

PA10-155

HB5163

Appropriations	3509-3528, 3644, 3646	22
House	3578-3613	36
<u>Senate</u>	<u>4116-4117, 4125-4127</u>	<u>5</u>
		63

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**APPROPRIATIONS
PART 10
3366 – 3711C**

2010

2

March 5, 2010

mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

1:00 P.M.

REP. GIANNAROS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the fact that I'm moved, I was moved up a little bit so that I can get out of here before my back completely goes out on me.

I -- I'm going to be speaking on House Bill Number 5163, AN ACT REQUIRING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SEARCHABLE DATABASE FOR STATE EXPENDITURES.

Let me start by saying that one of the things that intrigued me to put a bill in relating to this is what I saw with relation to Yankee Institute's ctsunlight.org. When I went in there -- because they're trying to do a service to the public, providing information -- when I went in there and typed a few names that I know, including my own, I found that there were errors. And I decided that we should not leave up -- leave it up to private enterprise, that is, or not-for-profits, cause they have a political agenda, to really provide the information the public should know, in my opinion, and public should have available to them electronically at any point in time that they want to observe.

For example, and let me just say this, that I printed out something from that website just now that relates to somebody that lives in my house, and they have her down as getting 22 thousand -- 611 thousand from Connecticut State University system. She only taught two courses part time, was no -- nowhere close to that amount. And what's happening there is the computer program that they -- they've used is erroneous and they're summing up the whole year income and putting it in each category that may

qualify, so you end up getting an inflated number. And I hope the Hartford Courant is picking up on that.

But, more importantly, there's a lot of cynicism out there in the public relating to government, how much we spend, where we spend it, and what our -- and our priorities. By passing this bill and making it law, we will make everything that it relates to government available to the public. They can go in and scrutinize it any way they want. They can call us and question us. There's going to be an increased transparency, increased accountability; it's going to increase the efficiency of government, which is very important as we look ahead into the next 20 years, and I will come to that in a moment. And, in my opinion, it will actually, because of the pressure from the public scrutinizing things, it will actually reduce unethical practices and free up dollars, free up dollars that can be used for what we need to do best and what we are responsible for as public officials, as government; that is, to help those that need assistance and to provide the public goods and services that are necessary for us to be a civilized society and society that has a civilized environment, a society that actually increases the standard of living through some public provision.

We are -- have limited resources; we all know that. And then if we don't really spend the -- those dollars efficiently, that means we're not going to be able to provide everything we need for our children and their education, for our elderly, and those that are in need and need help. As you all know from my past statements

and in the House of Representatives, I think the role of government is very important and very substantial, and it should be. But at the same time, waste and account -- waste should not be present and accountability should be in the forefront.

With relation to -- to what I mentioned before, over the next 20 years, we're going to face an unprecedented pressure in terms of government spending at all levels, federal government, state government, local government, because of the demographics. Because we are moving into an era where you're going to have much fewer working people per retiree than ever in the history of the U.S.; in fact, ever in the history of the world, for that matter. We are heading towards what -- two working individuals per retiree, whereas in 1950 we had seven working people per retiree. This is a massive change in the structure of the labor force and our ability to pay for all of those who will be retired, including me, especially the Baby Boom generation that will be coming into the retirement force in masses.

We have to spend and invest smarter and more selectively and set priorities in a much more smart and efficient way. We have to, in my opinion, use approaches that perhaps we don't talk about as much in our process here; that is, cost minimization analysis, which simply means that if we decide that we want to do something for the good of the public and we should, we should try and find the least-cost possible way to do it. That way we free up dollars to do other things that are important or as important.

The other thing that we do that -- and I have, I bring that to my students in public finance all the time, to their attention -- when we discuss things here, we're discussing each -- each item individually. And most of them are wonderful, great programs that we should really have. But if we're not looking at the finances and comparing to other things, we should be financing. But on the other hand, the resources are limited, and if the resources are limited, we have to do what we call "comparative impact analysis," where you're coming different possible projects for programs that you want to finance and choose the ones that give you the best for your buck; that is, the highest rate of return.

Now, why I'm saying these things partly because it's my first time that I have a chance to speak with you on this, but we do have over \$50 billion unfunded liabilities. The boat is in the middle of the Atlantic. We have to get it back, and it's going to be very tough, very tough. Because this -- this type of funding that we need over the next 20, 25 years is unprecedented, in my opinion. We cannot and should not fund everything requested, but we should fund programs that support the poor, programs that support those that need help here, programs that support our students, and programs that are absolutely necessary for our elderly. We should not be funding everything and anything.

And I think that the -- this proposal that I'm making in terms of making the data available on-line will actually help us because we will be getting people doing evaluations and calling us up. Hey, I just did this and this is what

it shows me, and perhaps you should consider this as a possibility, rather than this program versus that program; that may get you more of a return than otherwise would be the case.

Having said all of that, I want you, the public that is listening and to understand that Connecticut has done a great job when it comes to spending and taxing. For the last 20 years as the tax, that the income tax was passed, the size of our government is exactly the same thing, it's exactly the same size in was in 1992. The reason I'm bringing up issues that I brought before, we are going to be facing a total different day when we look ahead in terms of the pressures we're going to have from an ever-increasing, retired, open population with the -- the needs of our students and younger people rising as we need to educate people at a higher level in order to be competitive in the world market.

So having said all of that, I -- I appreciate your support, I hope, and I appreciate you having me up here first because I -- of my health problem.

I'll be -- I'll be delighted to answer any questions you may have, Mr. Chairman.

REP. GERAGOSIAN: Thank you, Representative.

I just had one question about, I think you serve on the Finance Committee, and do you contemplate shedding sunlight on tax credits and companies that are getting large tax credits, expenditures, and those, and the like as part of this project?

REP. GIANNAROS: I absolutely hope so. I have no

7

mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010

1:00 P.M.

excuse or I don't support any excuse that anyone has to keep any information relating to what -- what government does in terms of giving away tax credits and keeping it secret in any way or not in front of the public. The public should have access to every dollar that we spend and -- and scrutinize it, and every dollar that we tax credit or provide loopholes that are not productive. For those of you have served in Finance with me, you know that I'm against credits that go to corporate structures, because the other thing they do, they create inefficiency in the economy. You're supporting one in favor of -- you're favoring one against every other enterprise in the economy. And the other thing you're doing is really subsidizing and not really creating jobs, I feel, long term.

Let me give you -- let me tell -- talk about -- since you gave me that opportunity with relations and what just happened in Finance recently where we're going to be spending \$69 million to create 801 jobs. That is absolutely nonsense. If we spend \$69 -- \$69 million to create opportunities for most small businesses to thrive instead of spending it in -- for one corporation, we would get a lot more jobs created and a lot more income created. The data is out there. Any economist who has actually studied the labor market and its output production and benefits will tell you that. So I -- I do agree, and the public should know that. And the only way to know it is really if we have it all on-line.

REP. GERAGOSIAN: Thank you.

Are there any questions?

Representative Schofield.

REP. SCHOFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you for your testimony.

I just have one question, and -- and that is I recently got in the mail a postcard kind of thing from the Yankee -- Yankee Institute or something of that (inaudible). And they have a searchable database of all salaries, state employee salaries, all contracts, all grants on-line. I haven't actually searched through it for more than two seconds; I just was curious (inaudible). But is -- is -- does that not go as far as what you're suggesting or --

REP. GIANNAROS: Let you --

REP. SCHOFIELD: -- (inaudible)?

REP. GIANNAROS: Yeah. Representative Schofield, I made a comment up front on that issue.

REP. SCHOFIELD: Oh, I'm --

REP. GIANNAROS: But --

REP. SCHOFIELD: -- sorry.

REP. GIANNAROS: -- let me -- let me redirect you, actually elaborate a little so people will understand what I was saying in case there was some misunderstanding anyway.

I did go on-line, myself, and I did some searches, including my own name, my better half, and somebody else that I know, and I

found at least in two of the cases, two out of the three cases, significant errors.

REP. SCHOFIELD: Oh.

REP. GIANNAROS: Significant errors. So one of the problem that I have is when you allow the public information, in my opinion, to be manipulated by those and their political agendas, you're going to get a total difference result than what you should be putting out to the public. And therefore you're misleading. And then you have the talk -- the head-talks on the radio shows and everybody else taking erroneous data and exploiting them, 24 hours a day, and giving the wrong impression as to what we're doing up here.

I believe very strongly that the public has the right to know everything we do, and every dollar that we spend should be available -- available to them on-line for them to scrutinize. But I don't think it should be left up to politically oriented groups to determine how to manipulate or adjust the -- the data, you know, in a way that reflects political, perhaps interests rather than accurate data.

In -- in relation to that, I remember seeing the head of this organization on Channel 3's State of the State, and the unfortunate thing is the only thing he emphasized was UConn, X number of people, over 200 are making over \$100,000; of course, they are doctors.

REP. SCHOFIELD: Yeah.

REP. GIANNAROS: They are doctors. What do they --

what do they think they're going to make, PhDs? So no explanation, whatsoever, about how, why and how they make two -- over 200,000 -- a hundred thousand dollars and over. It just simply an exaggerated statement that inflates the public's, you know, the public gets basically angry with us, in the sense.

But I -- I, on the other hand, I did say that we have to be careful how we spend funds, because when we -- we look ahead over the next 20 years, I'm not going to be here; I can guarantee you that. But when we look ahead, we're going to have a horrible time. The pressures to finance the elderly, which is an -- it's increasing to 75 million new retirees, talking about the national level. We are worse in that case. The State of Connecticut has a worse demographic situation than the national average.

REP. SCHOFIELD: Uh-huh.

REP. GIANNAROS: We have to protect the elderly by planning ahead now.

REP. SCHOFIELD: Right.

REP. GIANNAROS: We have to protect our children by planning ahead now and not wasting resources in areas that we should not be spending on or perhaps do more smarter evaluations so that we cost-minimize; that is, minimize the cost of whatever we decide to spend on.

REP. SCHOFIELD: Uh-huh. Thank you. I -- I appreciate the comments and I, again, I apologize for not having heard your procedural speaking about that or (inaudible) private

11
mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010
1:00 P.M.

organizations. I just would suggest and -- and I -- I totally endorse your notion of having the -- the information available to the public. I -- I would just suggest we look at if -- if there's a way to make an existing source that doesn't cost the state anything be more accurate, then -- then that might be an alternative to look at. But one way or the other, I agree with you, and we should make it available. I know in other states where they do this, it's actually been a helpful tool in enabling people to research and provide ideas to their -- to their representatives on how states (inaudible) can achieve the (inaudible) --

REP. GIANNAROS: Well, we have a --

REP. SCHOFIELD: -- (inaudible) --

REP. GIANNAROS: Thank you. If I may, Mr. Chairman?

We -- we have a -- a not-for-profit organization right in this building. It's called the Office of Fiscal Analysis, a nonpartisan, I should say. And therefore with minimum computer -- some additional computer, perhaps, capacity, we can have it run right out of here. I don't see why not. It's a nonpartisan group; it's not -- it's not a complicated thing. I mean, I deal with computers all the time; it's not that complicated.

REP. GERAGOSIAN: Thank you.

Representative Heinrich.

12
mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010
1:00 P.M.

REP. HEINRICH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon.

REP. GIANNAROS: Good afternoon.

REP. HEINRICH: Well, my first question was going to be who, who do you envision setting up this database and who would be -- who would be maintaining it and checking it for accuracy; so your answer there would be -- your suggestion would be OFA, Office of Fiscal Analysis?

REP. GIANNAROS: In my opinion, it has to be a not-for -- nonpartisan group.

REP. HEINRICH: Oh, okay.

REP. GIANNAROS: And the Office of Fiscal Analysis comes to mind because they are exactly that.

REP. HEINRICH: Okay. So how often do you envision that this database would be updated?

REP. GIANNAROS: As soon as we pass a new budget or we adjust the budget based on some, perhaps votes that we take, it --

REP. HEINRICH: Okay.

REP. GIANNAROS: -- should be updated.

REP. HEINRICH: So it's what's in --

REP. GIANNAROS: So it'd be once or twice a year, basically.

REP. HEINRICH: What's in law as opposed to actual expenditures? Because we, as you probably

13
mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010
1:00 P.M.

know, we pass a budget and we put money into programs, and then are lapses and there are deficits and there are funds that the Executive Branch might hold back or they might spend more. And so this database and if we don't do actual expenditures as opposed to what's in law, we might have a very different picture of what's happening up at the state level --

A VOICE: Good point.

REP. HEINRICH: So, you know, there -- there are -- I love the idea of transparency. I love the idea of a searchable database. We have to work out some of these idiosyncrasies whereby things change rapidly, almost daily --

REP. GIANNAROS: Okay.

REP. HEINRICH: -- with regard to what's being spent where. And -- and I think it -- it might be a bigger job --

REP. GIANNAROS: Sure.

REP. HEINRICH: -- than perhaps we're envisioning to -- to make a truly accurate database (inaudible) --

REP. GIANNAROS: Representative Heinrich, I -- I agree with you, actually. I think that we can start the process by putting the -- the budget on-line, the details in the budget, not just the aggregates --

REP. HEINRICH: Yes.

REP. GIANNAROS: The totals.

14
mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010
1:00 P.M.

REP. HEINRICH: Yes.

REP. GIANNAROS: And I think we can expand the system to have it conveniently adjusted as -- as agencies change their spending and -- and have the actual spending on-line. I mean, that -- that's my objective, actually. It's for the public to see what we're actually spending, not what we may propose or may like to propose.

REP. HEINRICH: Okay. Thank you very much.

REP. GIANNAROS: Thank you.

REP. HEINRICH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. GERAGOSIAN: Thank you, Representative.

Senator Prague.

SENATOR PRAGUE: Thank you --

REP. GERAGOSIAN: (Inaudible).

SENATOR PRAGUE: -- Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to ask you something.

REP. GIANNAROS: What's that?

SENATOR PRAGUE: My ears sort of perked up when I heard that a corporation is getting \$69 million in a tax credit bill that came out of the Finance Committee the other day. Can you tell us which corporation that was?

REP. GIANNAROS: I believe it's Starwood Hotels, if I remember correctly. And I -- and I -- I do, I -- I believe I am correct. And, again, my

15
mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010
1:00 P.M.

point is it's not just that.

For any kind of special deal that we're making, we are, in my -- in my opinion, we're creating an inefficient economy and we are actually penalizing all these other hotels now that doesn't have the same tax break and forcing them out of business, eventually -- that's what happens -- and -- and basically we're gaining from one and losing a lot more from the other. Plus, you are actually creating an unfair, competitive situation for many other industries that you actually do the same thing.

SENATOR PRAGUE: So I'll have to get a copy of that legislation, because it sort of makes my mind spin, have one corporation would -- that would get that kind of a tax credit. Is that a new company that's coming in?

REP. GIANNAROS: Yes, from -- moving from New York.

A VOICE: Uh-huh.

REP. GIANNAROS: But the point, again, is that we do that in other -- in situations where there's no company coming in; we help them to move sometimes. But by helping somebody to move from one point of Connecticut to another, basically you're subsidizing them at the expense of other companies that competing -- are competing with them, and you're putting these other companies in jeopardy. Basically, that's what you're doing. So it's not a smart economic development to, in my -- in my opinion. The better way is just invest those dollars then simply subsidizing existing corporations that are not going to contribute as much to the work force because the work

16
mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010
1:00 P.M.

force increases.

Seventy percent of all jobs created in the U.S. come from small enterprises, not from these giants we are impressed by. And -- and that's where we -- the emphasis should be; help the small business, because they are the most innovative, most creative, they create the new products, the new ideas, and they are the ones that actually grow over time fast to create new jobs.

SENATOR PRAGUE: Thank you, very much. I have -- I have always respected your opinion.

REP. GIANNAROS: Well, thank you, appreciate that.

SENATOR PRAGUE: And I thank you for taking the time to come here today to testify.

REP. GIANNAROS: Thank you.

REP. GERAGOSIAN: Thank you, Senator.

Representative Stripp.

REP. STRIPP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representative Giannaros has a very interesting presentation, and I do want to agree with you on the inaccuracy of it, although I wouldn't apply a malevolent reason. And I -- I applaud the people who have at least put the thing together so we can start the conversation, which has started. And I -- I think that's healthy. And should improvements be made? Probably so.

I looked my own income up from the General

Assembly and I immediately called my wife. I thought maybe she had some income intercept because it -- it seemed to be somewhat higher than I had ever seen show up in my bank account.

REP. GERAGOSIAN: (Inaudible).

REP. STRIPP: Another issue, on Wednesday I listened to a presentation of somebody who did some -- some analysis of basically the population. And -- and one of the predicates of it is that people spend from 45 to 55, the most, because they buy a house a little bigger, they put the kids through college, and so forth and so on. And the end result of that -- and you're talking about we've got to be very, very careful with government expenditures -- but the end result of that is the conclusion he came to is that in the next ten years, we've better be very, very careful how we spend money, the -- on the personal side as well as on the government side, because it looks like ten years of pretty much a draught and very, very difficult to get expansion and growth in the economy because people in their spending years are very, very few. And it's going to take ten years before we have the next tsunami, which -- which is what powered a lot of the growth we had in the past. So I agree with you on -- on that too.

And some of the other things I don't necessarily agree with you on, but I appreciate you bringing them up because debate and discussion is how we improve things. So thank you.

REP. GIANNAROS: Well, thank you, Representative

Stripp, I appreciate that.

REP. GERAGOSIAN: Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: Thank you. It's good to see you and -
- and I hope -- you don't have written
testimony before us, right, or is that true?

REP. GIANNAROS: I have notes with me.

REP. DILLON: Okay. So I may be misunderstanding
you, and I hope I'm not, but I have a lot of
economics, though I don't have a degree in one,
and I tend more towards the political science
side of the street. And I have -- I -- I -- my
ears perked up when I heard you talk about
taking the politics out of it. And -- and how
could you do that? I mean, I'm the, you know,
I -- I don't -- and let me just give that there
are many, many well-intended things that have
been done that ended up being used as a weapon.
Once you put something in play, anybody can
pick it up.

You know, I mean, we did outreach to folks on
HUSKY, and it ended up being caught up in a
fight between Wal-Mart and Shop it -- and Stop
& Shop. No one could have foreseen that. And
all of a sudden it was Wal-Mart isn't, you
know, provide -- is -- is -- isn't doing
benefits or you're paying for it when actually,
you know, folks they were asked whether or not
we could go in there. Now that's fine because
we're going (inaudible) it's a right, you know,
to -- to fight for their members. But many of
us who were pushing to have folks go in there
like that couldn't have seen that. I mean, it
seems to me it's the same kind of thing.

19

mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010

1:00 P.M.

Let me think. The argument about -- about people with agendas, it seems to me relies on -- on the analysis; doesn't it? Are -- are you assuming that folks who are analyzing it have an agenda? But I wonder if you back up a little bit, it may be defined by which data fields you choose. You know, it's like the economist story.

And I believe it was someone who once lived in my district who won a Nobel Prize from economics, Tobin who -- good friend. The drunk under the street light, you know, that you find things under the street light because that's where you can see them. So you're choosing certain data fields to look at, and in a way that may frame it politically, whether you choose or not. I guess that's a -- an argument or a claim I'm making, but I'm just thinking out loud.

REP. GIANNAROS: Well, it's true.

And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I represent the bill and thank you for your comments. I -- what I'm trying to do here is to really increase the quality of information that's available in the marketplace, which is basically all of the people in Connecticut.

And what -- what I did find, when you talk about special fields, the only field that I -- that I went to was payroll, Demetrios Giannaros and some -- a couple other people, home, said -- hit the button. Tell me how much did I earn out of the State of Connecticut, and it was a wrong number in two out of three cases I tested. So therefore there's something wrong

20
mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010
1:00 P.M.

with the way the computer program worked. It could have been influenced by politics, I'm not sure. Some of the numbers that I saw just don't make any sense.

So -- so having said that, let me just finish. And then the -- what I -- what is good about information and from an economic point of view is that it allows the people to make up their own decisions based on what they -- they see. And then the media actually will pick up that information and through competition, they will actually present it a variety of ways so eventually the -- the public has a better picture as to what is going on then the -- than what may be going on if they get the information only from a politically oriented type of enterprise.

And I -- I think that by allowing the information to become public through a nonpartisan basis, let the public figure out. There's going to be multiple newspapers writing. As of now, I've seen something in the Hartford Courant, and some things that I saw, it's not their fault but they're not accurate.

REP. DILLON: Okay. I mean, I don't -- I don't want to -- I -- it just seems to me we're never going to take politics out of that. And -- and there's certainly input errors. But I think you and I agree in -- on one point, and that is that we trust the people; that is that if we have a lot of information out there, then folks -- and -- and a -- and a piece of information gets out, then you defend it. And -- and you compete in the marketplaces of -- of ideas, and I think that -- that you and I are in agreement on that point.

21
mhr/gbr

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

March 5, 2010
1:00 P.M.

I don't know that we'll ever be able to take politics out of what you choose to measure. You don't even know that you have a bias until you've already done it and somebody else looks at it. But -- but I think it's a really interesting idea and -- and we should certainly look at it.

So we thank you very much.

REP. GIANNAROS: Well, thank you.

REP. GERAGOSIAN: Thank you, Representative, and have a good day.

REP. GIANNAROS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

REP. GERAGOSIAN: Next is Comptroller Nancy Wyman.

STATE COMPTROLLER NANCY WYMAN: Good afternoon. Thank you, so much, Senator Harp, Representative Geragosian, and Representative Miner, and the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee. It is really good to be with you today.

For the record, I am State Comptroller Nancy Wyman, and I'd like to -- I have submitted my testimony, but I'd like to quickly go through some of the bills that are on your agenda today.

The first group is the House Bills 5393 and 5105. I want to thank Representative Reynolds for putting in House Bill 5105 and ask that when you do consider the proposal that you would incorporate and you -- you would pass

HB 5394
SB 360
SB 359
HB 5104
SB 3
HB 5073

CBIA

Connecticut Business & Industry Association

TESTIMONY OF
PETER M. GIOIA
VICE PRESIDENT AND ECONOMIST
CONNECTICUT BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION
SUBMITTED TO THE
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
MARCH 5, 2010
LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING
STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

Good day. My name is Pete Gioia. I am the economist for the Connecticut Business and Industry Association (CBIA). CBIA represents about 10,000 firms, which employ about 700,000 women and men in Connecticut. Our membership includes firms of all sizes and types, the vast majority of which are small businesses with fewer than 50 people.

CBIA would like to comment upon the following bills: SB 3, SB 356, SB 357, SB 358, SB 359, HB 5044, HB 5070, HB 5073, HB 5104, HB 5105, HB 5106, HB 5107, HB 5163, HB 5017, HB 5019, HB 5394, and HB 5395.

HB 5390

SB 3

The bill better clarifies the original intent of the cap. We support it.

HB 5044

Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) has been a concept before this body for the entire 20 years I have been with CBIA. While the public sector accounting involved in GAAP is fairly technical and arcane, what it wishes to achieve is fairly straightforward. GAAP seeks to present financial data on the state that is presented fairly and in conformity with widely

CBIA reminds the committee that spending reforms passed in 1991, including both the spending cap and biennial budgeting were part of a compromise that included adoption of a broad-based state personal income tax. In our minds and in the minds of our members the two items – spending reforms and tax changes – are unequivocally linked. Eighty-one percent of the electorate in 1992 voted for the state spending cap, an unprecedented call for prudent state spending. Our business membership overwhelmingly supported this spending cap. Businesses trust in state government is closely linked to the state government promise to keep spending in check to the growth in personal income. This is substantiated by several surveys of the business community.

HB 5105

CBIA supports increasing the Rainy Day Fund and targeting surplus to it.

HB 5106

CBIA feels a review of unfunded liabilities AND creating a plan to deal with them is long overdue.

HB 5107

See comments on HB 5044.

HB 5163

This would create better transparency in the budget and we support it.

HB 5017

CBIA supports the Governor's call for stronger rescission authority. The budget fiasco over the last two years demands such change here.

HB 5019

CBIA supports the Governor's call to strengthen the budget reserve fund.

H – 1085

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2010**

**VOL.53
PART 12
3573– 3922**

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

3
May 3, 2010

Beautiful. Beautiful. Beautiful.

Is there any business on the Clerk's desk?

THE CLERK:

Just today's calendar, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Are there any announcements or introductions?

Any announcements or introductions?

If not, will the Clerk please call Calendar
289.

THE CLERK:

The State of Connecticut House of
Representatives Calendar for Monday, May 3, 2010.

On Page 11, Calendar 289, Substitute for House
Bill Number 5163, AN ACT REQUIRING THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF A SEARCHABLE DATA BASE FOR STATE
EXPENDITURES, favorable report of the Committee on
Appropriations.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Demetrios Giannaros. You have
the floor, sir.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I move acceptance of the joint committee's
favorable report and passage of the bill.

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

4
May 3, 2010

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

Will you remark?

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May I be permitted to summarize?

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please, sir.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

This particular bill was introduced in the Appropriations Committee and got unanimous support.

The bill requires the Office of Fiscal Analysis to establish a searchable data base and maintain such for certain types of expenditures. In other words, what we're talking about having access online to the budget, state expenditures, state grants, state contracts, all the appropriate details the public will be able to access. So will the Legislators, the staff and anyone who is interested in government public policy that is, centers of public research, public policy research, et cetera.

This bill came about as a result of the establishment of some similar type of process by a private partisan, I would call it, think tank center and what happened is, I went into research, plug in a couple names that I knew, I found that there were mistakes, and serious mistakes, and therefore, I decided that it's upon us to democratize the process of budgeting, the process of granting, the process of contracting, by allowing the public to have full and clear cut information as to what we do up here, and being much more informed, much more able to discuss the issues that we are concerned about here and the public at large is concerned.

And the bill basically, for the first time, it will open up our government to the eyes of anybody who wants to see what we're doing in relation to government spending, government contracts, government grants and government bonds, eventually if not immediately.

It opens up our government. It creates full transparency. It increases government efficiency because by opening up all the information relating to data on cost on contracts, who gets what, who

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

6
May 3, 2010

gets paid what, and who is actually getting grants and for what purpose.

It will increase efficiency, but also it will reduce mistakes that we make. Humans make mistakes and oftentimes it's good for others to be looking at what is, has been implemented and perhaps bring those mistakes to the attention of the responsible individuals in government.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill has the potential of reducing unethical practices, practices that may have not occurred if one knows that the public is looking at them, exactly what it is that they're doing with their tax dollars and with their limited resources.

I believe if we had such a process in place earlier on. When I first came, by the way, I was one of the first ones to push for increasing online access go government.

But if we had this one available early on, perhaps some of the mistakes that had been made over the last 10, 15 years with relation to ethics would might have not been made.

The allocation of resources will improve, and therefore we can save by eliminating waste and

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

7
May 3, 2010

inefficiency and then put those dollars into more productive purposes to satisfy the needs of our people, and also perhaps reduce the potential tax burden on our taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a significant move forward to open our state government to democratize our budgeting process, to democratize our spending process, granting process, and to democratize whatever it is that we do up here, you know, in a much more significant way than we have in the past.

We want the public to be informed. We want the public to be active and looking at what it is that we are doing and help us make better decisions by pushing us to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of this bill, and I do have an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has in his possession LCO Number 5013. May he call it and may I be allowed to summarize.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will the Clerk please call LCO Number 5013, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A."

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

8
May 3, 2010

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 5013, House "A," offered by
Representatives Giannaros and Geragosian.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber
to summarize the amendment.

Is there objection?

Hearing none, Representative Giannaros, you
may proceed to summarization.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The amendment is, I would call it mostly a
technical type of amendment that clarifies some
language to make sure that we're not requesting,
the Office, by the way, the Office of Fiscal
Analysis will be in charge of this new system.
It's a nonpartisan entity and that's why I asked
from the beginning, the Appropriations Committee to
have the OFA be responsible for this new online
system.

The amendment basically precludes them from
asking for information that is not available, and
the Office of Policy and Management requested that
so that people are not asking for things that will

be either too costly to produce, or not available at all.

So the only information that is available and logical will be requested by the OFA to be made available online.

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on adoption.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

Representative Hamzy.

REP. HAMZY (78th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I have just a couple of questions to the proponent of the amendment.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. HAMZY (78th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, just reading through this, where it reads create unavailable financial or management data or an information technology system that does not exist, I'm having trouble understanding what that means, in this amendment when it uses that phrase or that wording.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, would the proponent be able to explain that a little bit more. Thank you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I mentioned before, this is language that was negotiated with the Office of Policy and Management.

But basically, the intention here for, I guess if this asked for legislative intent purposes, that the Office of Fiscal Analysis that will be supervising this system and will be managing this system, and the public will have access to the system through the computers of the Office of Fiscal Analysis or right, through their input.

They will be requesting information from the different agencies that relate to the budget, relate to grants, relating to contracts, and we wanted to make sure that the OFA does not ask for something that is not available, literally not available, and therefore it's not producible and creates a conflict, in a sense, that was not

intended in the original language of the bill.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hamzy.

REP. HAMZY (78th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Who makes the determination that financial information or management data is not available? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

That is a very good question, Mr. Speaker. I assume that once an explanation has been provided to the Office of Fiscal Analysis that such data is not available, and to have a good justification, I assume that there would be a reasonable assessment and a reaction from the Office of Fiscal Analysis.

We have not set up a board as such, but I assume that since the Office of Fiscal Analysis has access to Legislators, one can actually ask for a public hearing when there is a question that is now answerable by the agencies or the Office of Fiscal Analysis.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12
May 3, 2010

Representative Hamzy.

REP. HAMZY (78th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I appreciate the responses given, and the reason why I asked it is I strongly support the underling Bill, and I think that the information contained on that website or in that database should be as full, as transparent and as robust as possible.

And so, the language in this amendment concerns me that there may be a point in time in the future where a state agency does not want to disclose certain information for whatever reason, and will use the provisions of this amendment as an unreasonable excuse to not pass that information along to OFA.

And so I will, I assume that other people may have questions about this amendment and will try to get some clarification on my own, but I just wanted to put on the record that this does concern me and may limit the extent to which this database will accomplish its purpose.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Arthur O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a quick question, as we are still on the amendment. So, through you, Mr. Speaker, in the amendment, does, which I understand deletes the requirement or makes clear that there is no requirement for the production of unavailable data, there's a sense of nonexistent data.

Does this amendment provide for any kind of protection regarding data, which is currently not subject to the Freedom of Information Act? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, the last line and a half or Part 2 of this amendment, clearly states that disclosure of consumer, client, patient or student information otherwise protected by law from disclosure is protected information and therefore can remain private, can remain protected.

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

14
May 3, 2010

If I may, just one more statement to help my good friend, Representative O'Neill. The intention here and the way this amendment was drafted, the intention was to continue to protect anything that is protected by law.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had a little difficulty picking up, understanding the last few words of the lines that were read the gentleman.

So, Madam Speaker, perhaps he could reread those for me. I didn't receive a paper copy of the amendment. I haven't quite managed to get up to it on my computer, so perhaps he could reread those last couple of lines so that I could hear them.

(Deputy Speaker Orange in the Chair.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

15
May 3, 2010

Through you, the amendment starts by saying, nothing in this section shall be construed to require a state agency, and then we go to number two, disclose consumer, client, patient or student information otherwise protect by law from disclosure.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Excuse me, please.

Thank you. I believe Representative O'Neill is having a problem hearing.

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Hopefully, that's not a comment that my wife will be making any time soon.

So if I understand it correctly, what we're talking about is protecting consumer, client and student information and patient information.

My concern is information, for example, such as the amount of money being spent on the Witness Protection Program and other things that wouldn't fall into any of those categories, but which are apparently currently protected by the, from Freedom of Information Act disclosure.

Does that language cover some things such as

that, something that is otherwise non-disclosable
by virtue of the Freedom of Information Act.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam.

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes. The answer
is yes. The intention is to protect and prevent
that information that is currently covered by
current law that is considered to be private and
non-public to continue to be so.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for his answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

Will you care to remark on the amendment
before us? Will you care to remark?

Representative Miner of the 66th. You have
the floor, sir.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, earlier, I guess it was later in the week last week, I was asked a couple of times by the good gentleman whether I continue to support the underlying bill, and I want to make it very clear that I do.

I am a little concerned about the amendment, however, because I'm not sure what the effect, the net effect is, and during the Appropriations Committee public hearing on this bill, there was a lot of discussion about what information was appropriate and what information wasn't appropriate, and we were speaking, I think generally, about some of the publications that were floating around the State of Connecticut and whether they were accurate.

Through you, if I might. My recollection is that there were some questions about whether the wages embedded in some of the electronic information that was provided during the public hearing, whether that information was accurate or not.

If I could, through you, does the gentleman believe that as a result of this amendment, wage

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18
May 3, 2010

information would be withheld? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Madam Speaker, if I understood it correctly, the question correctly from Representative Miner, anything that pertains to wages and salaries of state employees is public information and therefore will be accessible on line.

That's the understanding of this. Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And at that time also, there was some discussion about what purchases might have been made by different agencies. I remember, I think there was an entry about perhaps a clown being paid for by the Department of Corrections and whether that might have been appropriate or not.

And through you, to the gentleman's understanding, if an agency was to make a purchase, and that purchase was available generally within

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

19
May 3, 2010

the information provided by an agency, could that information be withheld as a result of this amendment? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Miner.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you. Again, if I understand correctly, I'm no expert on Corrections law, but if there's anything that Corrections does or purchases that is currently restricted by law to be made public, it will continue to be so.

But otherwise, any spending carried out by the state government for any agency, the information should be accessible on line and we will be requesting it through the Office of Fiscal Analysis for it to be accessible. The public has the right to know. It's their money, their tax dollars and they are the ones who indirectly push us to, on bills and policy to make a policy in a sense, so they should have better information, be more informed, better quality decision making as a result.

So I think that, in my opinion at least,

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

20
May 3, 2010

everything should be accessible as much as possible, given the limitations of (inaudible) funding, et cetera.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I thank the gentleman for his answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

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

Representative Sawyer of the 55th, you have the floor, ma'am.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Good morning.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

A question, through you, on this amendment to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Please proceed, ma'am.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you.

In looking at one of the pieces under Number 2, it says disclose consumer, client, patient or student information.

My question for you, is the student information, where it says otherwise protected by disclosure, by law from disclosure.

We have a number of students, certainly, in the State of Connecticut that are hired for student work programs, doing research programs through let's say, a good example, say research at the University of Connecticut. It could be at the medical school. It could be at, I apologize for the feedback we're getting. Whether it's the -- it could be at the community colleges for someone who's working in the library, anything like that.

How much of that information could then be disclosed? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros:

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I was a student, and I was, if it was not for assistantships and fellowships, I would never have

been where I am today, either academically, or even in this Chamber, for example.

It is important for us to continue to support our students, especially those who are in need. It makes our economy more productive and it helps the family that cannot otherwise support students in higher education, or for that matter, at any level of education.

But the point is that this is, these are state dollars that are spent on a variety of programs and there's no reason why if I am a graduate assistant or a fellowship, a fellow in any department who's getting a PhD or master's or whatever it may be, there's no reason for us to hide that information unless it is restricted by federal or state law.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

I thank the gentleman and if I could continue in that line. What types of information, then, for the students would be restricted?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

23
May 3, 2010

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I failed to hear the last word. Would you kindly repeat it?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Certainly, sir.

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

What types of, under what laws, what part of the information would be restricted? What laws do we know of, whether it's federal or state, would bar disclosure?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I know for a fact that by law we cannot make public student grades and performance, or any personal matters that relate to their personal life, so therefore that would not be online and cannot be online as far as I know, and I would not even want it to be online if it was not illegal.

But if it relates to a student receiving a

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

24
May 3, 2010

work study type of a grant or a fellowship or graduate assistantship or anything of that sort, I don't see why that should not be part of the online access.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

So through you, Madam Speaker, the -- from your understanding, there is no financial piece that would be held back from any of the student work?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

I cannot perceive everything because I'm not familiar with every detail of higher education restrictions relating to financing, but as far as I can tell or see, I don't see why if the state taxpayers are supporting me to get my PhD or my master's or my bachelor's, and they are providing me with grants or work study programs, I don't see why that information should not be known to

individuals.

It helps us select the best possible students. It helps us support those who are most in need and not make frivolous decisions or inappropriate decisions based on friendships and other types of factors.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, and I thank the gentleman for his answer. If we are looking at the millions of millions of dollars that Connecticut has put forward for something like stem cell research that's being done at the University Health Center, those types of projects I believe would fall under this as well, and if I might pose that as a question.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Through you, I believe it would, unless it's proprietary information and it's not ready to be made available to the market to be abused or stolen by others.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

But through you, Madam Speaker, but the student payment portion of something like that would be disclosed?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, that is the intent of the bill and my hope.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm very protective of our students as they go forward. For some of them, this is sort of their first introduction to the workplace, more than say

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

27
May 3, 2010

a job that has been perhaps delivering papers or something like that, so I'm very protective of them.

And certainly, I know that the government is very protective of their social security numbers, that kind of privileged information as well as their grades. That is, again, confidential for them, and their financial situation.

So as we go forward with this, the, I am very much in support of protecting the students, but also disclosing when they are making state dollars and we are paying them to give us a very valuable service.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, ma'am.

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

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Just in conclusion. This is a good Bill and I hope this catapults us to actually move to the next

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

28
May 3, 2010

stage where we make everything accessible that relates to state government agencies so that the public can actually apply for licenses, apply for permits, apply for any information they need online and I hope that that's the next step for all of us to take.

We will save hundreds of millions of dollars, in my opinion as a result of this bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

We're speaking on the amendment.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

-- I'm sorry. Madam Speaker, let me just stop --
right there and allow you to take care of the amendment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

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

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

29
May 3, 2010

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

All those opposed, nay. The ayes have it.

The Amendment is adopted.

Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended? Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended?

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As I was saying just a bit earlier, this bill has the potential to open up government to make it more efficient, more friendly, more accessible, more accountable and saving, in my opinion, hundreds of millions of dollars a year because of the scrutiny that will be prevailing, and better information.

There's no decision that you can make in a market economy that is efficient without full information, accurate information, high quality information.

And at times like this when we are running huge budget deficits, this is one way to actually move government into cost savings, provide better information and better services to our public

through the scrutiny that we will face.

And also, I have to say, that even though the economy is going to be improving, it is improving and I will be, I am surprising all of you by saying, we are going to do better than all the estimates are indicating right now in terms of revenue and in terms of budget deficits next year and the following year.

I think the economy is on a good grounding and it's going to continue to grow and we're going to look much better than we are today.

But nevertheless, we have a structural deficit problem. It's serious. It needs to be taken care of. This is one action that can be taken to move us in the right direction without hurting people.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I hope everybody supports my effort here. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended?

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL: (69th):

Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I am a bit loathe to comment now that the proponent of the bill and the amendment has sort of wrapped up. But I do feel that it's important because there's not the kind of explicit language in the bill nor in the amendment that specifically states that items that are not subject to Freedom of Information disclosure are not subject to being placed in this database, and I would just want to reiterate that with a discussion on the bill itself, and not merely on the amendment, even though the amendment's now a part of the bill.

So through you, Madam Speaker, if I could just pose a couple of questions to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Please proceed.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Is it the intent of this legislation that information, which is not currently subject to disclosure pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, would remain not disclosed in this database, would not be added to this database?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Through you, the answer is yes.

REP. O'NEILL: (69th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I thank the gentlemen for his answers, and perhaps after we conclude the debate the gentleman would be happy to convey to me the names of those particular stocks that are going to outperform the economy here in the State of Connecticut so that we can both enjoy this wonderful new economy that he is predicting.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, Representative O'Neill.

Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended? Will you care to remark?

The distinguished Minority Leader,
Representative Larry Cafero of the 142nd, you have

the floor, sir.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning to you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE

Good morning.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Madam Speaker, I wonder if, through you, the good gentleman could comment on something.

We are, I think in principal, very supportive of the spirit of this bill, the underlying spirit of this bill, to have the public being able to see exactly what we talk about when we talk about cutting "X" program or "Y" program or enhancing X program or Y program is very important, because they hear a lot of stuff that comes out of this Chamber and in the news that with due respect, although it is not our intention is mumbo jumbo. It's legislative speak.

We talk in terms of initials of agencies and functions, et cetera, and though it is very important and a very good first step to put all of what we do with regard to the State Budget, the budget the taxpayers are paying for, on an

available-site.

My question I guess is, is it clearly understandable? I know I've been around this place for 18 years. I have been intimately involved in the budget process, certainly for the last five, six or seven years and I'm not saying I'm the sharpest knife in the drawer, but there's still times where we lump things together under a title, and though we are actually reporting that expenditure or what have you, it is very difficult to understand.

I know sometimes in the law we talk about plain language, simple language, that everyone can understand what we're doing. So there's sort of two parts to this thing.

One is of course to put all the information on a website for the world to see. But the other part is to sort of explain what the heck we're putting on the website because without that explanation, sometimes the kind of verbiage that we use or the words that we use and the acronyms that we use are just meaningless to the public.

What attempts, if any, are made to, if you will, translate into the conversation, into the

understandable, the kind of things that we contain in our budget?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giannaros.

REP. GIANNAROS (21st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Through you to Representative Cafero. I think what he's suggesting is ideal, if we can somehow also have explanatory language to explain what those different categories mean and what happens.

I think at this first stage, we want to get the information out, in my opinion, have the media scrutinize it, have the think tanks evaluate it, have the public that has the ability to make up its own mind I guess on certain things and what is happening.

But ideally, through you, Madam Speaker, I think his recommendation is a good idea to eventually move to the next step where we, if we have funding to do this, because it's going to require hiring a couple economists and financial analysts like me to elaborate, or maybe accountants, perhaps, to elaborate on the language

that we have in there.

But right now, I think the first step is really necessary for us to go to the next step.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I appreciate the gentleman's answer. I would suggest, however, that it doesn't take a bunch of experts, if you will, on the budget, economists, et cetera, to sometimes just speak in clear, simple language.

When we list general categories of things that might include personnel, it might be a wage increase. It might be for supplies, et cetera. It shouldn't be too difficult to break those things down and state them in pure, clear, simple language.

I'm all for, very supporting of putting all that we're talking about, all that we do here, for all the world to see. But if we put it in the language that all the world can't understand, then it's meaningless.

So I applaud this first step, but would

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

37
May 3, 2010

encourage all of us to strive and work towards clear, simple language so that people we represent can, with a click of a button at least somewhat understand what we do here.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

Will you care to remark further? Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended?

Will you care to remark further 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 voting by roll call. Members to the chamber, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

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

And the Clerk will please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5163 as amended by House "A."

Total number Voting	132
Necessary for Passage	67
Those voting Yea	132
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	19

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. The Bill passes as amended.

Will the Clerk, are there any announcements or points of personal privilege? Announcements or points? Representative Aresimowicz, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ARESIMOWICZ (30th):

Yes, Madam Speaker, for the purposes of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ARESIMOWICZ (30th):

Madam Speaker, in the Chamber up in the Gallery today is an important person to me. She stopped by my house yesterday and was talking about

S - 610

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2010**

**VOL. 53
PART 13
3842 - 4128**

cd
SENATE

562
May 5, 2010

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Calendar page 18, Calendar 548, House Bill 5533,
move to place on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Calendar page 18, Calendar 549, House Bill 5387,
move to place on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Calendar page 19, Calendar 522, House Bill 5163,
move to place on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Excuse me. Senator Looney, could you repeat that
one please?

SENATOR LOONEY:

Oh, yes, Mr. President. It's calendar page 19, I
believe the Calendar may be 552.

cd
SENATE

563
May 5, 2010

THE CHAIR:

Yes, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

552 -- Calendar 552, House Bill 5163, move to place
on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Calendar page 19, Calendar 550, House Bill 5471,
move to place on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Calendar page 19, Calendar 551, House Bill 5413,
move to place on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Calendar page 19 -- we reached this I believe
already -- 552, House Bill 5163 previously placed on
consent.

cd
SENATE

571
May 5, 2010

Calendar page 10, Calendar 461, House Bill 5207;
Calendar 483, House Bill 5244.

Calendar 484, on page 11, House Bill 5383; Calendar
487, House Bill 5220; Calendar 488, House Bill 5297;
Calendar 490, 5425 -- House; Calendar 496, House Bill
5497; Calendar 509, House Bill 5126.

Calendar page 14, Calendar 511, House Bill 5527;
Calendar 514, House Bill 5426; Calendar 516, House Bill
5393.

Calendar page 15, Calendar 520, House Bill 5336;
Calendar 521, House Bill 5424; Calendar 523, House Bill
5223; Calendar 525, House Bill 5255.

Calendar page 16, Calendar 531, House Bill 5004.

Calendar page 17, Calendar 533, House Bill 5436;
Calendar 540, House Bill 5494; Calendar 543, House Bill
5399.

Calendar page 18, Calendar 544, House Bill 5434;
Calendar 547, House Bill 5196; Calendar 548, House Bill
5533; Calendar 549, House Bill 5387; Calendar 550, House
Bill 5471; Calendar 551, House Bill 5413; Calendar 552,
House Bill 5163; Calendar 553, House Bill 5159.

Calendar page 19, Calendar 554, House Bill 5164.

cd
SENATE

572
May 5, 2010

Calendar page 20, Calendar 556, House Bill 5498;
Calendar 557, House Bill 5270; 559, House Bill 5407; 562,
House Bill 5253; and House Bill -- Calendar 563, House
Bill 5340; Calendar 567, House Bill 5371; and Calendar
573, House Bill 5371.

Mr. President, I believe that completes the items

--
THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, could you please give me on Calendar 567,
do you have 5516, sir?

THE CLERK:

What -- what calendar?

THE CHAIR:

567 on page 22.

THE CLERK:

It's 5516.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, sir. Okay.

Machine's open.

THE CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the
Senate on the consent calendar. Will all Senators please
return to the chamber. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the
consent calendar. Will all Senators please return to the chamber.

cd
SENATE

573
May 5, 2010

THE CHAIR:

Have all Senators voted? Please check your vote. The machine will be locked. The Clerk will call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Motion is on adoption of Consent
Calendar Number 2.

Total number voting	35
Necessary for Adoption	18
Those voting Yea	35
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar Number 2 passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. President -- Mr. President, before moving to adjourn, I would like to ensure the entire chamber will wish Laura Stefon, Senator McDonald's aide, my former intern, a happy birthday.

And with that -- and with that, Mr. President, I would move the Senate stand adjourn