

Act Number:	09-16 (Special Act)	
Bill Number:	1068	
Senate Pages:	1798-1813, 2552-2568, 2585-2588	37
House Pages:	10337-10345	9
Committee:	None	0
	Page Total:	46

S - 582

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2009**

**VOL. 52
PART 6
1667 - 2005**

rgd
SENATE

132
April 30, 2009

you've done as an exceptional intern here in the state capital and I applaud your efforts. Alex is a member of the University of Connecticut class of 2010, and is studying political science and history. We wish you well in your studies and we hope you'll seriously consider furthering your career in the political process and we wish you will. And I hope the circle will join me in congratulating Alex and wish him well in his future studies. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Congratulations, Alex. Good job.

Are there further announcements or points of personal privilege? Further announcements or points of personal privilege? If not, Mr. Clerk, please return to the call.

THE CLERK: Calendar page 24, Calendar Number 252, File Number 309, substitute for Senate Bill 1068, AN ACT CONCERNING GREEN JOBS, favorable report of the Committee on Commerce and Export and Energy and Technologies. Clerk is in possession of amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

rgd
SENATE

133
April 30, 2009

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. Always great to see you up there in the chair. I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is acceptance and passage. Will you remark further?

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Clerk has an amendment, LCO Number 6331. May he call it and may I be allowed to summarize?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call LCO 6331, to be designated Senate A.

THE CLERK: LCO 6331, which has been designated Senate Amendment Schedule A. Is offered by Senator LeBeau of the 3rd district et al.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau has requested leave to summarize this amendment. Is there objection? Seeing none, please proceed, Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment does

a cleanup amendment and it becomes the bill. It does one very significant thing, and in addition to the bill, which I will explain in a moment, but it takes away the fiscal note on the bill. And what the bill does is it's entirely not concerning green jobs, and I'm tempted to say it's not easy being green, but I won't, but I did. So I'll continue with that.

What this bill does is ask the DECD to apply for federal economics stimulus funds pursuant to the American recovery and reinvestment act of 2009. And establish with such funds a program that creates green jobs and promote green energy and conservation by targeting investments and renewable energy and research, development and deployment and promoting the use of renewable energy in state buildings, nonprofits and educational institutions.

The program should be -- include, but not be limited to components that emphasize the use of existing industries in the state such as fuel cells and solar and that examine the viability of other renewable industries. And we -- we're also asking, of course we're asking DC to report back

rgd
SENATE

135
April 30, 2009

to the Legislature on how this -- what transpires over the course of the next year. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Would you move adoption, please, Senator?

SENATOR LeBEAU:

In fact, I'm sorry, Mr. President. I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

The question before the chamber is the adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule A. Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment which bares my name and thank Senator LeBeau. Yesterday, in reading the bill as currently before as, it appeared that as written, the bill made the statement that should the State receive any federal stimulus money, whether it be housing or transportation, it would be required to establish this programs through DECD. I don't believe that was the intent of the legislation, just a fair interpretation of the drafting. I think, as

rgd
SENATE

136
April 30, 2009

Senator LeBeau said, this is a clarifying amendment which clarifies the original intent.

I think after the amendment is adopted we can have a discussion just based on some information that's out there recently about the roles and rights of legislatures regarding stimulus money, because I think that's important to get on the record for legislative intent as well, too. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

You're welcome. Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you, Mr. President and I'd like to thank Senator McKinney for his role in this. I believe he was correct in the bill as written and the amendments that were drawn to it could have been interpreted to mean all stimulus money would have to be used for this purpose and that was not the intent of the legislation, but to use that portion which is for green jobs and green energy to be applicable in this situation. Thank you, Mr. President.

President in the Chair.

rgd
SENATE

137
April 30, 2009

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on Senate a? Remark further? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, signify by saying, aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed, nays.

The ayes have it. Senate A is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended by Senate A? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. A few questions through you to the proponent of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR KISSEL:

My first question has to do with what Senator McKinney just alluded to. And we hear quite often that some governors are turning some money back. They don't want to get too roped in to programs

rgd
SENATE

138
April 30, 2009

that are going to have large costs associated with them. For example, with some of the federal stimulus money associated with unemployment compensation. I guess some of those southern states, Louisiana and the like, they don't have programs has ramped up as ours are. And so if there is a question as to, well, if we get stimulus money, how much of a state commitment is there going to be going forward? I know at least in that instance that that is not the case in the state of Connecticut.

