

PA12-049

HB5250

Government Admin. & Elections	91, 96, 117-118, 150, 154, 165, 168, 171, 173, 186-189	14
House	779-790, 5940-5955	28
<u>Senate</u>	<u>1090-1093, 1178-1179</u>	<u>6</u>
		48

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS
PART 1
1 – 325**

**2012
INDEX**

February 27, 2012

la/gbr GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND 10:30 A.M.
ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

SECRETARY OF THE STATE DENISE MERRILL: Good morning. Chairman Morin, members of the committee, I would like to briefly address -- I think it's about six of the bills before the Committee this morning. And I know you have my written testimony, but I will read it just because some of these provisions are a little complicated.

So we'll start with Raised Bill 212, An Act Concerning Provisional Ballots for State and Municipal Elections. This bill would allow provisional ballots to be used in state and municipal elections, and this is our proposal from my office.

Currently, provisional ballots are available in Federal elections for voters who are registered but for some reason their name is not on the registry list for their polling place or town.

And let me just stop and say this happens fairly frequently. In fact, if I were to cite one of the biggest problems with our voting system, it is not all the -- you hear a lot of different concerns. It's really errors that occur for various reasons, mostly human error of some sort. You know, someone can't read the handwriting on the card. Mostly it's not the registrar's fault; mostly voters get confused about where they're supposed to be. Maybe their polling place changed and so forth.

When you vote by provisional ballot, you're only casting votes for Federal candidates. This we allow now just for Federal elections. So essentially, this bill will allow a provisional ballot to look like the regular ballot being used, because it will include all the candidates running for office in that election, as opposed to just the Federal candidates.

SB213SB218HB5250

7
la/gbr GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
February 27, 2012
10:30 A.M.

And there were, frankly, some concerns about undue political influence in the big cities, where a primary is the major election. And if certain primary precincts are considered the base of one candidate or another and they get eliminated, you know, there is concern about the politics of all this.

So I think this compromise makes sense. I don't know how the 20,000 number was arrived at, but, you know, in concept it makes a lot of sense.

Then there's Raised Bill 5250, An Act Concerning the Appointment of Primary Polling Officials. This bill would provide that an enrolled party member in the State, rather than just an enrolled party member in the municipality may serve as a primary polling place official.

This simply addresses the fact of life that it's getting harder and harder to find polling place workers and this simply allows, in a primary, any enrolled party member from other towns could also serve as a poll worker in a primary of their own party in a town.

We think it makes sense; it conforms primary to what's already done in general elections. So I would support that bill.

So, with that, I would be happy to answer question or address other concerns.

REP. MORIN: Thank you, Madam Secretary. I appreciate your input. In Senate Bill 213, you talk about -- that's the one with Internet access for registrars?

SECRETARY OF THE STATE DENISE MERRILL: Right.

REP. MORIN: Did I say the name right? Did I say your name correctly?

MARGARET DE SHANKO: Yes, you did.

REP. MORIN: That's good, then. I feel better.

Senator Boucher I don't see. If she comes down, we'll certainly accommodate her.

Moving on to House Bill 5250, I have George Cody.

GEORGE CODY: Good morning, everyone. My name is George Cody. Senators Meyer, McLachlan, Representative Floren and my representative, John Hetherington, I thank you for the opportunity to appear here.

You have a copy of my testimony before you, and I'm going to ask the indulgence of the Committee. I would like to address 5250 and 5254. They're extremely similar bills, applying basically the same paragraphs in the statutes, the single paragraph in the statutes.

In towns with a small minority -- with small minority parties involved in a primary, registrars have an occasion, encounter a problem with finding qualified and in the case of moderators, certified party members within their own towns and party to staff in primary. The two bills before you would deal with this problem by allowing registrars to use party members outside their own town to supplement the staffing.

The appointment of a primary, 5250 basically allows -- it limits you to using members of your own party or of that party. But when an adequate number of trained local officials are

not available within a town, then the registrar has the option of using certified or trained enrolled party members from any municipality in Connecticut.

5254, again, basically offers the same opportunity to use other towns, but it also -- statutory requirements should be extended to primaries that require mandatory training of all polling place officials.

Right now the statutes have -- require training for elections but it did not mention primaries, and we'd like to see an extension of mandatory training to primaries, and that involves one other item not in this bill, which is the 21 -- is the ten-day deadline, as listed in the bill, for the submission of officials by a candidate.

Candidates and parties can now submit a list of workers to the registrar for consideration up to ten days before the election. We would like to see that changed 'til 21, simply because in larger towns the training workers, which is critical -- I mean, if anything we've heard over the last several years in this Legislature is that the polling place workers need training. It is often done before that ten-day limit.

And so it puts a very difficult restraint or constraint on the registrars to have to go back and train these party officials who are party choices and party workers who are not necessarily familiar with the polling place. So we ask that it be extended to 21 in a primary, 21 days in a primary. I believe it's 20 days in an election already in statutes.

Other than that, we support these bills. The recommended language change could be done with

61 February 27, 2012
 la/gbr GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND 10:30 A.M.
 ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

understand. Yes, you --

SENATOR MC LACHLAN: -- in a timely fashion?

