree with the Minority, unless Representative Nardello, having some pride in the language that was struck and some disappointment in the ways things happened, but believing firmly in the good will of the members of this Chamber and occasionally the other, as well.

And wishing to -- and believing strongly in representative democracy, the process is what matters.

The mission of this trust is as important as clearly the fiduciary. I've always been anxious that some of the companies will go into Chapter 11 and those dollars will not be there. So all of that -- I'm very sympathetic to.

I'd like to thank all the people of good will, but I would particularly like to thank the Speaker whose leadership really got at us in terms of focusing on what the mission of this trust should be. And on the issues

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

involving health care and her skills in working with all the parties involved.

Thank you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, Representative Dillon.

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I didn't mean to speak after Representative Dillon, but I couldn't get your attention.

Just to ask her a brief question here for legislative intent. Through you, Madam Speaker if I could to Representative Dillon. In terms of the grant program beginning on line 25, is it correct to assume that grants may be made to non-profit entities as well as to public agencies?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I'm sorry, which line are you talking about?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

The grant program beginning on line 25, may these grants be made to non-profit entities as well as to public agencies?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Through you, Madam Speaker. The language is silent on that matter. And I assume that that decision would be made by the individuals who are named in that section.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

If I could. Then is it correct to assume that the language of that section does not preclude grants from being made to non-profit entities?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I see no language that would preclude such grants.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

gmh

57

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

Thank you very much. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to fully concur, for the first time this week, with Representative Nardello with my displeasure to Section 28 coming out of the bill.

I believe not only Section 28 coming out of the bill doesn't start the planning process so that when this money arrives, hopefully, next June, that it is well planned and spent in an appropriate place.

But I believe, as of five o'clock last Friday, everybody had agreed to that language, at least to the best of my recollection and the room was four caucuses, as well as representatives of the Governor's office that those things would be put in place.

And through you, Madam Speaker, if I could ask a question of Representative Dillon.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to Representative Dillon. Understanding the trust fund issues that came up since early this morning and maybe late yesterday, are you aware of what the need is to delete Section 28 which is not a funding mechanism, but is only the establishment of a plan?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Are you asking me to try to intuit the motives of the framers of the amendment in the Senate?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Through you, Madam Speaker. No.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Madam Speaker, if the lady could please repeat her answer. I wasn't able to hear it.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon, if you would care to repeat your answer.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. No.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Does that mean the lady would not want to answer the question or doesn't have an answer?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon, do you care to answer?

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe that it was clear that I didn't think that it would be appropriate or were I capable of intuiting all the motives of any members of any chamber.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

I can now certainly understand that answer,
Representative Dillon.

Through you, Madam Speaker. Section, I guess, 27 of
the current language before us, in that plan, to the
best of your recollection, Representative Dillon, was
that all agreed upon by four caucuses as well as the
Governor's office about five o'clock on Friday
afternoon?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe that we
understood what we had agreed on, but apparently there
were some muddy waters.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Did somebody have a bad
weekend?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon, do you care to answer?

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I assume that's a

gmh

61

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

rhetorical question and I appreciate all of your help on this bill, Representative Cleary.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Thank you, Representative Dillon. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to speak in favor of the amendment because I think that for today's session it is the best we are going to get. I certainly think the plan could have been left in place even if the funding mechanism was not. But I guess in this Chamber at this time of day we do not have a choice.

So I would speak in favor of the amendment.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Do you care to remark further?

Representative Widlitz.

REP. WIDLITZ: (98TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the proponent of the amendment, a question, please.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please frame your question, Madam.

REP. WIDLITZ: (98TH)

Just for legislative intent, in Section 69, subsection (b) there is a reference to special

gnh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

obligation revenue bonds of the City of Meriden for construction of a water line. There is a very long sentence beginning on -- oh, I am sorry. I withdraw the question. This is on the underlying bill.

I apologize.

SPEAKER LYONS:

That's alright, Madam.

Would you care to remark on the amendment that is in front of us?

Representative Eberle.

REP. EBERLE: (15TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. As Chair of the Public Health Committee I would like to express my strong support for the amendment and to say that I think that we probably wouldn't have been here as long today if it weren't for some of the frustration that this is all the money in the tobacco settlement that we currently know that is being earmarked for public health needs.

And while I understand that that was necessary for this budget biennium, I would hope that for future bienniums, we take a hard look, not just at what's being set aside for the trust fund and I agree with the distinguished Minority Leader, trust funds need to be set in trust and principle protected so that they are there in perpetuity for the future, as well as the

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

present.

We do need a discussion and a debate over what our public health policy in the State needs to be -- over what our public health plan needs to be and I think that there needs to be an ongoing discussion as to the use of some of these monies for that in the future.

This biennium, the money was needed and we did what we needed to do with it. I would hope that in the future we can look for something more than just 15% and that we can move forward on a number of fronts, but it needs to be with the plan and we need to engage in that discussion as soon as possible.

So, I join with Representative Cleary and Representative Nardello in saying that of all the pieces we go forward with, I hope the planning piece is the first and that will engender some support and some understanding of what the public health needs in this state are and the impact we could have on many other areas of the budget if we stepped up and addressed those in a planned, thoughtful, directed way.

And I support the amendment and I urge its adoption and I want to thank you for your leadership on this because the discussion wouldn't be on the table at all, I think if you hadn't placed it there and asked us to work on drafting language for the trust fund that would

gmh

64

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

clearly direct it to tobacco prevention cessation and other public health needs and I thank you for that, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, Representative Eberle.

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

If not, let me try your minds.

All 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?
Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?

Representative Newton.

REP. NEWTON: (124TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. A question to the proponent of the amendment on Section 10.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. NEWTON: (124TH)

That talks about the lotto, the Connecticut

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Powerball. And I raise this concern because this Legislature just passed profiling and passed some laws in this General Assembly and what I'm afraid is that this is sort of redlining in my estimate of excluding people from buying Powerball tickets.

A question, probably, through you, Madam Speaker to the proponent of this bill. Is the State of Connecticut right now in a compact with other states and does this put us in jeopardy with dollars that we have as a compact with other states to participate in this Powerball?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Through you, Madam Speaker. My understanding is that we are in a compact with other states. On the question of any judgment I might apply on jeopardy questions, I would defer, if you would, to the Chair of the Public Safety Committee.

SPEAKER LYONS:

I believe a question has -- are you yielding -

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Would you grant me permission to yield to the Chair of the Public Safety Committee?

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dargan, I believe the lady has yielded to you for a response to a question. Do you care to accept the yield?

REP. DARGAN: (115TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. In reference to the question, through you, Madam Speaker, with other states. We are in a compact agreement, but if I could further the explanation about Section 10.

The State of Connecticut now, through the Connecticut Lottery Corporation, has initiated a Powerball auction alert when Powerballs get above \$100 million within the Powerball--within the states that are active with that.

Within the State of Connecticut, on our borders, there were problems in the past when Powerball went above \$100 million. Right now this week, if anybody would like to buy a ticket in the State of Connecticut, it will be over \$60 million and if that winning ticket is within the State of Connecticut we will also increase revenue for the State of Connecticut to help with what Representative Nardello talked about in the public health to fund those different committees.

So, you can't win if you don't play, as they say, but the Connecticut Lottery Corporation has worked very

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

closely with DOT, with the tri-states, with New York and New Jersey when the lotto gets up to that amount and there was a problem with our bordering states and hopefully that will be alleviated as we move forward with those increased lottos that go on with a number of states that are active.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir. Representative Newton, you have the floor, sir.

REP. NEWTON: (124TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. One more question. Could you explain to me what a public threat to health and safety could be by people purchasing Powerball tickets? What was in the thought of that?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Newton, are you posing that question to Representative Dargan?

REP. NEWTON: (124TH)

Yes, Ma'am.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dargan.

REP. DARGAN: (115TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you. In the past when Powerball did go over the \$100 million mark,

gmh

68

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

communities on our borders were pressed with public safety as far as what was going on within the local communities as far as traffic that was going on within those respective communities.

So, what the Connecticut Lottery Corporation has told people now at Grand Central Station, do not stop at the borders. Do not stop at Greenwich. Come up to Stamford. Come up to Bridgeport to buy your tickets and they're also using this as a tourism tool when these lotteries are about that \$100 million to also not just buy a ticket within the State of Connecticut, but to visit our state and spend money here.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Newton, you still have the floor, sir.

REP. NEWTON: (124TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just raised those questions because I hope that this is not a way to keep certain people out of certain towns in this state. I just hope that that's not what this is because if that is, then we set a bad precedent in this state if we outlaw certain people from coming across the borders to our towns and to our cities.

So I would hope that that's not what this is.

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?

Representative Beamon.

REP. BEAMON: (72ND)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. With regards to Section 10 again, this only deals exactly with a Powerball game. So a few questions, through you, to, if I may direct my questions to our esteemed chairman of our Public Safety Committee, Representative Dargan.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dargan, I believe Representative Beamon is posing a question. Please proceed with your question, sir.

REP. BEAMON: (72ND)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. As serious as this matter is because it is our public policy to sell lottery tickets, and not just one specific game, through you, Madam Speaker, would there be any time for which our Classic Lotto would reach \$100 million?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dargan.

REP. DARGAN: (115TH)

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Through you, Madam Speaker. Not that I have any statistical evidence that says that cannot happen, but it might happen. So I really don't have the answer for that. What I can say is that there's more play within our lottery system when the value of that prize increases, such as this week with Powerball which will be in the vicinity of over \$60 million. There should be a lot more activity in that prize compared to the normal \$1 million to \$3 million prizes.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Beamon.

REP. BEAMON: (72ND)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. But the question was, would Classic Lotto, which they changed from Wild Card Lotto, now the Classic Lotto, reach \$100 million? If it reached \$100 million, which is quite unlikely, but if it did, first of all that means that we would go many weeks without a winner, but also this would not be enforceable because the way this is crafted, it's only for Powerball and I also don't think that the answer that we got, in terms of the agreement for which our state enjoins with other states in order just to be a participant in Powerball was answered adequately.

We do not know the amount of money that we put in -

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

- well, I guess we do know the amount of money that we put into participate. However, we're not sure if this will have an effect, an adverse effect on the jackpots which would be allowed through Powerball.

I think it's a very dangerous thing we do here. We paid the City of Greenwich for the overtime and police and other activity for which they had to do in order to sell these tickets.

Now, if they're going to be better marketing as I heard earlier, well, I would think the Department of the Connecticut Lottery Corporation would take some ads out in New York City newspapers to show them to come to Waterbury and buy tickets or to come up to Bridgeport, Naugatuck, or Beacon Falls over in Danbury. We have a great state that has many entrances to it. And if individuals do not want to shop in the border towns in New York, they shouldn't go there, they should go other places and I think Representative Newton is right on target. Is this going to have an affect that only some people will be allowed to purchase tickets in a community? That's nerve racking. The thought of it.

I thought we were in this business of gaming to make money. Now, according to OFA, the \$26 million that comes through our Powerball into our state coffers, that's not including subsidiary or ancillary benefits

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

that towns receive from restaurants, from attractions, and now we're saying, well guess what, folks, we should close that down. We should not have this because some chief elected official may deem an emergency.

I always thought emergencies had flashing lights and police cars and fire engines. I don't see how buying a ticket constitutes an emergency in this very small state.

I really think this should not be here. It's not fair and on top of it, I just don't think it's right. I don't think it's right. It makes no sense that now we can allow chief executives from municipalities to just automatically say because something has reached an artificial level of \$100 million that now we don't want people in our city.

What happens if it reaches \$80 million? It doesn't apply, but the same people could come in. I think it's wrong. It should not be here. This should be debated under our regular rules and not here in emergency certified because this is not an emergency.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?
Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?

Representative Widlitz.

REP. WIDLITZ: (98TH)

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a quick question to the proponent of the amendment, please.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please frame your question, Madam.

REP. WIDLITZ: (98TH)

In section 69 of the bill, subsection (b) it refers to special obligation revenue bonds of the City of Meriden for the construction of a water line. In a run on sentence that begins in line 2091, "The City of Meriden shall not be obligated to pay...it goes down to - the lines I'm concerned about, lines 2097 through 2100, "and furthermore shall protect, defend, and hold harmless the State, its agencies, departments, agents, and employees from and against any and all suits, actions, demands, costs and damages."

Just for clarification, Madam Speaker, I would like to make sure that this only refers to the fiscal obligation for the revenue bonds and does not refer to any diversion permits or any actions of any state agencies that do not specifically relate to the fiscal responsibility.

Thank you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Widlitz, if I may, perhaps it would be best to redirect your question to Representative

gmh

74

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Altobello who I believe would be able to answer it.

So, if you would, Madam, redirect your question.

REP. WIDLITZ: (98TH)

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

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, Madam.

Representative Altobello.

REP. ALTOBELLO: (82ND)

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It is indeed true that everything that the former speaker said is true, but just for a little bit of clarification. I think that the City of Meriden is in no way, in no way, shape or how asking for the State of Connecticut to back them up on this particular Section 69.

What we have here or what I had here and I wish to call because of the short time, I did not, was I would just like to read this into the record, if I may and what I would like to say is, "The State of Connecticut shall not be obligated to pay any of the principle of or of the interest on said bonds" and I would hope that that would satisfy the Chamber that the City of Meriden is a stand alone on this issue and that we are not, at all, looking to the State for any - not only compensation or re-compensation or anything else and I

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

would - through you, Madam Chair, I would hope that would satisfy the lady's question.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir your legislative intent.

Representative Widlitz.

REP. WIDLITZ: (98TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to clarify that it is only the fiscal responsibility that this section deals with and not permits that might issued by state agencies such as the Department of Environmental Protection for diversion or something to that nature.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Altobello.

REP. ALTOBELLO: (82ND)

Through you, Madam Speaker. That is my understanding and I believe that to be correct.

Thank you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Widlitz.

REP. WIDLITZ: (98TH)

Thank you very much.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, Madam.

Will you remark further on the amendment or on the

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

bill as amended?

Representative Tonucci.

REP. TONUCCI: (104TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I know everyone wants to go home and I will be extremely brief here. There are two sections I just wanted to speak on very briefly.

The first section is Section 2. And Section 2 has to do with the Lyme Disease and I worked hard with that with some of the patients from my area and also with Representative Landino, Representative Murphy and Representative Orefice and of course, if it wasn't for Jim Amann, it would have never come out of the Insurance Committee, but Mary Eberle, also the Chairman of Public Health who helped me so much with this and the section here on page 2 just adds that somebody with Lyme Disease could also go out-of-state if they deem -- if it deems necessary and it may seem like a trivial thing in the bill, but it's very important to Lyme Disease patients that they can go out-of-state if that's the case.

And in addition to last week, last week we added instead of just being a board certified rumathologist, we also added it effects disease or a specialist or a neurologist.

So again, that's very important to me and I thank

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

the people who helped with that.

One other section was on page 39, 38, excuse me, 38 and 39. This little section, although it may seem trivial, is extremely important. Again, Mary Eberle helped me with this and this was a concern also of Representative Len Greene and Representative Klarides. This came up from a woman and her husband that live in the City of Derby. It just says, "a provider shall notify a patient of any test results in the provider's possession that indicates a need for further treatment or a diagnosis." Again, it doesn't sound like much, but what that is saying is that in case a doctor does have a test result from a patient that needs further treatment, then he or she, the doctor, the provider is responsible for telling the patient. In the past sometimes this hasn't happened.

I have a constituent in Derby that was a patient of a doctor. Had a liver test done and the test -- the husband and the wife asked how the test result was on the husband and the doctor said that the test result was fine.

Well, twelve years later when the patient decided to change insurance companies, the new doctor needed the test results. When he checked the test results, of course, the former doctor didn't want to give up the

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

test results, but when the new doctor reviewed them he saw that the patient had cirrhosis of the liver. He had liver cancer. It was unrelated to alcohol and he had this cancer for twelve years.

So, if the doctor had told him, if this was in the bill, that was legislation before, this would have never happened.

Unfortunately, the fellow passed away three years later from the liver disease.

I can see from the chamber that everybody has probably had enough and wants to go home so I will cut it short here, but I just want to thank you for those two sections of the bill.

Thank you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir for your comments.

Will you remark further? Representative Tulisano.

REP. TULISANO: (29TH)

Madam Speaker, just for the record, I want to focus on Sections 48, 49, and 50. In my opinion, inappropriate in a budget implentor especially when we struck out the parts that implemented the budget and only putting sentencing provisions in this bill right now.

And for those reasons alone, I will vote not.

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir, for your comments.

Will you remark further? Representative Lawlor.

REP. LAWLOR: (99TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to say that to some extent I concur with Representative Tulisano. It is unorthodox to put substantive criminal law in the budget.

However, I think it is important to emphasize that (a) this proposal has been fully debated in the committee process was a bill that had made the full circuit, but more importantly, it's a bill that had grown out of earlier requests from this Chamber both on the Megan's Law discussion and on the civil commitment discussion to make it easier for prosecutors to identify and sentence serious sexual predators to long term commitment rather than have it done after the fact. And although it is unusual that we're implementing part of the budget that was removed from the budget with this language, hopefully next year the money to do the appropriate screening of sex offenders to really allow this language to have full effect will be included in next year's budget.

I urge adoption - I would urge passage of the bill notwithstanding the fact the money is not in the budget,

gmh

80

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

but hopefully next year we will have it in there.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir, for your remarks.

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Having gotten through the Senate amendment, I would like to speak in favor of the bill that's before us. It has a lot of things that a lot of folks have negotiated over the last week in good faith and as many bills that passed the Public Health Committee unanimously, that just weren't going to quite make the call on Wednesday night, and I think there's a lot of good things in there for the public health of the State of Connecticut and I would hope we would have the Chamber's support.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further? Representative Kerensky.

REP. KERENSKY: (14TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question to the proponent of the bill.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please frame your question, Madam.

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

REP. KERENSKY: (14TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you. In section 42 of the bill, I notice that we are now transferring some money to help Gulf War veterans. The Legislature, two years ago, created the Persian Gulf War Information and Relief Commission. This group has been up and running and has now completed some work that it needed to do without funding and is now ready to go forward with funding.

So, I thank the proponent of the bill for including this group in funding and for legislative intent would just like to clarify that the purpose of this money would be to fund the Persian Gulf War Information and Relief Commission to help them carry out their duties?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92ND)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, that is the intent of this language. It's encompassed in this language and it will be referenced in the budget document and thank you for asking to reassure all of us who want to help the veterans of the Gulf War.

Thank you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Representative Kerensky.

REP. KERENSKY: (14TH)

Thank you very much.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, Madam.

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?

Will you remark further? If not, Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Also clearly on the bill to support the bill, as amended to tell you that I think it is a good bill and although anybody can have a problem with any one part, that, in fact, it implements a number of important parts of our budget.

And just very briefly on process. Perhaps and let me say before doing that, to thank Representative Dillon for her work on this bill, both late in the regular session or during the regular session including very late on the regular session and today.

And for you, Madam Speaker, who helped try to work this out today.

Let me indicate that several years ago the custom started that we would take a lot of budget implementing bills and roll them into a big one or into two or three big ones. And I will suggest to you that perhaps some of the misunderstanding today is attributed to us

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

following that pattern that started a couple of years ago where I would say 6, or 7 or 8 years ago budget implementing bills kind of went one at a time and I was as much a participant as anybody else. So it's not meant as criticism, but merely an observation that perhaps to the extent we have implementors next session's budget modifications that the old method and not the method of the last five or six years where most implementors stand by themselves, might avoid those kinds of misunderstandings so that we don't have nights where the bill is too long to understand at the end despite a lot of hard work by a lot of people or special session days where we struggle to determine what was agreed to by a few people in a room.

That aside, let me say that what is before us, I think is a good product and represents significant efforts on people of both sides of the aisle to fairly and honestly implement a budget that passed this Chamber nearly unanimously.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further?

Representative Pudlin.

REP. PUDLIN: (24TH)

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few brief words about the bill before us, perhaps about the amendment that proceeded it. Perhaps about the special session and maybe the full session.

I've learned from Representative Dillon and others in the last several hours that sometimes we change things for the better and sometimes we change things for the worse and sometimes we change things and change things and in the end, they may not be better, but they are changed.

We have been through a great deal today in recent hours. Perhaps the work that could have been in two or three minutes at the end of session and perhaps more deliberately should take place over a full session as many of these questions will in the year to come.

I share with many the disappointment that the crisis of - the cancer that has generated from smoking and the particular -- the problems of youth who are beginning to smoke cigarettes were not adequately addressed in our work this year. In this session and in the special session.

But I think that in the deliberative process that we'll be returning to in February, we've all become more keenly aware than ever of the necessity of taking very substantive and meaningful steps and I look forward to

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

that part of the process.

Madam Speaker, I thank you very much for your influence and for what you've brought to us in this special session that has brought to conclusion some very, very good work and hopefully, not too much silliness.

And so with that, I suggest that we all vote for a very good bill and a very good session.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?
Would you remark?

If not, would staff and guests please come to the Well. Would members take their 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 members voted? If all members have voted, please check the machine to make sure your vote is properly recorded.

The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

gmh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 14, 1999

The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

E-cert House Bill 7501, as amended by Senate
Amendment Schedule "A" in concurrence with the Senate

Total Number Voting	115
Necessary for Passage	58
Those voting Yea	111
Those voting Nay	4
Those absent and not Voting	36

SPEAKER LYONS:

The bill, as amended passes.

Are there any announcements or points of personal privilege?

Representative Currey.

REP. CURREY: (10TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. For the purposes of an announcement.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please proceed, Madam.

REP. CURREY: (10TH)

I would like the Chamber to join me today, this evening in congratulating Deputy Speaker Wade Hyslop on his birthday.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Happy birthday to you. Happy birthday to you. Happy