I'm wondering about, first, how, if Senator LeBeau know -- all right. Let me take a step back. Within the stimulus bill, are there specific earmarks for this kind of initiative? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Through -- thank -- Mr. President, through you, Mr. President, I believe there are, Senator Kissel.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

rgd
SENATE

139
April 30, 2009

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much. And one of the things in talking to Commissioner Joan McDonald recently regarding a lot of the federal initiatives, part of what I understand to be some of the delays, because some of my local communities, they want to know how, you know, what's with the education component? What's with the shovel ready component? And part of it is -- was simply the fact that -- and there's a new administration that just got sworn in, middle of January. There were little -- some stumbles along the way for some of the -- some of President Obama's appointments to head up certain departments. And that some of the folks that may have been there from previous administrations were hesitant to move forward on making decisions or crafting out parameters as to implement the federal incentive legislation. But that in -- now that we've had the first hundred days, a lot of that has now come to fruition.

So I guess, where are we now, would be my next question as far as if there are specific components of the federal stimulus funds, what exactly are there, is Senator LeBeau knows?

rgd
SENATE

140
April 30, 2009

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Through you, Mr. President, I don't really know the answer, the specific answers to the questions, Senator, on that data.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Okay. And also, regarding the balance of power between the executive branch and the legislative branch and the judicial branch and sometimes there's a little bit of attention there. Do we know whether the Legislature can craft policies that would act as a bucket for these federal stimulus dollars or does this have to have some kind of sign off by the executive branch? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Through you, Mr. President, again, I'm not sure exactly what the federal legislation says. But what this legislation says, it directs DECD to

rgd
SENATE

141
April 30, 2009

apply for those funds if they are available and we assume that they are available, which would give them -- would give the executive a lot of leeway in defining the programs that they would want to deal with.

We've given some broad policy initiatives here to promote green energy and conservation. I don't think there's any dispute between the executive and the legislative branches on those broad policy initiatives. So I think this is a very broad statement of policy, a broad statement to direct DECD to go after those dollars and they would have a lot of, I mean, they would have to make up the application, specifically what they'd be going for, specifically what the applications would be, specifically where things might be put, specifically what technologies they might tap into, specifically where they might place various alternative energy solutions within state buildings or within -- for nonprofits in the state.

So this is a very broad stroke and the details would come from the executive.

THE CHAIR:

rgd
SENATE

142
April 30, 2009

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much. And for example, let's say there were two programs outlined by the federal legislation for fuel-cell automobiles, and that in reading through the federal guidelines the Department of Economic Community Development ascertained that one would require a \$50 million state commitment and that the federal government would then give us an additional hundred million dollars. Whereas the alternative, equally important green fuel cell automobile, which I think would probably fall under the aegis of what we're dealing with here, would require only a \$20 million state commitment for a \$50 million federal additional funds. Is the import of the bill that we're debating here that the State would have to apply for both programs? Could the executive branch say, the hundred million dollars seems a little steep but the \$20 million state, sort of, initial funding seems more reasonable? How does that actually work out between, let's say, two similar, two programs with similar ends? Through you, Mr. President.

rgd
SENATE

143
April 30, 2009

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Through you, Mr. President, I would say that the executive would have broad latitude in deciding which programs and specifically, which programs to go for. Now, the example you gave, Senator Kissel, in both cases, the executive would have to come back unless there are, perhaps, bond funds that were previously allocated or previously authorized that might be used. It could be allocated for those purposes, but generally speaking, if we're talking about an appropriation, there would be a necessity to come back to the Legislature for approval on that.

I mean, but there are some exceptions to that. If there are pots of money, clean energy funds, perhaps, that could be used for some of these things. And I, you know, I -- but again, I think that the answer to your question is this would be a broad latitude on the part of the executive to work with her people, to work with DECD, to work with clean energy fund, to work with our energy people, OPM and to decide what is best within the

rgd
SENATE

144
April 30, 2009

parameters of her powers, as they currently exist.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. And again, I want to thank Senator LeBeau for that terrific answer. And in the underlying bill as amended, is there a reporting requirement? Is there a timeframe where we might know what they're looking into between now and when we hopefully adjourn the first Wednesday in June, or is there a report back to the Legislature embraced in there? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Through you, Mr. President, the time period for the report back, Senator Kissel, is October 1, 2009.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much and through you, Mr. President, exactly what should that report be

comprised of? Should the executive branch have already made application for some of this funding, or would the report be, we've assessed what's out there. This is our recommendation to you, Legislature, and what do you think about us moving forward on XYZ? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Through you, Mr. President, the report would regard the status of the application for funding and the implementation of the program if there was a program established at that point. So we would be asking for -- if nothing happened, I would expect to get reports saying nothing happened. If they began -- if they were in the middle of applying, I would expect to get a report saying nothing -- that they're in the middle of applying.

If they had applied and they just received a grant for \$20 million, hopefully, we would get that report. And if they were -- had received dollars and had begun to implement that program, I would receive that. I think we would receive that report. So on October 1st, we would expect to get

rgd
SENATE

146
April 30, 2009

some kind of report in terms of what the status of this program would be.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much. And in trying to reach out there and turn our state or refine our state to really focus on green jobs and the green economy, but if there was a component of the federal stimulus act that goes into higher education that may or may not be for, lets say, that there's money that could be allocated for education in the stimulus bill unless -- let's call it higher education. And that it would be up to the executive branch, whether perhaps, they want to use that for infrastructure upgrades, for community technical colleges, or if they wanted to utilize that for green initiatives. Would it be within the purview of DECD to unilaterally make that choice? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes. Mr. President, thank you. If we might as this item temporarily.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered, sir.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK: Calendar page 25, Calendar Number 274, and File Number 353, Senate Bill Number 824, AN ACT CONCERNING MARINE DEALERS, MARINE SURVEYORS AND YACHT BROKERS, favorable report of the committee on environment and finance revenue and bonding.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, if that item might be passed temporarily.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK: Calendar page 28, Calendar Number 354, File Number 467, substitute for Senate Bill 499, AN ACT CONCERNING A PET LEMON LAW AND THE RELEASE OF RABIES VACCINATION RECORDS TO ANIMAL CONTROL

S - 584

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2009**

**VOL. 52
PART 8
2344 - 2636**

tmj
SENATE

209
May 19, 2009

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar page 29, Calendar Number 252, File
Number 309, substitute for Senate Bill 1068, AN ACT
CONCERNING GREEN JOBS, Favorably Reported by Committee
on Commerce and Export and Energy and Technology.
Clerk is in possession of Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's
Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

Mr. President, the Clerk is in possession of an
Amendment, I hope. Number 6863. Would it please be
called and may I be allowed to summarize?

THE CHAIR:

The gentleman seeks leave to summarize. Mr.
Clerk.

tmj
SENATE

210
May 19, 2009

THE CLERK:

LCO 6863, which will be designated Senate
Amendment Schedule "A", which is offered by Senator
LeBeau of the 3rd District, et al.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move passage of the
Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. This Amendment becomes
the bill and it takes care of some of the problems in
the green jobs bill that were pointed out earlier by
the minority leader and others. Particularly the
problem with, if the stimulus funds are not available
for green jobs, that the program would end at that
time. So we've taken care of that.

Basically, this Amendment is about providing
green jobs for our workers in the State of
Connecticut, as Senator DeBicella was talking about
earlier with his kind words.

tmj
SENATE

211
May 19, 2009

What we're attempting to do here is to use stimulus funds and to direct the Department of Economic and Community Development to go out and to engage in a competitive process for stimulus funds with other states to bring as much of that stimulus money as we can to the State of Connecticut for, quote, green jobs.

As has been pointed out today, this is a tremendous -- this could be, and probably will be, a tremendous growth area for the entire United States economy, the entire world economy. And it should be a part of the Connecticut economy. We think that tens of thousands of jobs can be created in this area and with the stimulus package being made available this year. This bill directs DECD to go out and to pursue those funds in order to help our economy in the State of Connecticut grow in a way that we think is environmentally sound and will help create high technology, high value-added jobs for our workers in the State of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further?

Mr. Clerk.

tmj
SENATE

212
May 19, 2009

THE CLERK:

Mr. President, just for clarification, when the bill was before us on April 30th, LCO 6331 was called and adopted as Senate Amendment Schedule "A". The Amendment before us presently, LCO 6863 should be designated Senate Amendment Schedule "B".

THE CHAIR:

So noted. Will you remark further? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I think the bill in front of us is a good bill. I think that it is a bill that looks towards the future of an economy of green jobs. I think it's a bill that recognizes that, in this state, in this country, we need to grow jobs. And this is a sector for which it can be very important and we can be on the forefront of that mission.

However, Mr. President, although I support the bill, I am concerned over other issues that float around this building that send the complete, opposite message. When we have budgets that are taxing vehicles that get over 40 miles a gallon. We have

tmj
SENATE

213
May 19, 2009

bills that are taxing services to operate waste treatment plants, air pollution control facilities, solar energy, water electric generation plants, space heating systems, geothermal resources. When we have bills that are out that are going to do all that and yet, we're trying to grow the green jobs that we're going to tax. And when we're looking at taking businesses and adding 30 percent tax to the businesses, I don't really understand the message. I understand the message of this bill and it's a good bill. And it's a good message. But when you put it together with the other messages we're sending out, people can do what this bill proposes to do in other states and not get taxed, or not get taxed as hard. And have the exemptions that go with the businesses you're trying to create.

Let's look at it another way. If we want to have people create green jobs, you're going to need a demand for the services that they produce. That demand is either going to be a business in the State that's going to create those widgets or green jobs or those products that are green job components. If I'm going to tax it at 30 percent, they're not going to do

tmj
SENATE

214
May 19, 2009

it in the State of Connecticut. So, we can put all the legislation in that we want to do green jobs, but if we're going to put the gate at the end, which is the taxing gate, we're not really being honest with the proposal that we all, I think, are going to embrace in this Circle today. Thirty percent business tax is disingenuous to say you want to create green jobs. A sales tax on items that promote the green job industry is disingenuous to saying you want to create green jobs.

Senator McKinney talked about a theme, earlier, of consistency. I agree with that. For I know that the bill that I'm talking about is in limbo some place, wrapped around an 8.7 billion dollar state deficit. But at the time that we come to deal with that issue, we have to be aware of what we passed in this Chamber, because if we really want this bill to be law and become something that Senator LeBeau has stated is important, not only to this State but to this country, to this world -- the green jobs, then we should also be a state that leads the way and says we're going to recognize this (inaudible).

We're going to take a shot. We're going to grow

tmj
SENATE

215
May 19, 2009

these jobs. The products are not going to be subject to sales tax. The businesses are not going to be subject to a 30 percent tax. Because we are going to grow jobs in the State of Connecticut. We're going to get businesses in the State of Connecticut. We're going to welcome them where they're running from New York and they're running from Massachusetts and they're running from New Jersey because they went up in their taxes. We're going to say "Come here." We want your businesses. We want your employees. We have the kids who are smart enough to do this and we've got workers who are hard workers who can perform. So leave New York, leave Massachusetts, leave Vermont, leave New Jersey. Come here to Connecticut. We don't want to be a percent or two percent below their taxing rate. We want to be well below.

This is an opportunity for us we've never had, ever, to restart and steal those workers and those businesses. And legislation like we have today is the threshold. But if you couple that with the tax, it's a death blow to the very legislation this Circle is going to embrace today. So, support this bill and I

tmj
SENATE

216
May 19, 2009

look forward to us keeping in the spirit of this bill,
when we get to our taxing policies. Thank you, Mr.
President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Remark further?

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. And I commend you,
Senator LeBeau, for your hard work in this area. I
know that this is something that's near and dear to
your heart.. It is to a lot of other people, as well,
in Connecticut. Particularly those who are familiar
with economic development and, as many of us know
around this Circle, there is already a certain amount
of critical mass in the green energy and efficient
energy manufacturing and sciences business, right here
in Connecticut already. Particularly, in the area of
fuel cells and in the area of battery and energy
storage technology. It's quite impressive here
already and a boost from the federal government in
terms of funding for some of these individual
companies and industries is something that Connecticut
sure could use right about now.

tmj
SENATE

217
May 19, 2009

In following up with the previous comments from Senator Fasano, I would also like to emphasize, once again, here on the floor that Connecticut faces a once in a -- not one lifetime, but five lifetime opportunity to make itself an absolute powerhouse, not only in the area of green jobs and energy and aerospace like Connecticut already has, but in a variety of other areas as well, particularly financial service, the investment business, insurance and so on and so forth.

All we have to do is keep our taxes where they are today. Prior to a few weeks ago, my phone was ringing off the hook because of our proximity in our offices to New York City, where there are a lot of financial services firms. There was a tremendous amount of interest and concrete interest in moving to Connecticut, if we could guarantee that we weren't going to be raising our corporate taxes and hopefully, our income taxes on individuals and families as well. I received -- I can't tell you how many calls. It was a lot. And that particular day, when a certain proposal came out, my phone went dead. The demand is there. These companies can move literally overnight

tmj
SENATE

218
May 19, 2009

to the State of Connecticut. Capital, good minds and good business minds go to wherever the conditions are the best. Whether that's some other state in the United States of America or, possibly, another country throughout the rest of the industrialized and civilized world.

We have a great industrial and financial services base here in Connecticut. We are at risk because of the number of impositions and taxes and regulations and so on and so forth. And the messages that we send to industry in the State of Connecticut, and we do risk harming the tax base and harming our overall economy and, in particular, jobs.

So this is a great initiative. We hope that the money comes from Washington. We're going to fight for it fiercely and my understanding is that if the money does stop after two years or three years, that the program stops, let's do this. But let's make it easier on the private sector. Let's make it easier on businesses here in Connecticut of all sizes and shapes and forms so that we will have a future, an economic and industrial future, a tax base future for the State of Connecticut. It's the only way we're going to

tmj
SENATE

219
May 19, 2009

survive. So, thank you for that, for your effort,
Senator LeBeau. And, Mr. President, I'm done, thank
you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Amendment? I
would remind the Chamber we're still on the Amendment.
Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of
the Amendment. And I won't repeat the good comments
that I agree with, wholeheartedly, of all of the
previous speakers. I just wanted to rise and thank
Senator LeBeau for his work on this. The Amendment,
based on conversations we had, improves the underlying
bill.

I think we've taken the right step by saying that
if we're going to start a good program with federal
dollars, if those federal dollars aren't there, the
program won't last but we, obviously, will have the
ability as a legislature or whoever is in this Circle
to review the work of that, assuming we get some
money. And decide if we want to make that a priority
spending of the State of Connecticut, as well.

tmj
SENATE

220
May 19, 2009

So I think we're being up front with how it's going to work. I think we are cognizant of the federal stimulus act and the role of the Executive Branch here, as well. And so, Senator LeBeau, you're a man of your word in working with us on what I think is a good Amendment and becomes a good bill, I want to thank you and urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Remark further on the Amendment. If not, Chair will try your minds. All in favor, please signify by saying Aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

All opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The Amendment passes. Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. Can I ask for a brief pause?

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will stand at ease.

(Senate at ease.)

tmj
SENATE

221
May 19, 2009

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will come back to order. Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to ask for, because of the parliamentary procedure we've gone through here, I'd like to ask for a reconsideration of Senate "A". I was on the prevailing side in that vote.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is for reconsideration of Senate "A". Will you remark? Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

This will clarify the entire process, particularly when this bill leaves the Senate and goes down to the House by striking Senate "A".

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further?

Motion on reconsideration of Senate "A". Without objection, so ordered. The motion is before us. Try your minds.

The Amendment is now before us and the Chair will try your minds. Senator LeBeau.

tmj
SENATE

222
May 19, 2009

SENATOR LEBEAU:

The motion is on withdrawal. I move to withdraw
Senate "A".

THE CHAIR:

The motion is to withdraw Senate "A". Remarks?
Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you. Mr. President, just for purposes of a
question, I understand the intent here is we recently
adopted Senate "B", as I understand it. We had, on a
prior date, adopted Senate Amendment "A". Senate "B"
-- my question though, is if Senate "B" was a strike-
all, what is the existence of Senate "A"? I
understand the reason why we're doing this is the
procedures down in the House are to bring up a bill
and then address each Amendment adopted by the Senate.
Kind of in a different way than we do it. If the
House were to take up Senate "A", even though Senate
"A" was stripped with the adoption of a strike all
which was Senate "B", I'm not sure why the House would
be doing that. But is there really a Senate Amendment
"A" anymore with the adoption of Senate "B", I guess,
is my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President?

tmj
SENATE

223
May 19, 2009

THE CHAIR:

It is the Chair's understanding that Senate "A" still is before us, is still in existence and would have to be acted upon, either here or down in the House, as you correctly indicated as the rules of the House. Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

I just want to make sure that our reconsideration and withdrawal of Senate "A" doesn't impact the now bill before us which would be the bill as amended by Senate "B", which was a strike-all. As long as that is the bill that gets down to the house, I'm good.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I would like to join Senator McKinney in expression of what I think is unanimous will of this Chamber to make sure that -- and the posture in which we send the bill to the House of Representatives is one in which we will be asking them to take up the bill exclusively as

tmj
SENATE

224
May 19, 2009

amended by Senate "B". And for that reason, that's the purpose of this colloquy, to make sure that, under their rules, they would not find themselves in a position of disagreement with us by voting to reject "A". In effect that would put them in a position of - - the House in a position of disagreement with us, but not substantively, since we have already, in effect, also indicated that we wanted Senate Amendment "B" to supersede Senate Amendment "A". But because of the differences in the way the two Chambers act upon Amendments coming from the other Chamber, we want to clarify. So I would join Senator McKinney in requesting that clarification from the Chair, that by withdrawing Senate "A", we are now leaving the bill as amended exclusively by Senate "B". And that's the posture in which it would go to the House, presuming no other Amendments are adopted.

THE CHAIR:

That is the Chair's understanding, Mr. Majority Leader. And presuming we adopt no further Amendments. Will you remark further? Remark further? If not, is there any objection to withdrawal of Senate "A"?

Seeing none, Senate "A" is withdrawn. Will you

tmj
SENATE

225
May 19, 2009

remark further on the bill? Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

If there's no objection, Mr. President, could
this bill be moved to the Consent Calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk. Mr.
Majority Leader.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, if
we might move to Calendar page 23, Calendar Number 84,
Senate Bill 290.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Turning to Calendar page 23, matters returned
from Committee, Calendar Number 84, File Number 5,
Substitute for Senate Bill 290, AN ACT CONCERNING
HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR BONE MARROW TESTING,
Favorably Reported from the Committee on Insurance and
Appropriations, the Clerk is in possession of
Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Crisco.

tmj
SENATE

242
May 19, 2009

that it be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk, would you please return to the call of the Calendar. Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR LOONEY:

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

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

The 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? Mr. President, those items placed on the first Consent Calendar begin on Calendar page 5. Calendar Number 392, House Bill 6433.

Calendar 397, Substitute for House Bill 5915.

Calendar 405, House Bill 5536.

Calendar page 6, Calendar 406, House Bill 5873.

Calendar 457, substitute for House Bill 6264.

tmj
SENATE

243
May 19, 2009

Calendar page 12. Calendar Number 599,
substitute for House Bill 6463.

Calendar page 13, Calendar 608, House Bill 6640.

Calendar page 14, Calendar 611, substitute for
House Bill 6341.

Calendar 612, substitute for House Bill 6286.

Calendar 620, substitute for House Bill 5664.

Calendar page 15, Calendar 622, substitute for
House Bill 6496.

Calendar page 16, Calendar 628, House Bill 5809.

Calendar 630, substitute for House Bill 5519.

Calendar page 23, Calendar Number 284, substitute
for Senate Bill 290.

Calendar page 24, Calendar 103, Senate Bill 754.

Calendar 120, Senate Bill 818.

Calendar 136, Senate Bill 789.

Calendar page 26, Calendar 179, substitute for
Senate Bill 951.

Calendar page 27, Calendar 207, substitute for
Senate Bill 950.

Calendar page 29, Calendar 252, substitute for
Senate Bill 1068.

Calendar page 34, Calendar Number 420, Senate

tmj
SENATE

244
May 19, 2009

Bill 325.

And Calendar page 40, Calendar Number 541, House
Bill 6076.

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

THE CHAIR:

On the first Consent Calendar, the machine is
open.

THE CLERK:

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 the Senators voted? Seeing that all
Senators have voted, the machine will be closed.
Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Motions on adoption to the Consent Calendar,
number 1.

Total Number Voting 36

Those voting Yea 36

tmj
SENATE

245
May 19, 2009

Those voting Nay 0

Those absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar is adopted. Mr. Majority
Leader.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, a few
more items to be marked "go." First, Calendar page
29, Calendar 249, House Bill 6185. Calendar page 35,
Calendar 424, Senate Bill 1045. Calendar page 36,
Calendar 429, Senate Bill 940. Thank you, Mr.
President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Turning to Calendar page 29, Calendar Number 249,
Files number 49 and 285, House Bill 6185, AN ACT
CONCERNING PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF CERTAIN
PERSONNEL FILE STATUTES as amended by House Amendment,
Schedule "A". Favorably Reported, Committee on Labor
and Judiciary.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Prague.

H – 1068

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2009**

**VOL.52
PART 32
10190 – 10500**

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

497

June 3, 2009

Those voting Nay 4

Those absent and not voting 4

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY: .

The Bill is passed in concurrence.

Mr. Clerk, Calendar Number 651.

THE CLERK:

On Page 18, Calendar Number 651, Substitute for
Senate Bill Number 1068 AN ACT CONCERNING GREEN JOBS.
Favorable Report of the Committee on Energy and
Technology.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the
Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the
Bill in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The question is on acceptance and passage in
concurrence. Representative.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. The Clerk is in possession of Amendment LCO
Number 6863. I ask that he call and I be allowed to
summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

498
June 3, 2009

The Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 6863 previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "D". Mr. Clerk, would you please call it.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 6863, Senate "B", offered by Senator Williams, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The gentlemen has asked leave of the Chamber to summarize. Without objection. Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a strike all Amendment. Mr. Speaker, this Amendment is going to require the Department of Economic and Community Development to apply for federal economic stimulus funds. Those funds are going to be used to establish new programs, which will enable us, the State of Connecticut, to create green jobs from green energy and conservation.

This program will terminate when such funds are used and no longer available. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The question is on adoption. Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

499
June 3, 2009

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, several questions to the proponent of the Amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Line 13 refers to the viability of other renewable industries. Would this, for example, include fuel cell technology?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

That's affirmative, through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And do I understand the proponent correctly that these would be dollars from the stimulus program, and that this is the only source for funding under the proposed Amendment?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

500
June 3, 2009

Yes, through you, Mr. Speaker. That would be from the American Recovery and Investment Act 2009.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And as a result, there is no municipal fiscal impact and no fiscal impact to the state as well? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that's affirmative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir. Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the Amendment, which becomes the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir. Representative McCrory.

REP. McCRORY (7th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the proponent of the Amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please proceed, sir.

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

501
June 3, 2009

REP. McCrory (7th):

Mr. Speaker, through you, exactly what's the dollar amount attached to this stimulus money that's going to go to create these new green jobs, Mr. Speaker, through you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes, through you, Mr. Speaker, that number is not determinable at this time, but it will be monies that are received from the Recovery Act. That will be a new program established through DECD.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative McCrory.

REP. McCrory (7th):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, have there been any identified locations where these green jobs will be developed or where the job training sites will be started, Mr. Speaker, through you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be administered through DECD, and we're hopeful that the entire state will benefit through this program.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative McCrory.

REP. McCRORY (7th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you. And who will be monitoring the development of these new jobs and the job development programs? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the first part of that question. I'm sorry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Well, let me help out.

(Gavel.)

Representative McCrory, could you please repeat the question.

REP. McCRORY (7th):

Sure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, my question was, who will be monitoring the impact of the job development and the creation of the jobs and how

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

503
June 3, 2009

will jobs be distributed throughout the State of
Connecticut?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. That will be
administered through the Department of Economic and
Community Development.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative McCrory.

REP. McCRORY (7th):

And my last question, through you, Mr. Speaker,
besides the Department of Economic Development will
there be any other watchdog agencies monitoring these
dollars and this job development also? Through you,
Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the normal process of
review as the state receives federal funds. I would
imagine OPM, DECD and other entities deemed
appropriate through contracting laws of the State of

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

504
June 3, 2009

Connecticut and through, as we receive those monies.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative McCrory.

REP. MCCRORY (7th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, I thank my
colleague for answering my questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir. Question is on adoption of
Senate Amendment Schedule "B". Let me try your minds.
All those in favor signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. the Amendment
is adopted. Will you remark on the Bill as amended?

If not, staff and guests please come to the Well
of the House. Members take your seats. The machine
will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by Roll
Call. Members to the Chamber.

The House is taking a Roll Call Vote. Members to
the Chamber, please.

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

505
June 3, 2009

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Have all the Members voted? If all the Members have voted, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will take a tally, and the Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

On Senate Bill Number 1068 as amended by Senate "B"

in concurrence with the Senate.

Total Number Voting	149
Necessary for Passage	75
Those voting Yea	149
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	2

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The Bill is passed in concurrence.

Mr. Clerk, Calendar Number 655.

THE CLERK:

On Page 19, Calendar Number 655, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 383 AN ACT EXEMPTING REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATINS FROM PAYMENT OF LOCAL PROPERTY TAXES. Favorable Report by the Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Reynolds.