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN WITH MICHAEL BRANDI: We have records that will guarantee consistency and that we'd be able to find out what we gave as advice and to let everyone know.

SENATOR MC LACHLAN: So that simple FOI request of the information made available. Thank you.

REP. MORIN: Thank you, Senator. Any other questions? Thank you very much, both of you. Appreciate it and look forward to working with you. Next, Judy Beaudreau.

Judy, would you please push the red button. Thank you.

JUDY BEAUDREAU: I wasn't feeling too well, so I wasn't sure I was going to stay today but I've submitted my testimony for everybody. So I'll just briefly go over all of the things that I wrote about. I was feeling bad, but after being in your presence I feel so much better.

Raised Senate Bill 212, the act concerning provisional ballots for all elections. We are -- all registrars are definitely in favor of this. I don't know who wouldn't be. This is a no-brainer. This is called -- you know, nobody gets disenfranchised this way. And maybe somewhere in this you should say that it will eliminate the challenge ballot process, which is hard to do and challenge somebody's right to vote. But with a provisional ballot you get them to vote and then you can research it later.

SB213
SB214
SB217
SB218
HB5250
HB5254
HB5251

The only thing I want to caution you on is

"Oh, no, no, no. I need an absentee ballot."
Well, not the day before, you know, that type
of thing. But it was a very good election.

So decreasing these things for emergencies and
for lack of people coming to vote is a very
good thing.

Raised Bill 5250 and 5254 are actually very
similar bills and the -- my testimony is that,
if we have a choice between both of them, I'd
prefer the 5254. It is better for --
registrars need consistency. We need to have
our election laws and our primary laws and our
referendum laws and everything the same. And
it has to be municipal and Federal.

You know, what's good in a Federal law
sometimes doesn't work in the municipal and the
law shouldn't be the same. People shouldn't be
punished one way or another, so that they need
to be able to have a provisional ballot in all
elections and not just in Federal, these type
of things. So with making this law, you know,
more in gear with the election laws, I would be
very happy.

I would ask you that you put in some statement
saying that all prospective primary poll
workers must be properly trained by the
registrars of voters and you have appropriate
positions in order to serve as poll workers. I
stress the training. Training is a must.
People have to be trained to do these jobs.

The only other thing I want to talk to you
about is 5251, which is the transfer of the
voter registration list. I think this was not
written exactly the way we had presented it to
be written. This actually just talks about



Election Division
Election Administrators
Registrars of Voters

Judith A. Beaudreau
E-mail: JudithBeaudreau@gmail.com
Cell: 860-670-2159

TOWN OF VERNON

375 Hartford Turnpike # 117, Vernon, CT 06066
Office: (860) 870-3685
Fax: (860) 870-3583
E-mail: vernon.dem@gmail.com
www.vernonelections.org

*Chairman Senator Slosseberg, Representative Morin, members of G A & E Committee
My name is Judith Beaudreau, Registrar of Voters from Vernon. I am here today to testify
mostly in favor of all bills presented today.*

RSB 212

AAC PROVISIONAL BALLOTS FOR STATE AND MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

This bill will get rid of the need for challenged ballots. Maybe some where in this bill should be written that Challenged ballots can be repealed and provisional ballots shall take the place of these.

I would like to suggest that it be slightly worded different. We want to make sure that the provisional Ballots are done by the Assist Registrar of Voters and not just a poll worker. Assistant Registrars do them now and are trained to do these types of ballots.

So in Line 56 - 58 New Language

(c) If a poll worker denies an individual the opportunity to cast a ballot for any reason for which a provisional ballot may be issued, such poll worker shall HAVE ~~offer~~ such individual OFFERED a provisional ballot.

SB214
SB217
SB218
HB5250
HB5251
HB5254

RSB 213

AAC INTERNET ACCESS FOR REGISTRARS OF VOTERS

It is sad that in the year 2012 that some of my colleagues do not have internet access in their offices. Registrars of Voters have been treated and thought about as that saying of "STEP CHILDREN". Everyone else in their respective town halls have internet and yet you have to mandate to the towns in CT that the Registrars of Voters must have internet access. This is amazing. Most of the Registrars of Voters information coming from DMV and other sources comes by way of the internet and these registrars have to get their information at home and bring to the office to do their work. This is really shameful that Registrars who run Elections are under such inadequate tools to do their jobs. Thank you for raising this bill and bringing this important issue to light....

RHB 5250

AAC THE APPOINTMENT OF PRIMARY POLLING OFFICIALS

This will bring the primaries statutes in line with our election statutes. Registrars of Voters are looking for consistency. To have all elections - primaries etc run the same no matter if it is a municipal - state or federal process. The hiring of poll workers has got to be decided on the training given to them and the capability of poll workers to demonstrate the integrity of elections and that their political preferences should not or will not be tolerated in the polling place. That poll workers are election officials and that they do not work for the political parties - candidates - or committees. They work for the Election Office and the Voters of the municipality holding the process. Their political preferences can only be demonstrated in casting their secret vote. Would like to have the sentence added on line 70 (see below)

Substitute language

Lines 4, 9, 21, 27, 40, 45, 47, 48, 50, 53, 63, 67, 68, 71, 74, 76

Registrar = REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

Lines 25, 28, 40, 45, checkers = OFFICIAL CHECKERS

Lines 26, 29, assistant registrars = ASSISTANT REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

Line 28 add BALLOT CLERK

Line 8, 9, 26 Delete references to Challengers

68 the above-mentioned proportion. The registrar OF VOTERS shall notify all such
 69 candidates and contestants of their right to submit a list of designees
 70 under this section.

**ALL PROSPECTIVE PRIMARY POLL WORKERS MUST BE PROPERLY
 TRAINED BY THE REGISTRARS OF VOTERS IN THE APPROPRIATE POSITIONS
 IN ORDER TO SERVE AS POLL WORKERS.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this
 71 section, the registrar OF VOTERS shall appoint as moderators only persons who are

RHB 5251

AAC TRANSFER ON VOTER REGISTRATION LISTS.

I thought that this was ROVAC bill to replace the Transfer Form with a Registration Card as we did last year for the restoration form to a voter registration Card. But this is dealing mainly with Canvass and not transfer of names on our list on election - primary days.



DENISE MERRILL

SECRETARY OF THE STATE
CONNECTICUT

**GAE Committee
Public Hearing Testimony
February 27, 2012**

Good Morning Chairman Morin, Chairman Slossberg and members of the committee. For the record my name is Denise Merrill and I am Secretary of the State of Connecticut. I would like to briefly address eight bills before the committee this morning

- Raised Bill 212 "AN ACT CONCERNING PROVISIONAL BALLOTS FOR STATE AND MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS"

This bill would allow provisional ballots to be used in state and municipal elections, and I support this concept, which is our proposal. Currently, provisional ballots are available in federal elections for voters who are registered but for some reason their name is not on the registry list for their polling place or town. When you vote by provisional ballot you are only casting votes for federal candidates.

This bill will allow a provisional ballot to look like the regular ballot being used because it will include all the candidates running for office in that election. Because federal candidates only run in even number election year, the provisional ballots are not used during municipal elections. This bill would extend the use of provisional ballots to all elections for all offices including local candidates. This also gives us an opportunity to streamline the election process. By extending the use of Provisional ballots, we can then eliminate the need to have challenge ballots. Provisional ballots allow voters whose registration is in doubt to cast ballots on Election Day.

Our office proposed this bill last year as well, and it did pass the House. Very simply, we have had the provisional ballot in use for a number of years and there have been no incidents of any kind on Election Day which would give us any security or integrity concern. Provisional ballots are counted later, up to six days after Election Day – only after it is determined that the voter is legitimately registered. If the registrars are unable to determine that the applicant is eligible to vote, then the ballot is not counted.

Provisional ballots are currently in use for federal elections; raised bill 212 would expand that to municipal and state elections. I support passage.

SB213
SB214
SB215
SB218
HB5250
HB5251

- **Raised Bill 215 “AN ACT CONCERNING SPECIAL ELECTION TIMING FOR PROBATE JUDGE VACANCIES”**

I will say that in general I support this concept. I will add that the bill as it is currently constructed needs to be reconciled with other state statutes that govern this area. We look forward to working with the members of this committee on a workable solution.

- **Raised Bill 218 “AN ACT CONCERNING POLLING PLACES FOR PRIMARIES”**

This bill would permit small towns (under 20,000 in population) to reduce the number of polling places for primaries. The cost of running elections is of particular concern for small towns. Many times you will have a much smaller voter turnout for a primary than for a general election. As such, a town may not need to staff and run as many polling places for a primary as they do at a general election. Reducing the number of polling places would definitely save towns money, and in general we support the idea of cutting the cost of elections.

Appropriately, this bill also addresses the important issue of how to notify voters of a change in polling location. However, eliminating certain polling places becomes problematic in cities where the neighborhood polling place is important because people can get there by foot. Eliminating a polling place in a city neighborhood can create voter confusion and place a hardship on a voter who does not have a car if he or she wants to exercise their right to vote.

There were also frankly some concerns about undue political influence in the big cities – where the primary is the major election – if certain primary precincts that are considered the base of one candidate are somehow eliminated. We have tried a compromise on this issue in the past, so what I would say about this bill is that if a compromise can be reached that addresses the needs of the small towns to lower their election costs while not creating problems for voters in the bigger cities, I will support such a compromise.

- **Raised Bill 5250 “AN ACT CONCERNING THE APPOINTMENT OF PRIMARY POLLING OFFICIALS”**

This bill would provide that an enrolled party member in the state, rather than just an enrolled party member in the municipality, may serve as a primary polling place official. Currently, any registered voter in the state can serve as a poll worker in a general election. This bill would make that rule applicable for a primary, where any enrolled party member in the state could serve as a poll worker for a primary of their party in any town in Connecticut.

I support this concept because any registrar of voters will tell you how difficult it is to find qualified poll workers for a primary. This bill would expand the pool of people available to work at the polls and that is a good thing. My feeling is that if voters from different towns can work the polls in other towns in Connecticut in a general election, the same rule should apply to enrolled party members in a primary. This bill simply conforms primaries to what is already done in general elections. So I support this bill and I urge passage.

H.B. 5250**Government Administration and Elections Committee
Testimony – February 27, 2012****Luther Weeks
Luther@CTVotersCount.org
334 Hollister Way West, Glastonbury, CT 06033**

Chairs and members of the Committee, my name is Luther Weeks, Executive Director of CTVotersCount. I have served in three elections as a central count absentee ballot Moderator.

I support H.B. 5250 which provides for Certified Moderators and others to serve as officials in any municipality in the state in a primary, just as they can in elections. I also have a suggestion for further improvement in this law and bill.

The three times I served as moderator in an election, were in a municipality, other than my own. Because of the existing law, I have had to turn down serving in primaries. The existing law and distinction between primaries and elections makes no sense and can make staffing difficult for registrars of voters.

I also suggest changing the limitations on checkers, ballot clerks, and machine tenders, which seem to imply that only a single check-in line is necessary in a primary. In high volume primaries, especially now that towns are consolidating polling places, serving the public may demand more than a single line, often requiring more than two checkers. Leave it to registrars of voters to determine staffing necessary to serve the public. I have provided suggested text:

at least one ~~[, but not more than two]~~ official checker[s], not more than two challengers if ~~[he]~~ the registrar deems it necessary, and at least one ~~[and not more than two]~~ ballot clerk[s] and at least one ~~[but not more than two voting]~~ tabulator tender ~~[s for each tabulator in use at such primary]~~

I also note that in several bills 'registrar' is changed to 'registrar of voters'. For consistency, that same change should be made in several places in this bill.

Thank you.

**ROVAC
REGISTRARS OF VOTERS
ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT**

GAE Testimony: February 27,2012 Submitted by George Cody, Reg. of Voters, New Canaan

HB 5250 AAC THE APPOINTMENT OF PRIMARY POLLING OFFICIALS
HB 5254 AAC CONCERNING PRIMARIES FOR MUNICIPAL OR STATE OFFICE

Submitted in support of HB 5250 AND HB 5254, Testimony Feb. 2012 GAE hearing

Sen. Slossberg, Sen. McLachlan, Rep. Morin, Rep Hwang, and members of the GAE Committee. My name is George Cody, and I would like to speak in favor of two bills before you today . Both proposed bills relate to allowing the Registrars of Voters greater flexibility in the selection and staffing of polling places in Primaries, and carry the endorsement of the Legislative committee of ROVAC.

In towns when small minority parties are involved in a primary, Registrars have on occasion encountered a problem with finding qualified and, in the case of Moderators, certified party members within their own towns and party to staff the primary. The two bills before you deal with this problem by allowing Registrars to use party members outside their town to supplement the staffing.

HB 5250 AAC THE APPOINTMENT OF PRIMARY POLLING OFFICIALS:

Removes the requirement that all polling place officials in a primary be selected from that party's local membership. Under the proposed bill, when an adequate number of trained local officials are not available within that town, then the Registrar has the option of using certified or trained enrolled party members from any municipality in Connecticut.

HB 5254 AAC CONCERNING PRIMARIES FOR MUNICIPAL OR STATE OFFICE:

Proposes additional small changes to polling place setup such as no longer requiring one voting booth for every 500 enrolled party members in the district, and the use of a second tabulator when unaffiliated voters are allowed to participate in a party's Primary would become optional rather than required.

We would recommend the following change to both HB 5254 and HB 5250. We request that the deadline for submission of potential qualified polling place officials by candidates be changed from 10 days to 21 days. 9-249 requires mandatory training of all polling place officials for elections. These statutory requirements should be extended to Primaries. Since these submitted names potentially have less experience, they would require additional training, or in the case of Moderators, certification. In the cities, training is often undertaken before the existing 10-day deadline. The additional time is needed to assure well-trained and qualified polling place officials. Currently, there is no training required for Primary poll workers. ROVAC is asking for language as appears in 9-249 to be inserted to require such training.

Thank you for your attention, and we look forward to working on these issues.

GAE Testimony: February 27,2012 Submitted by George Cody, Reg. of Voters, New Canaan

RECOMMENDED LANGUAGE CHANG 9-436 'd'

[Names of designees and alternate designees] Suggested names of qualified poll workers, for such positions including the position of Moderator shall be submitted in writing [by party-endorsed candidates and contestants] to the Registrar of Voters not later than [10] 21 days before a primary. [, Except the names of designees and alternate designees for the position of certified Moderator shall be submitted not later than twenty-one days before the primary]

In line 110 after "section" please insert the following text: ALL PROSPECTIVE PRIMARY POLLWORKERS MUST BE PROPERLY TRAINED BY THE REGISTRARS OF VOTERS IN THE APPROPRIATE POSITIONS IN ORDER TO SERVE AS POLLWORKERS.



Connecticut Democratic Party

330 Main Street, Hartford, CT 06106 • ctdelems.org

**Testimony to the Connecticut General Assembly
Submitted in Writing
To the
Government Administration and Elections Committee
Monday, February 27, 2012
on
Raised Bills 5250, 5254 and 217**

Chairwoman Slossberg, Chairman Morin and distinguished members of the Government Administration and Elections Committee, my name is Nancy DiNardo, and I am the chairwoman of the Connecticut Democratic Party. My testimony today is in support of Raised Bill No. 5250, An Act Concerning the Appointment of Primary Polling Officials, and in opposition to Raised Bill No. 5254, An Act Concerning Primaries for Municipal or State Office, and Raised Bill No. 217, An Act Concerning Challengers as Polling Place Officials.

I support the Secretary of State's proposal included in Raised Bill No. 5250 to allow local election officials to look outside of their municipality for poll workers from the same political party should they be unable to find poll workers in their own municipality. The bill provides that outside poll workers could be retained from outside municipalities only after an exhaustive search goes unfulfilled. I support registrars reaching out to surrounding towns to make certain that polls are adequately staffed and voter access is assured.

I oppose, however, Raised Bill No. 5254, which would allow anyone, regardless of political affiliation, to work in a polling place. This legislation would allow any elector to be appointed to serve in the case of a primary, which I believe is a slippery slope. Connecticut has closed primaries and, as chairwoman of the Connecticut Democratic Party, I do not support open primaries.

Additionally, I oppose Raised Bill No. 217, which would eliminate appointed challengers at polling places. As chairwoman, I support the concept of challengers, and I do not believe there is any need to eliminate challengers.

H – 1125

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2012**

**VOL.55
PART 3
695 – 1045**

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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if their vote is properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

On House Bill 5057.

Total number voting	142
Necessary for adoption	72
Those voting Yea	142
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	9

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The bill passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 117?

THE CLERK:

On page 14, Calendar 117, Substitute for House Bill Number 5250, AN ACT CONCERNING THE APPOINTMENT OF PRIMARY POLLING PLACE OFFICIALS, favorable report by

rgd/mb/md/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

86
April 4, 2012

the Committee on Government Administration and
Elections.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Russ Morin of the 28th, Chairman
of the Government Administration and Elections
Committee, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's
favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The question is acceptance of the Joint
Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

Representative Morin, you have the floor.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What this bill does is it lifts the requirement
of primary polling place officials, for example,
moderators and checkers and challengers, et cetera.
It lifts that requirement that they actually reside in
the municipality or a political subdivision holding
the primary. It will allow the registrars to -- of
voters to appoint any state electorate to these
positions, which they may already do for elections.

rgd/mb/md/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

87
April 4, 2012

So it's really conforming, bringing primaries into practice of what the general elections already do, and I urge passage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Hwang of the 134th.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, some questions to the proponent of this bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, sir.

Now, the law currently requires that the worker at that primary be a representative of that party. Does this bill retain that?

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It does and the whole intent of this is to allow -- and I'll give an example. Say, in the city

of -- we'll use the city of Hartford where there might -- there would be a Republican primary and maybe there are not so many active Republicans to fill the roles of manning the primary voting districts. It would allow for the moderators or the registrars to bring in registered Republicans from surrounding towns to help serve that.

Now, the language does allow, if that effort goes unmet, it does allow for any elector to hold a position. It would so -- it would allow an unaffiliated voter as well.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you again, that exception that you just cited, would the registrar of that party be able to choose that individual as part of the exception?

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

rgd/mb/md/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

89
April 4, 2012

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

That's all the questions I have. I'm in support of this bill.

And thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further on this bill?

Representative Cafero, the Minority Leader.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a few questions through you to the chairman of GAE.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, Representative Morin, the summary of the bill that's before us indicates that one would be able to go outside a municipality only after an exhaustive search. How is that

communicated in the bill that's before us?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe in the language it allows for the folks, the registrar, per se, to go through the process that they normally go through now, and in general elections as well, where they would go through the process of soliciting workers as they normally do.

Once that is exhausted and they can't fill it then, of course, then they will be able to go outside of, and hopefully, get members of the respective parties.

I don't know that I can answer any more, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, would the registrar of voters, plural or singular, of each town be responsible for conducting this exhaustive search?

rgd/mb/md/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

91
April 4, 2012

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

The way I understand it, yes. That was -- that's definitely the intent.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

It's my understanding that there are some towns that have only one registrar of voters and that person may be of one party or another. Or am I incorrect on that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm not aware of that. I apologize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Cafero.

rgd/mb/md/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

92
April 4, 2012

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

And through you, Mr. Speaker .

Just to clarify, you're not aware that that's the case, or you're not aware whether it is true or not?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess I'm not aware that that's the case, that there's only one, that there's a town that has just one registrar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you.

With regard to this exhaustive search, what would prevent a registrar from -- just from jump street, from right off the bat saying, you know what, I'm not going to bother with trying to solicit in-town polling workers. I'm going to go outside of the town and choose, you know, 10, 20, whatever polling people that I need.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

rgd/mb/md/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

93
April 4, 2012

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know that. And since we can already do this in the general election, I've never heard of this type of situation arising.

Could it happen? I suppose. I suppose if a registrar wanted to try to do that, I'm guessing that the registrars truly are looking -- have come to us for this because there is an opportunity that they've come up with that there's no way they can fill spots. And they're just looking for a way to get some help. I'm not sure that there's ever been this case.

And as we listened to the testimony -- we got multiple people come to testify about this, some registrars and different local election officials -- that scenario was never brought forth that I'm aware of.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The reason I asked the question, ladies and

gentlemen, is my concern is that -- and I realize that we need to give local registrars some flexibility in order to appropriately staff the polling places on election day. And I'm sure you've heard in your committee many stories about registrars that are unable, within the confines of their municipality, to find sufficient numbers of people, and they wanted to look outside that.

And I think the bill appropriately says that they should first look within and then look without, but I don't think there is any teeth to that within the bill, if I'm not mistaken. In other words, in my mind, there's nothing that would prohibit exactly what I said a registrar feeling, I'm not going to go within the municipality at all; I'm just going to look from without and outside the state and bring them in. And that gives me some concern.

Do you have any comment on that? Or anything that could assure us that that would not be the case?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

And I appreciate that, that comment and the thought process. As we went through it again, listening that this is already in effect for general elections and not having any history of there being any issue, I am sensitive to the gentleman's concerns.

And as this is dealing just distinctly with primaries, I would suggest that the intent is that people are going to conduct themselves honorably and do the right thing, as we frankly have seen in our elections throughout history. But I would be open if in future times if this was brought forth to look at this again if a problem did come to us.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for his answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on this bill? Will you remark further on this bill? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats. The machine will be

rgd/mb/md/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

96
April 4, 2012

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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Will the members please check the board to determine if their vote is properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5250.

Total number voting	144
Necessary for adoption	73
Those voting Yea	144
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	7

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The bill passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 124?

THE CLERK:

On page 15, Calendar 124, House Bill Number 5345,

H – 1140

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2012**

**VOL.55
PART 18
5829 – 6187**

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

Will you remark?

REP. MORIN (28th):

Mr. Speaker, if this bill sounds familiar to you, it should, we had passed this bill unanimously previously and I will ask the Clerk, the Clerk has an Amendment LCO 3161, and I would ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 3161, which was previously designated 7 Senate A.

THE CLERK:

LCO 3161 Senate A, offered by Senator Slossberg and Representative Morin.

(Representative Kirkley-Bey in the Chair.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

The Representative has leave to summarize Senate Amendment A.

Is there any objection? Is there any objection?

Hearing none, please proceed, Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

And as I said before, if this is familiar to you, it's for good reason. We had passed this bill unanimously in the house. It was transmitted to the Senate and was made aware there was a minor drafting error that came through that was not caught. The Senate amended that, voted unanimously on the bill, and now the good bill that we had passed, we need to adopt that same amendment here.

Basically, the amendment is very simple. It's conforming language. In line 52 it just adds -- it takes the word "his" and puts "the head moderator's" in place. In line 63, if you notice it said "not later than 10 days before the primary." We bracket out 10 and add 21, which brings it in -- the primaries conforming into the general election. So, both standards are the same. And in line 70 it removed -- it inserts "the Registrar shall train each prospective primary poll worker to perform in the poll workers' designated position." And that was the intent in the original -- when I originally brought this bill out and unfortunately it was not properly drafted. So, I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

The question before us is adoption.

Will you remark?

Representative Hwang, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, a couple questions on the amendment to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Morin, please prepare yourself.

Representative Hwang, please proceed.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you very much.

Through you, Ma'am, in regards to the line 63 of inserting 21, what was the rationale in the original to go to 10, or was that in error?

Through you, Ma'am, speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, that was existing language, I believe, and we wanted to make sure that this -- the primaries and the general elections have the same amount of dates. And extending the time was a benefit to the registrars to get the training and get everything in place.

smj/law/djp/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

185
May 4, 2012

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

And then Senate Amendment A, it said we're going to add a deadline to submitting the polling place officials names to the registrar. Is that related to line 63, or was that in a separate location? And if so, through you, Ma'am, what date would that be, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, where do you see that? I'd just like to know where they're referring to in Senate Amendment A because I'm looking at the amendment and I'm not seeing that.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Hwang, would you please point to the line you're speaking of?

REP. HWANG (134th):

Sure. Through you, Madam Speaker, that's

smj/law/djp/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

186
May 4, 2012

actually why I'm asking the question. In the OLR bill analysis, it cited that it made a technical change and added the deadline for submitting polling place officials' names to the registrar. And I'm just trying to ascertain where that is because I don't see it as well, Ma'am.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I'm looking at all the lines in the amendment. And as, again, it was brought forth to me this is strictly -- I'm not looking at that. I guess I'll have to try to find the LCO, their report. But the way this was described to me and the way I understand it is we're going through it, this is just conforming language that should have been taken care of. And I apologize that it doesn't when we originally brought out the bill and I don't know where that language came from, but I don't have it right in front of me. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, with that said, I'd like to be noted that -- and I'm fairly confident that working with the Chair of the GAE, that we will ascertain that and make the proper notation in our records.

Thank you. Through you again, Ma'am, the other aspect of it is, is the implementation of a training requirement for the Registrar and the additional poll workers. Could you elaborate a little bit more as to what extent of that training requirement is?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Morin, you have the floor.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

And, in fact, it does -- the amendment does require the Registrars of Voters to train prospective poll workers. And again, to the extent most municipalities -- they don't currently do this. Most municipalities that I've discussed the registrars when they've come in to discuss, they all provide training for poll workers. I think this is something unfortunately we have to put in there because there are a few instances that maybe the poll workers aren't

receiving the proper instructions.

There is a -- you know, I think there is going to be a minimal cost to this, but it's very important to make sure that the campaigns are run with as few distractions. The poll workers that are there are knowledgeable, and especially the underlying part of this bill, which is bringing in poll workers from different municipalities if you can't recruit them from your own. So, I think ultimately the reason for this, too, is to ensure that, especially if new people are coming in from different municipalities, that they're more familiar with how things are run in each town.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, Ma'am.

Through you, Madam Speaker, I think the reason I raise that point is as we have done other bills as it relates to maybe election day registration where we put a fiscal note on it in regards to we're adding an employee and adding 12 to \$15 an hour and having a defined number. I'm just concerned that when we cite

minimal costs and place that state mandate, and having no number on it raises a concern. And I just wanted to ask the good Chairman how he felt -- well, what he knew of what the potential cost would be.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

I certainly can't put a specific dollar amount, but again, I would say especially with my conversations and discussions with registrars and election officials throughout the state, right now majority -- I don't know of any place to my knowledge that does not train their poll workers. I have not seen a direct dollar amount, so, I can't -- it wouldn't be fair for me to try to come up with one. But, again, the OFA folks gave it a minimal cost because I think they recognized that based on our discussions, the majority of folks do, in fact, provide that training.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

The reason I raise that in concern of the cost is, you know, I live in Fairfield, but if there is a need in the City of Bridgeport to require additional assistance and additional poll worker, I would tend to think -- and I would ask the Chairman's thoughts on this -- is the fact that to train someone who is working in Fairfield and going into the City of Bridgeport, there are changes that are dramatic. And I ask the Chair if there is any consideration for that in regard to the cost differential that might be required to train.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

I suppose there could be. And, again, during the discussions as we had testimony and as I've discussed this with different election officials, of course, that there may be some potential, but I don't think this is going to be a big dollar issue. I really don't. I think that the prospective poll workers --

smj/law/djp/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

191
May 4, 2012

honestly, people were clamoring for us to do this. The cities were looking for it. The small towns were looking for it because it's so hard to get people. And I think if they felt that this was going to be a specific problem, they would have let us know that this was -- could be a problem.

And I guess what I would say to my fine Ranking Member is I would be happy to keep going with this. And as we may learn something new in the upcoming session next year, if we see that there is a problem, we certainly can address it. But most of the election folks that I know that came to talk to us were clamoring for us to make this change, and we're in this position now to fix a few drafting errors.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I appreciate that sentiment, and the good Chair has been true to his words in that working relationship. I want to simply say that it seems like deja vu all over again with this bill because obviously we have revised it and the Senate has made

the amendment. But it comes back to me, as I'm raising these questions as a concern, that as it comes down on amendment, we are placing a state-mandated cost onto our municipalities. And I grant that it may not be significant, but I think as Legislatures, we need to be extremely sensitive that as we make arbitrary language changes we have real financial and economic consequences to our municipalities. And that as we consider future bills moving forward, that we take the time to recognize that whatever the minimal amount that might be, it is a burden on our municipalities and the State that is making this law provides no resources to that effect.

So, through you, Madam Speaker, I just want to offer obviously my support of this bill, but with the caveat and consideration that we recognize and respect and not placing the financial burdens on our municipalities without consciousness.

Through you, Ma'am.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Xièxiè.

Representative Alberts, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

smj/law/djp/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

193
May 4, 2012

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Good afternoon.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

A couple of questions to the proponent, if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It's my understanding that the poll workers are required to show up about 30 minutes prior to the polls being open. So, my sense would be that the type of training that we're envisioning here as outlined in Senate "A" is probably the level of training that could be completed in that 30-minute period, is it not?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, certainly. And again, I rely on the registrars to provide the training that they feel is appropriate for their, for their municipality. And I think that's probably very, very true.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And really, the total cost here that we're envisioning would really be a function of the number of people coming from outside communities. So, it could vary from one person to several people, depending on the pole situation; isn't that correct, Madam Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

I believe that's correct. And I also want to just mention that in the original discussion of the bill, the intent of -- and I believe I discussed it, was that this was that we were going to require them to provide the training. And I think it just didn't make it into the language.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And, again, this is all permissive language. So, even though there is the calculation of a State mandate with a minimal cost that we anticipate, this is something that the municipality is seeking to do to address a specific municipal issue. So, is that not correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I do thank the gentleman for his answers. I think this is something that we should all support.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Thank you.

Will you remark further on Senate Amendment "A"?

Will you remark further on Senate Amendment "A"?

If not, let me try your minds. All those in

smj/law/djp/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

196
May 4, 2012

favor, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER KIRKLEY-BEY:

Those opposed nay.

The ayes have it. The amendment has been
adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

If not, staff and guests, please come to the
well. Members, take your seats. The machine will be
open.

THE CLERK:

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

(Speaker Donovan in the Chair.)

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members
voted?

Have all the members voted? Have all the members
voted? The machine will be locked. The Clerk will
please take a tally.

Will the Clerk please announce the tally?

smj/law/djp/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

197
May 4, 2012

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5250 as amended by Senate "A" in
concurrency with the Senate.

Total number voting	144
Necessary for passage	73
Those voting yea	144
Those voting nay	0
Those absent and not voting	7

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The bill as amended in concurrency with the
Senate is passed.

Any announcements or introductions? Any
announcements or introductions?

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78th):

I hope the Chamber carries on talking loudly so I don't have to acknowledge this, but, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of bipartisan effort, once again, I have challenged your ability to accept my challenges. I think the bow tie that you're wearing right now is the first time I've ever seen you wear a bow tie. It looks very distinguished on you and it has cost me a considerable amount of money that will be going to the Connecticut challenge.

S - 639

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2012**

**VOL. 55
PART 4
942 - 1311**

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

149
April 18, 2012

The bill remains now in three sections: Section 1, expands the membership of the Connecticut Medical Examining Board; Section 2, deals with continuing education requirements for physicians: And Section 3, also makes changes to the Connecticut State Board of Examiners for Nursing.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the bill as amendment?
Will you remark further on the bill as amendment?

If not, Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Seeing no objection, if this could be placed on our
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing and hearing no objection, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Thank you.

THE CLERK:

On page 11, Calendar 238, Substitute for House Bill
Number 5250, AN ACT CONCERNING THE APPOINTMENT OF
PRIMARY POLLING PLACE OFFICIALS, favorable report of
the committee on Government Administration And
Elections.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

150
April 18, 2012

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President.

It's so nice to see in the Chair this evening, sir.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

I move the joint committees' favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

On acceptance and passage in concurrence, will you remark, Madam?

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Yes, thank you, Mr. -- Mr. President.

The -- the bill here that was passed by the House, very simply allows the registrars of voters to appoint primary place -- primary polling place officials who reside outside the municipality. This makes it consistent with the authority registrars all ready have regarding general elections.

The underlying bill was passed by the House and then it was determined -- discovered that there had been a technical glitch and the substitute language that was supposed to be in the bill was not actually there. So for the purpose of correcting that technicality, I would ask that the Clerk call LCO Number 3161, which he should have in his possession, and that I be granted leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

151
April 18, 2012

LCO Number 3161, Senate "A" offered by Senator
Slossberg and Representative Morin.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

On adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Yes. This is the language that was actually voted out of committee as substitute language, as well. So in addition to the underlying language that I previously summarized, the amendment requires candidates who want to designate polling place workers to submit those individuals names to the registrar 21 days rather than 10 days before the primary, and it requires the registrars to train perspective poll workers.

With the adoption of the amendment, it will reunite the substitute language with the original language, and we will have the bill that the committee JFS'd out of our committee earlier in the session, so with that I would ask for support of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment?

If not, I'll try your minds.

All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

152
April 18, 2012

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

All those opposed, nay.

The ayes have it. Senate Amendment "A" is adopted.

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Yes, Mr. President. If there's no objection, I'd ask
that this item be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing and hearing no objection, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CLERK:

On page 12, Calendar 260, Substitute for Senate Bill
Number 232, AN ACT EXTENDING A MORATORIUM ON CERTAIN
LONG TERM CARE BEDS, favorable report of the committee
on Human Services.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Musto.

SENATOR MUSTO:

Good evening, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, sir.

SENATOR MUSTO:

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

237
April 18, 2012

Madam President, if we might call now to have the Clerk read the items on the Consent Calendar and then to move to a vote on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you please read the items on the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

On page 1, Calendar 300, House Joint Resolution Number 78; page 1, Calendar 301, House Joint Resolution Number 79.

Page 2 Calendar 302, House Joint Resolution Number 80; page 2, Senate Bill -- Calendar Number 64, Senate Bill 37.

Page 3, Calendar 89, Senate Bill 56.

Page 4, Calendar 110, Senate Bill 184; page 4, Calendar 91, Senate Bill Number 276.

Page 5, Calendar 127, Senate Bill 320.

Page 8, Calendar 203, Senate Bill 408.

Page 9, Calendar 226, Senate Bill 411; also, on page 9, Calendar 224, Senate Bill Number 339.

Page 10, Calendar 232, Senate Bill Number 186.

On page 11, Calendar 238, House Bill 5250.

On page 12, Calendar 258, Senate Bill 340; also on page 12, Calendar 259, Senate Bill 157; page 12, Calendar 265, Senate Bill 176.

Page 13, Calendar 271, Senate Bill 350; page 13, Calendar 273, Senate Bill 293; page 13, Calendar 274, Senate Bill 294.

Page 14, Calendar 285, Senate Bill 404.

Page 15, Calendar 296, Senate Bill Number 307.

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

238
April 18, 2012

And page 24, Calendar 132, Senate Bill 337.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease for a second.

(Chamber at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

Okay. Those are the items listed. The machine will be open.

Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a roll call vote on the Consent Calendar. Thank you.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators please return to the chamber. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? If all members voted, the machine will be locked.

And Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

On today's Consent Calendar.

Total Number Voting	35
Necessary for passage	19
Those voting Yea	35
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar has passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY.