

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

Act Number: 07-198

Bill Number: 1172

Senate Pages: 1447, 1504-1506, 5241-5248

12

House Pages: 6318-6341, 8955-8957

27

Committee: No Hearings

Page Total:

39

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

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2016

S-541

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
2007

VOL. 50
PART 5
1346-1688

jmk

147

Senate

April 25, 2007

Calendar 61, Senate Bill 110, Mr. President, I would move to refer this item to the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SEN. LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Calendar 96, Senate Bill 153, I would move to refer this item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objection, so ordered.

SEN. LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Calendar Page 11, Calendar 98, Senate Bill 1172, Mr. President, I would move to place this item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objection, so ordered.

SEN. LOONEY:

jmk

147

Senate

April 25, 2007

Calendar 61, Senate Bill 110, Mr. President, I would move to refer this item to the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SEN. LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Calendar 96, Senate Bill 153, I would move to refer this item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objection, so ordered.

SEN. LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Calendar Page 11, Calendar 98, Senate Bill 1172, Mr. President, I would move to place this item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objection, so ordered.

SEN. LOONEY:

jmk

204

Senate

April 25, 2007

Calendar 423, House Joint Resolution 145.

Calendar 424, House Joint Resolution 146.

Calendar 426, House Joint Resolution 149.

Calendar Page 9, Calendar 427, House Joint Resolution 150.

Calendar 429, House Joint Resolution 152.

Calendar 430, House Joint Resolution 153.

Calendar Page 10, calendar 433, House Joint Resolution 156.

Calendar Page 11, Calendar 98, Senate Bill 1172.

Calendar Page 15, Calendar 186, Senate Bill 1108.

Calendar Page 16, Calendar 208, House Bill 6392.

Calendar Page 19, Calendar 289, Substitute for Senate Bill 618.

Calendar Page 21, Calendar 338, Substitute for Senate Bill 1287.

Calendar Page 22, Calendar 347, Substitute for Senate Bill 1417.

Calendar Page 23, Calendar 380, House Bill 6952.

jmk

205

Senate

April 25, 2007

Calendar 381, House Bill 7108.

Calendar Page 24, Calendar 387, House Bill 7109.

Calendar 388, House Bill 7127.

Calendar 389, Substitute for House Bill 7265.

Calendar Page 28, Calendar 412, Senate Bill 1454.

Calendar Page 33, Calendar 133, Substitute for
Senate Bill 1102.

Calendar 136, Substitute for Senate Bill 1190.

Calendar Page 34, Calendar 241, Senate Bill 1337.

Calendar page 35, Calendar 254, Substitute for
Senate Bill 1378.

Calendar Page 38, Calendar 317, Substitute for
Senate Bill 1224. Mr. President, I believe that
completes those items previously placed on the first
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Please call the roll call
vote again, please.

THE CLERK:

jmk

206

Senate

April 25, 2007

The Senate is now voting by roll call on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

The Senate is now voting by roll call on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Motion is on adoption of the Consent Calendar.

Total number voting, 35; those necessary for adoption, 18. Those voting "yea", 35; those voting "nay", 0. Those absent and not voting, 1.

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar is adopted. Senator Looney.

SEN. LOONEY:

S-552

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
2007

VOL. 50
PART 16
5071-5415

slr

Senate

June 4, 2007

Hearing and seeing no objections, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar Page 18, Disagreeing Actions, Calendar 98, File 17, Senate Bill 1172, An Act Concerning Wholesale Beer Price Posting and Modifying Beer Packaging for Consumption On and Off Premises, as amended by House Schedule "A", Favorable Report in the Committee on General Law.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Colapietro.

SEN. COLAPIETRO:

Thank you, Mr. President, I move the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill and rejection of House "A", and I would ask for a roll call.

THE CHAIR:

slr

Senate

June 4, 2007

Acting on approval of the bill, will you remark further, Sir? The first motion is on rejection of House "A".

SEN. COLAPIETRO:

I asked for a roll call on that, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

You would like a roll call on that, Sir? Okay. Mr. Clerk, would you please call a roll call. Senator Roraback.

SEN. RORABACK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Speaking in opposition to rejection of House "A", Mr. President, nothing is more complicated than Connecticut Farm Wine, and House "A" is an attempt to clarify some confusing provisions in our laws governing Connecticut-grown wine. It would help a particular vineyard in my district, and I would urge people to oppose the rejection of House "A". Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senate

June 4, 2007

Will you remark further on the rejection of House "A"? If not, Mr. Clerk, please call for a roll call vote. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

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

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

THE CHAIR:

Have all Senators Voted? If all Senators have voted, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Motion is on rejection of House Amendment Schedule "A".

Total number voting, 35; necessary for rejection,
18. Those voting "yea", 23; those voting "nay", 12.
Those absent and not voting, 1.

THE CHAIR:

House "A" is rejected. Senator Colapietro.

SEN. COLAPIETRO:

This bill allows beer manufacturers, wholesalers,
and out-of-state shipper's permittees' to
differentiate in the manner in which their products
are packaged on the basis of offsite consumption, and
to require wholesale postings for beer to be provided
to the retail permittees by the 20th day of each month,
so that they all agreed that this would be easier for
them to post their prices.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Colapietro. Will you remark
further on the bill? Senator Colapietro.

SEN. COLAPIETRO:

slr

103

Senate

June 4, 2007

Thank you, Mr. President. If there is no further objection, I would move this to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing and seeing no objections, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Mr. President, I believe that completes those items previously marked Go. There are a number of items marked Passed Temporarily.

SEN. LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, if the Clerk might call the first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call the roll for the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

slr

104

Senate

June 4, 2007

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

Mr. President, those items previously placed on the first Consent Calendar begin on Calendar Page 4, Calendar 629, Substitute for House Bill 5273.

Calendar 635, House Bill 6893.

Calendar Page 5, Calendar 641, House Bill 7116.

Calendar Page 6, Calendar 649, Substitute for House Bill 6856.

Calendar 651, House Bill 7167.

Calendar Page 10, Calendar 244, Senate Bill 74.

Calendar Page 11, Calendar 320, Substitute for Senate Bill 1396.

Calendar Page 14, Calendar 407, Substitute for Senate Bill 1311.

Calendar Page 15, Calendar 501, Substitute for House Bill 7217.

Calendar 541, Substitute for House Bill 7238.

slr

105

Senate

June 4, 2007

Calendar Page 16, Calendar 561, Substitute for
Senate Bill 1440.

Calendar 575, Substitute for Senate Bill 940.

Calendar Page 17, Calendar 614, Substitute for
House Bill 6209.

Calendar Page 18, Calendar 98, Senate Bill 1172.

Calendar Page 19, Calendar 197, Substitute for
Senate Bill 1315.

Calendar 251, Substitute for Senate Bill 1066.

Calendar Page 20, Calendar 413, Substitute for
Senate Bill 1270.

Calendar 576, Substitute for Senate Bill 977.

Calendar Page 21, Calendar 667, Senate Resolution
70.

Mr. President, that completes those items
previously placed on the first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

If you will please call the roll again, the
machine will be open.

slr

Senate

June 4, 2007

THE CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Have all Senators Voted? If all Senators have voted, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Motion is on adoption of Consent Calendar No. 1.

Total number voting, 36; necessary for adoption, 19. Those voting "yea", 36; those voting "nay", 0. Those absent and not voting, 0.

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar No. 1 passes. Senator Looney.

SEN. LOONEY:

H-1003

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
2007

VOL. 50
PART 20
6281-6629

pat
House of Representatives

214
June 1, 2007

Senate Bill Number 1270, as amended by House
Amendment Schedules "A" and "B", in concurrence
with the Senate.

Total Number Voting	146
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	146
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	5

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The Bill as amended is passed. The House will
stand at ease.

(CHAMBER AT EASE)

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Good afternoon, friends and Members, families and
guests, children of all ages. The House of
Representatives is about to come back in order. Would
the Clerk please return to the Call of the Calendar
and call Calendar Number 496.

CLERK:

On Page 8, Calendar Number 496, Senate Bill
Number 1172, AN ACT CONCERNING WHOLESALE BEER PRICE

pat
House of Representatives

215
June 1, 2007

POSTING AND MODIFYING BEER PACKAGING FOR CONSUMPTION
ON AND OFF PREMISES, Favorable Report of the Committee
on General Law.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Stone of the 9th District, you have
the floor, Sir.

REP. STONE: (9th)

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and good
afternoon to you. I move acceptance of the Joint
Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill
in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of
the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of
the Bill in concurrence with the Senate.

Representative Stone, please proceed.

REP. STONE: (9th)

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Bill
that's before us has been seen before. Last year we,
in the House, passed this Bill almost unanimously, but

pat
House of Representatives

216
June 1, 2007

unfortunately was never taken up by our colleagues in the Senate.

The Bill before us had a full public hearing, once again, before the General Law Committee and it passed out of Committee close to unanimously. There was only one dissenting vote.

The Bill provides really two revisions to our laws as they relate to the distribution of beer and the posting of beer prices.

I'll start with the end of the Bill, which refers to the posting of prices. It provides that wholesale postings for beer must be provided to retail permittees no later than the 20th day of the month prior to such posting.

Existing law provides for all other types of spirits and alcohol products that the posting must be made no later than the 27th day of the month prior to such posting.

So this gives the retailers a little more time to schedule their sales, schedule their advertising, on beer only, and it's really because the other part of

pat
House of Representatives

217
June 1, 2007

the Bill provides for a different manner by which beer may be packaged and offered for distribution to retailers and restaurants than what is currently allowed in our statute.

Presently, whether it be beer or spirits, the wholesaler distributor must offer the same product type, both in terms of the product, and the manner in which that product is packaged to all types of end users, whether they be restaurants or retailers in the form of package stores or grocery stores that have a grocery store beer permit.

So for example, if a distributor distributes long-neck Budweiser bottles and offers that to the buying public, or the end users throughout the state, it must offer that type of, that beer product in that type of packaging to all, so that that, under my example, that long-neck Budweiser beer bottle must be offered not only to restaurants where those are commonly found, but also must be offered to package stores and grocery stores with beer permits as well.

pat
House of Representatives

218
June 1, 2007

And what we found in our testimony before the Committee is that there are certain types of end users, or certain end users, focus on one type of packaging. Other types of end users focus on a different, or another type of end packaging.

In another example commonly given is keg beer, particularly with the work of the Legislature in years past, in terms of trying to curtail house parties, and trying to curtail drinking by those who are not of age, the issue of keg, of beer provided in kegs became an issue.

And so, if this Bill were to pass, a wholesaler distributor would be able to offer beer in the form of keg beer to restaurants but would not be forced to.

It would have the discretion not to offer that same product to retailers, package stores primarily, throughout the state, notwithstanding what the present law is, and that would be if this particular Bill were to pass, has passed by the General Law Committee.

That particular change, or that particular option, I should say, to offer beer products only, it

pat
House of Representatives

219
June 1, 2007

only applies to beer, differentiate between the manner in which beer is packaged and distributed and offered to retailers is provided in Lines 31 through 34, where the beer wholesaler, beer distributor, beer manufacturer, and beer out-of-state shippers, or those who have out-of-state shipper permits, can package the product differently and offer it differently, based upon whether it's onsite consumption, and that would be your restaurants, or off-site consumption, and that would be your package stores and grocery stores having a grocery store beer permit.

There is no fiscal impact on the Bill. It provides that additional option to our beer distributors and manufacturers, which quite frankly, they asked for, but also, which the Department of Consumer Protection supported, and the Committee supported.

From the Committee's perspective, it was primarily an effort to give them the opportunity to use their discretion to target certain types of beer

pat
House of Representatives

220
June 1, 2007

products or beer packaging to one particular end user as opposed to another.

There was some consideration, which during the Committee hearing, in which there was a suggestion, or at least a question asked as to whether just to pick up on one of the examples I used, whether we should, as a state, ban the distribution of keg beer entirely.

We just didn't feel like doing that would, it would be harmful to those retailers who have on-site consumption, your restaurants.

While it may have had some effect on the keg party issue, etc., it would have been hurtful and harmful to the restaurants, and that was, there was opposition to that from the Restaurant Association, and quite frankly, from Members of the Committee.

By doing it this way, we're allowing the business community to use their discretion and they have shown themselves to be, in many respects, supportive of our efforts at the Committee level, and in the General Assembly to promote temperance, to promote responsible alcohol consumption, and to deter or dissuade, prevent

pat
House of Representatives

221
June 1, 2007

the consumption of alcohol by those who are not of legal age to consume alcohol.

And so we're hoping that if this Bill were to pass, that that discretion would be used and exercised wisely, and we have every confidence that that, indeed, would be the case.

This would apply, I know we had an earlier bill on the brew pubs. We did a fix earlier to allow both beer distributors and beer and spirit distributors to distribute beer products from a brew pub.

This applies to both types of beer distributors, whether it be those distributors who just distribute beer or malt products.

They also sell malt products as well, and those distributors who distribute to the retailers both beer and spirits. So we caught it here, and there's not that distinction as provided in this particular Bill.

I would also state for the Chamber's edification that this Bill supported not only by the distributors, but also by the employees in the unions that work, I

pat
House of Representatives

222
June 1, 2007

believe the Teamsters is one in particular that work in these distribution plants.

They support this Bill. They think it's an important step. They feel that they can, it will assist them in focusing their delivery efforts in their end user, affecting the end user, and what exactly has to be brought and what can, at option, can be brought to the retail end user.

So I think all in all it's an important Bill. I hope that the Chamber has not changed its mind on this Bill since last year. I do believe it got out of the, at least the House almost unanimously. I think there were one or two dissenters, and hopefully the Senate.

I'm sorry. This is a Senate Bill, so the Senate has already taken this Bill up, and has already approved it. I believe the Senate approved it unanimously.

I want to thank my Senate Co-Chair for his work on this Bill, and also, as always, thank the Committee for their considered look, analytical look at this

pat
House of Representatives

223
June 1, 2007

Bill and what its impact would be, and what we're trying to accomplish.

And certainly last, but not least, I'd like to thank my Ranking Member, Len Greene, who has always worked hard on this Bill, and has been a supporter along with myself of this effort.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd be more than happy to answer any questions, which any of the Members might have, but I think it's a good Bill, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in passing it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Stone. Further on the Bill? Representative Leonard Greene of the 105th, you have the floor, Sir.

REP. GREENE: (105th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, good evening. I also rise in support of this. As our good Chairman has indicated, we had this same Bill last year. It passed out of this Chamber and went upstairs and did make it out of the Senate.

pat
House of Representatives

224
June 1, 2007

So in our good wisdom, we started it there first, so I do encourage this Chamber to support it again, and thank Chairman Stone and the Committee for taking it up again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Greene. Representative Miner of the 66th, you have the floor, Sir.

REP. MINER: (66th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I might, just a few questions to the proponent of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed, Sir.

REP. MINER: (66th)

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the language in Lines 31 to 34, I know the gentleman gave a brief description of what this Bill does, and I'm just trying to be sure.

Currently in existing law there's a differentiation, or there is no differentiation that is that if a distributor sells one type of beer to a

pat
House of Representatives

225
June 1, 2007

restaurant, then they have to make it available to a retail customer? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Stone.

REP. STONE: (9th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to that question, but you referenced in the preface to your question certain lines of the Bill that you were concentrating on.

If I could, with the Chamber's indulgence just ask the good questioner to repeat which lines, remind we which lines he was referring to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER: (66th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I'm looking at the Bill, it would be Lines 31 through 34. It talks about differentiation between a manufacturer, a wholesaler, an out-of-state shipper, and then how they can distribute their products. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

pat
House of Representatives

226
June 1, 2007

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Stone.

REP. STONE: (9th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, first of all, the Bill before us, as usually is the case, contains not only the change that's proposed, but also contains the existing statutory scheme that we presently operate under, and if you note, Lines 24 through the beginning of Line 31, that sets forth the prohibition against differentiating, or differential treatment.

Now, those, in that section, it doesn't state specifically that you cannot differentiate between the manner of packaging of beer products. It refers to, you can't discriminate on price discounts.

You can't discriminate on offering same brand, brand names, and then it goes out to say like age, size and quality, depending upon, and that part while it doesn't refer directly to packaging, the size and quality, I think goes to that packaging issue.

pat
House of Representatives

227
June 1, 2007

So, and the Department has interpreted that as meaning, if you offer one type of packaged beer product to one type of end user, you have to offer it to all types of end users.

And so by adding the language in Lines 31 through 34, we almost created an exception as it relates to beer, an exception for differentiating in the manner of packaging materials based upon, packaging beer based upon whether the beer is to be used on premises or consumed on premises, or consumed off premises. I hope that answers the good gentleman's question. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER: (66th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just in terms of that packaging, is it, are we talking about the case that it would come in, or are you talking about even being as broad as the specific container that it might come in, beer by beer, so to speak. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

pat
House of Representatives

228
June 1, 2007

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Stone.

REP. STONE: (9th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, it would apply to both, and so you could have a case of 18 versus a case of 24.

That's a differentiation in packaging, or you could have a 16 oz., I guess they call them Kingers, in the beer world, a 16 oz. can of beer or a 12 oz. can of beer, or a long-neck bottle, or a non long-neck bottle, or, and I think this was the focus of the Committee, keg beer or no keg beer.

And I think in terms of our underlying intent here, it was to really get at the keg issue, and to allow the distributors to use their discretion, and use their efforts in terms of temperance and prohibiting or making it difficult if not impossible, for minors to obtain that alcohol to make that bar goal as well. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Miner.

pat
House of Representatives

229
June 1, 2007

REP. MINER: (66th)

And if I might, Lines 74 to 76 where it talks about postings, could the gentleman explain what that is. Is that kind of an internal, like a wholesale price for gasoline?

Is that something that the retail customer just probably wouldn't generally get involved in? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Stone.

REP. STONE: (9th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, there is presently a monthly, I think they call it the *Beverage Journal*, and that's the posting that's referred to here, and they have to give the beer retailer a little bit more time because there might be a differentiation in the packaging or what might be available.

And what the end user that requested that change, or the retailers, because they have to plan ahead, the retailers for consumption off premises, they plan ahead.

pat
House of Representatives

230
June 1, 2007

They plan their sales ahead, and they needed to know what type of packaged product, and what manner that packaged product, at what price, would be available for the upcoming month.

But it is, I believe it's called the *Beverage Journal*. That's the posting that's referred to there. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER: (66th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the gentleman for his answers. It's been enlightening. Never knew that much about beer. I've had one or two in my life, but this has certainly cleared up, oh, that was just this week.

Mr. Speaker, if I might, through you, I believe the Clerk has an Amendment, LCO Number 8658. If he call it, and I be allowed to summarize it, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Will the Clerk please call LCO Number 8658, which shall be designated House Amendment Schedule "A".

pat
House of Representatives

231
June 1, 2007

CLERK:

LCO Number 8658, House "A", offered by
Representative Miner and Senator Roraback.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER: (66th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what this Amendment does is, I guess allow a notion that went through this Chamber some time ago to live again, and it has to do with the farm winery system in the State of Connecticut.

After the House passed an amendment, I think it was about a month ago, we entered into a discussion with both the wine, farm winery folks, and the liquor distributors and reached an agreement as to what the language should look like so as not to jeopardize a whole bunch of things, specifically the farm winery industry and also the three-tier system here in the State of Connecticut, and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

pat
House of Representatives

232
June 1, 2007

The question is on adoption. Would you remark further, Representative Miner? Please proceed, Sir.

REP. MINER: (66th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For those of you that may remember, there was a change in the law last year that would require farm wineries to grow the product that the wine is made out of on property that they own or is adjacent, and for a number of farm wineries in the State of Connecticut, that put them in a bit of a situation where they had product, grapes, apples, currants, you name it, that may not have come off of that property, that's sitting in inventory.

In an effort to try and make sure that they wouldn't come under any undue criticism from the Department of Consumer Protection, and live within the confines of Connecticut law, we attempted to draft an Amendment that would allow them to grow grapes anywhere in the State of Connecticut, and other produce.

What this Bill does is really embody that, provided there is a list of those properties on file

pat
House of Representatives

233
June 1, 2007

so the Department of Consumer Protection and the federal permit would be consistent where those products are grown. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you. Questions? Before the House is adoption of House "A". Representative Stone, do you care to comment?

REP. STONE: (9th)

Just briefly, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Chamber's indulgence. I also want to commend Representative Miner for working on this particular Amendment. I know that we had a bill that came out of the General Law Committee that we had passed out of the House that dealt with this issue.

I think this is another version that hopefully all the stakeholders will, I'm sure they have signed off on it because obviously Representative Miner indicated as such.

But while it looks rather detailed, it does provide those safeguards that Representative Miner was

pat
House of Representatives

234
June 1, 2007

referring to, and it really gets to the heart of this farm winery issue.

Quite frankly, before we did the change in the law last year or two years ago, our statutes read that, or did not, at least as I read the statute, limit where the grapes that had to be Connecticut grapes, had to be grown.

It was an interpretation by the Department of Consumer Protection that those grapes had to be grown on the farm winery premises. The statute didn't say that. I couldn't read it into the statute, but that's the way it was interpreted.

As I read the statute, those grapes had to be grown in Connecticut, regardless of whether they were on the premises of the farm winery.

That being said, this addresses the issue. This does not create a slew of farm wineries throughout the state, throughout the State of Connecticut at various locations, solely if some of the grapes from that, some grapes are grown on those premises and that are ultimately in the end product.

pat
House of Representatives

235
June 1, 2007

So it addresses that issue. I urge my colleagues to support the Amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Stone. Representative Miner, further? Further on House "A"? Further on House "A"? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Nay? Ayes have it. House "A" is adopted.
Further on the Bill as amended? Representative Miner.

REP. MINER: (66th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very briefly. I want to thank Chairman Stone and the other Members of the Committee, specifically Ranking Member on our side of the aisle for helping me with this Amendment, and also with the underlying Bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Further on the Bill as amended? Further on the Bill as amended? If not, staff and guests please

pat
House of Representatives

236
June 1, 2007

retire to the Well of the House. The 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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Have all Members voted? Have all Members voted?
Voters please check the board to make sure your vote
is properly cast.

If all Members have voted, the machine will be
locked. Will the Clerk please take a tally. Will the
Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill Number 1172, as amended by House
Amendment Schedule "A".

Total Number Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	144
Those voting Nay	3
Those absent and not voting	4

pat
House of Representatives

237
June 1, 2007

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The Bill as amended is passed. Representative
Christ of the 11th, you have the floor, Sir.

REP. CHRIST: (11th)

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move
for the immediate transmittal of all items needing
further action to the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Without objection? Without objection? So
ordered. The House will stand at ease.

(CHAMBER AT EASE)

Would the House please come back to order. Will
the Clerk please return to the Call of the Calendar
and call Calendar Number 584.

CLERK:

On Page 12, Calendar Number 584, Substitute for
Senate Bill Number 1184, AN ACT CONCERNING THE
PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE PRIMARY, Favorable Report of
the Committee on Government Administration and
Elections.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO: