

SA12-005

HB5326

General Law	800-813, 1057-1059	17
House	8225-8227, 8288-8290	6
<u>Senate</u>	<u>4485, 4496-4499</u>	<u>5</u>
		28

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GENERAL
LAW
PART 3
555 – 824**

2012

SENATOR HARTLEY: Thank you.

REP. TABORSAK: Representative Miner. After Representative Miner we're going to switch to members of the public.

REP. MINER: Good morning, Representative Taborsak, Senator Doyle and members of the committee. I'm here this morning to testify on behalf of House Bill 5326, which was a bit of legislation I asked to have introduced, and I would take a moment, if I could, to kind of paint a picture for you.

Back as early as I think the 1800s the State of Connecticut gave municipalities the right to levy property tax. And since that day the State of Connecticut has taken away some of that opportunity by excluding things. In fact, we've done it to ourselves on the sales tax issue.

And one of the areas that we determined in terms of good public policy is the area of agriculture, agriculture and aquaculture. And it was early determined that in order to try and provide a safe and reliable food source for the state of Connecticut, having a hundred thousand tillable acres available in the state of Connecticut to provide good, quality food sources for residents of the state of Connecticut was paramount. And so I say that as a means of trying to connect the dots here. What we've done is we have over time created good public policy to further agriculture. We've created good public policy to offset the effects of sprawl by saying that in these certain circumstances we think it's good public policy not to develop.

And what this bill proposes to do is to connect what I think is that last dot. When

consumers walk into a grocery store right now and they're looking at the vast array of apples and peaches and beans and squash, there's nothing there that tells them where it comes from, and I think we've heard over the last couple of years all sorts of stories about how difficult it is to track food and what the implications might be in terms of the health effects of some food because it's treated outside this country differently than we treat it here in this country.

And it's always, at least it's always been my opinion that the closer you could deliver that food to market the greater the quality was when someone consumed it. I think there's scientific data that shows that. So as simple as this bill is, what it tries to do is to say to the consumer if you knew that this product, squash, was grown in Harrington and you had a choice of choosing that product even at a higher value, would you choose it over something that might have been grown in South America?

And many of my constituents, in fact many of the people that have testified on behalf of many of the farm issues over the years, have always said let that choice, most people would choose to keep the business here. So what I think this bill does is create furtherance of the public policy that we have. I think what it does is it helps the consumer connect that last dot, which creates a stronger market for locally grown, and I don't think has a negative impact in terms of any other business that might go on in the state of Connecticut.

One thing I would mention, however, is that when I've spoken to people who understand how the grocery industry works, they've talked about UPC labels and they've talked about the

implications on a drop dead base, so to speak, in terms of requiring this to be done. And most have suggested to me that if we want to be fair with the industry we should be trying to push the data out at which this has to occur at the grocery store to one in which they would normally incorporate it within one of their software upgrades.

I would also tell you that a constituent of mine is working with the maple syrup industry in Connecticut right now. One percent of the maple syrup sold in the state of Connecticut is Connecticut grown. That's maple syrup. When you take into account breakfast syrup, all the stuff made with corn starch and everything else that some argue doesn't have the same value a maple syrup, it becomes a tiny fraction.

So I would ask you when you leave today as you're driving home look at all the acreage we have in trees, think of all the acres the state of Connecticut owns in trees, and I think you can formulate your own vision of how we can grow just even that industry in the state of Connecticut, creating more jobs and more revenue and so on. Once again, I thank you for raising it and if I could be I guess so bold on Section B if we could look at phasing this in over at least a year period of time in terms of the obligation on the grocery store industry, so that they don't have a significant impact in terms of their software. Thank you.

REP. TABORSAK: Thank you, Representative. Are there any -- Senator Kissel has a question.

SENATOR KISSEL: First of all, thank you, Mr. Chairman, Representative Miner, thank you so much for bringing this forward before us. You

know, that there's at least a couple of folks up here that have interest in agricultural issues, and you have for quite a while.

I know that earlier this year actually trying to recall, I think it was right before our session started there was a presentation from a representative from Vermont regarding initiatives that they were making up there trying to increase public awareness of food grown in Vermont. They have huge dairy interests up there, but also she stated the notion that if given an opportunity that individuals would increase the amount of purchases they would make of locally grown produce and other agricultural products. And the receipt, I think, gets us to that point because then the consumer gets to go home and you might feel good that, hey, last week was 2 percent and this week is 3 percent.

Because I think the notion is that we recognize that there are some threats posed by huge, multinational corporations who basically just concerned about the bottom line as opposed to smaller businesses or local businesses where they're more connected to the community, they're supportive of the community, and they're the ones that are the job creators in many instances, or at least job creators with good salaries, or we would hope so. Have you looked to other states? Is this proposal tailored on some of the things that are going on, for example, in Vermont or Illinois? And have you reached out and talked to folks in the industry to see if they can iron out some of those differences?

REP. MINER: Thank you, Senator. This isn't specifically modeled against anything else, but it is - - I was doing some research this summer on how other states treat

Connecticut-grown products as an added value, so for instance if you took maple syrup and then added it to a candy that you might have gotten from Kraft foods, there are certain circumstances where other states provide greater incentives to locally grown and locally grown combinations than we do here in Connecticut.

Plenty of information that I have read over the last year or two leads me to believe that the grocery industry could clearly state for the committee the benefit they see in that tabulation of a receipt. They know that a consumer will go back to in my case a stop and shop because I earned gas points and then I take the gas points to Torrington and I buy gas and I get a discount in gasoline. They know that certain products tracked by coupons have certain advertisement values, and then that information is shared with others, so they know the demographics of people who buy things. So while this isn't specifically crafted on Vermont, I am aware that many states - - you may have attended a meeting down in Washington where one of the Senators from Georgia who I'm familiar with in the Sportsman's Caucus I think is the chair of the National Association.

Maybe you didn't. But anyway, they're very keen on this sort of stuff all over the country because they know what you've expressed that given the choice and if people knew when they looked at that package of beans it came from as I said Harwinton or, you know, somewhere else like New Zealand, that in all likelihood they would choose to leave the money here.

SENATOR KISSEL: I'm more than, I would be delighted if I could try to help you with this

particular proposal. I don't know how far it has to go or how much opposition we'll hear this afternoon, but it strikes me that even if you had a - - you have two products, even if one is slightly more expensive, and we're assuming that the Connecticut one might be more expensive, it may not be the case.

But even so, I can see many of my constituents saying, well, if it's 50 cents difference that's not a big deal. I'd rather help the local business. To my mind the selling that product does not work a detriment on grocery stores, and so the notion is can we get that information into their tracking system. And I've been on this committee back when the whole notion of not posting prices was first put forward. I remember working for those in this room that may remember her, the late - - and she was a pleasure to work with - - Grace No (phonetic).

The idea was they wanted to get at the register pricing but they didn't want to have to bother with putting the price on all the items. And so the notion is can we do something electronically? And there were some pilots that were done. My recollection is that some of those initial pilots weren't with food stores but were with drug stores. And so we built this construct that said, okay, industry if you want to go electronic an save cost that way there need to be a penalty on the other side that says if it rings up wrong the consumer gets to have it for free. And we have a proposal on this committee that would extend that, I think, to produce.

Because for some reason produce got left out of that. So the notion that perhaps we can take the next step to try to help local growers of produce and other local

agricultural interest, I think works as a benefit, not only to those folks but also to the industry because I don't see them losing out in the end, and one of my frustrations has been I think we have done a great job in preserving agricultural land. I don't think we've done such a good job in trying to make sure that that's all utilized. But unless we create an environment where we make it more beneficial to utilize all that land that we've spent so many millions of dollars to acquire rights to, then we're only doing a piece of the puzzle.

So I congratulate you on this initiative, and maybe like so many other bills it may take a couple of years to come to fruition, but I'm completely aware that Illinois, Vermont, so many other states in the country are moving in this direction, that I think it's an important initiative that we should look at very strongly. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. TABORSAK: Thank you, Senator. Senate Leone and then Chairman Doyle.

SENATOR LEONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Representative. I appreciate your comments and I'm very supportive of the fact that we, you know, any time we can assist Connecticut homegrown products I think that's a good thing. And you know, the organic revolution is well under way, so many people are already self educating themselves on the benefits of, you know, buying produce a local as possible.

My only concern is in terms of how this would actually get implemented, and I know you've mentioned the larger chains, such as a stop and shop, and my concern would be the smaller

locations that would also sell the products, you know, a more family oriented, something, a 500 square foot facility, even a 1,000 square foot facility, as compared to, you know, a 20,000 square foot facility that would have deeper pockets and more resources in order to do this.

And even in cases of where we'd have farmers' markets where ,you know, we're selling out of state but it's still locally and fresh. So my concern would be how that gets implemented and that we don't inadvertently put more pressures on smaller businesses relative to the larger businesses. So have you had any contact with those establishments, and even the larger establishments, how have they weighed in on this topic?

REP. MINER: Thank you, Senator Leone. I have not had a conversation with the smaller establishments, and I figured this was the opportunity to at least provide my testimony.

If your suggestion is that I have that conversation in the next week or two I'd be happy to do it. But I would say to that embedded in much of our statutory language there's a 10,000 square foot threshold. It seems to be the brake mark where when we do these sorts of things that's where we say if you're above that you need to, if you're below that you don't. I guess one of the things I would say to you is that I think if you go to a farmer's market there's little question as to what it is. Usually they're very forthright about where that package of beans came from. If it didn't come from their field they're usually willing to tell you it came from down the street.

If the honey they have on display is sold it

has to show where it came from and what's in it. But I do recognize that labeling is an issue and it means different things to different people. What I was kind of focusing on was the larger volume of sales and our ability to capture that information and determine whether or not the tax policy we've established here is actually benefiting us. We may actually be giving a lot of tax incentives to an industry that really isn't fully benefiting us.

And I think they want to, and I think in the case where we have raw land that's not being really used for anything other than perhaps creating a bale of hay that may not even have any food value to a horse, they qualify. And so I think if we could just look at produce to start with and then go to meat, there are a lot of initiatives in the state of Connecticut, which some of you may be aware of, relative to grass-fed beef, free-range chickens and so on, where the consumer has clearly made decisions to spend more money. But I will, if that's what you're suggesting, I will reach out to both sides.

SENATOR LEONE: Thank you. And your willingness to do that, I think, speaks volumes. So I thank you for your comments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Doyle?

SENATOR DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Representative.

REP. MINER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR DOYLE: I just want to touch - - as you're probably aware, the Chair, the Chairs have meetings. We had a meeting with the grocery store association and they expressed some reservations with this bill, as you probably

suspect.

I don't know if you want to, you know, contact them, but I guess it was presented to us that -- and the spirit of the bill I certainly support, so I'm just kind of telling you what is facing you. Their concern is, you know, further regulation of requiring, you know, signage would maybe a disincentive for Connecticut items. I don't know if you want to comment on that. It's not position, this language was presented to me to give you an opportunity to address it.

REP. MINER: Sure, thank you. I'm not naive enough to think that there wouldn't be some opposition because I think most people who run businesses -- I have and do myself -- always get some concern when government in general tries to put an obligation on their business.

Clearly they have, at least in terms of their business model, made the determination that more information is better. Otherwise there's no reasons why they would have self imposed, you know, that number on the bottom of the receipt that says if you do a certain amount of business here, you get a discount on gas. So I think that's a recognition that this type of gathering of information works, not only for them, but I suspect that it provides information that those they buy supplies from.

Secondly, I would hope that by making a change to this legislation it puts the implementation state off to the next opportunity that I would imagine they would be rewriting software anyway. That it kind of does away with the hidden costs associated with it. I do know, I guess I'll refer back to the maple syrup comment, I do know that at least one chain within the state of Connecticut has already

made the determination on their own that they see great value in being able to connect their store, their brand, with somebody's maple syrup in the state of Connecticut.

Otherwise they wouldn't have voluntarily done it. So while I'm perfectly willing to have the conversation and will seek out those that representative the grocery store industry, I think the facts are pretty clear and that's that there's great value in this for everybody. Certainly there's a lot of value for them because I know when Litchfield has their farmers' market, one of the questions was does it take away from the grocery store, and what I heard back from our grocery store was it creates a lot of interest.

It creates a lot of interest in buying and creates a lot of conversation about good quality food and so from that aspect, if the farmers market's not open on Thursday, people go in looking for good produce and they think that's healthy.

SENATOR DOYLE: And I'd just like to follow up (inaudible). Personally I think, and, you know, you see in stores now, some stores have Connecticut grown. I think it's much more effective, you know, to have the signage in the store when people are shopping, not necessarily their receipt just, you know, it's up to you.

But I think it's probably more effective when a person's going through the produce to see Connecticut grown and I think they think fresher and you know, maybe even help the Connecticut farmers. But you know, it's your bill and hopefully you can just contact, speak to them and then you can get back to the committee.

REP. MINER: I'd be happy to do that. And in the first section there, that is what I've - - I'm attempting to do.

SENATOR DOYLE: Oh, yeah, no, I agree, no.

REP. MINER: To make that connection, and I agree with you.

SENATOR DOYLE: I think that's more effective.

REP. MINER: It's of little value to pick it up, take it all the way to cash register and wait on the line and then find out what you didn't get what you thought you got, so I agree with you wholeheartedly.

SENATOR DOYLE: Thank you.

REP. MINER: Thank you.

REP. TABORSAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the second time. And just along the lines of where Senator Doyle's coming from, cause obviously if there's pushback it's going to be a more difficult, and I apologize for the pun, row to hoe. But maybe a pilot, and I don't know if there would be any outlets out thee willing to take this on, but maybe someone in the industry, either a geographically centered pilot or a specific store, but just to show that I think that there's gains to be made on both sides of this equation.

For the local farmers to try to get some of this fallow land up and tilled and producing things that we need as a state. At the press conference that we had not too long ago on

trying to get a select committee on agriculture, and some of my colleagues and constituents have indicated that food is a billion dollar a month industry in Connecticut. In fact, there's this notion that Mexico is doing such a good job of growing food at such a cheap price but yet it has this bad image, that it actually can ship its food to Canada, be labeled as Canadian, still come back to America and still undercut us as far as price.

Well, you know, price is one element of a purchase decision, but also trying to help your neighbor and trying to help the state is another element. And you know, you balance it with what you have in your budget. You might say, okay, I can do X amount. And how many folks like to go out there when it's the right season and buy local corn and things like that?

So any kind of conversations you have with the industry I think would be helpful but I'd like to believe at some point the state will be competitive with other states that are thinking exactly this way. And the other group that I would touch bases with if at all possible, and I'll try to think of doing it myself, is the governor has his council on agriculture. They're very interested in trying to move us along this road.

Part of what their mission is to increase consumption of locally grown food stuffs by a certain year. There's a target date that they are required to try to achieve, both through the executive branch and I'm not even sure if it's a statute. But the other thing that they want to do is they really want to make the notion that farmers, every length of the spectrum, and you had mentioned, you know,

meat, but whether it's dairy, whether it's chickens, whether it's things that are grown, whether it's any component, it could be even Christmas trees, you know, we want to try to promote the use of this land that we have done such a great job of preserving.

So I look forward to having this continue to move forward, this decision. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. TABORSAK: Thank you, Senator. With that, thank you - -

REP. MINER: I just wanted to thank you for that comment. I did have - - I have had a conversation with some of the members of that commission, and they've not taken a position on the bill yet. But we had a very frank conversation about the implications in the bill, both pro and con.

And so as I said to you earlier, I'd be happy to try and work my way through those. I think that the best change legislation like this has with moving forward is a good, positive dialogue, and what I've heard today is a good indicator of things to come. Thank you.

REP. TABORSAK: Thank you for your testimony. Moving onto the public portion. Our first speaker is John Arabasos, or Arabatos. Apologies, followed by Alex Lanuk, followed by Karen Buckley Bates, followed by Eric Schoonmaker. Good afternoon.

JOHN ARABALOS: Good afternoon, Senator Doyle, Representative Taborsak, and respected members of the General Law Committee. My name is John Arabalos, I am a registered interior designer, small business owner in West Haven, and interior design educator at the University of

HB 5307

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GENERAL
LAW
PART 4
825 – 1093**

2012



Connecticut Farm Bureau Association
775 Bloomfield Ave., Windsor, CT 06095-2322
(860) 768-1100 • Fax (860) 768-1108 • www.cfba.org

March 6, 2012

Testimony in Opposition to: Raised Bill no. 5326 AN ACT ENCOURAGING THE PURCHASE OF FOOD PRODUCTS GROWN OR MADE IN CONNECTICUT.

Submitted by: Henry N. Talmage, Executive Director, Connecticut Farm Bureau Association

The following testimony is submitted on behalf of the Connecticut Farm Bureau, a statewide nonprofit membership organization of over 5,000 families dedicated to farming and the future of Connecticut agriculture.

Members of the Committee on General Law,

Agriculture is a \$3.5 billion industry comprising over 20,000 jobs in Connecticut according to a 2010 University of Connecticut study on the impact of the agricultural to the state's economy. There is significant interest in local foods and farm products. Connecticut is finally considering growth in agriculture as a legitimate economic development strategy.

Although the Connecticut Farm Bureau is in favor of farm-of-origin labeling and supportive the CT Grown program and efforts to identify and promote locally grown agricultural products, we are concerned that the Raised Bill No. 5326 would place an unreasonable burden on grocery stores to comply. In particular, we are concerned that many grocers would need to make significant investment in system upgrades in order to comply with the provisions as outlined in section (b). As an alternative we would like to encourage the promotion of the CT Grown program and encourage the use of voluntary labeling programs to meet consumer demands for CT Grown products.

CT Farm Bureau therefore urges the defeat of Raised Bill No. 5326 as drafted.

Government Affairs

State Public Policy

Industry Information



Partnerships

Trade Services

Retailer Services

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE TESTIMONY**By Stan Sorkin, President****Connecticut Food Association****March 6, 2012****TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO RB 5326: AN ACT ENCOURAGING THE PURCHASE OF PRODUCTS GROWN OR MADE IN CONNECTICUT**

The Connecticut Food Association (CFA) is the state trade association that conducts programs in public affairs, food safety, research, education and industry relations on behalf of its 240 member companies— food retailers, wholesalers, distributors, and service providers in the state of Connecticut. CFA's members in Connecticut operate approximately 300 retail food stores and 250 pharmacies. Their combined estimated annual sales volume of \$5.7 billion represents 75% of all retail food store sales in Connecticut. CFA's retail membership is composed of independent supermarkets, regional firms, and large multi-store chains employing over 30,000 associates. The majority of our members are family owned privately owned supermarkets. Our goal is to create a growth oriented economic climate that makes Connecticut more competitive with surrounding states. The Connecticut Specialty Food Association (CSFA), an organization of Connecticut base entrepreneurs sharing a vision to provide consumers with high quality specialty foods, is part of the Connecticut Food Association.

I am Stan Sorkin, President of the Connecticut Food Association. The CFA wholeheartedly endorses the purpose of the act- encouraging the purchase of products grown or made in Connecticut, **but not the means specified in the act to get there.**

First, the Connecticut Food Association is responsible for the success of Connecticut's specialty food industry. Our business and marketing plans are geared to increasing the distribution and sales of CSFA produced specialty foods to distributors, retailers, and consumers.

Second, CFA members are active in their support of Connecticut grown fresh products with most retailers heavily advertising and displaying CT Grown products during the peak selling season. Our retailers were quick to recognize the consumer trend of buying local and thus, developing partnerships with local producers to increase distribution and sale of CT Grown products in Connecticut's supermarkets. We are highly supportive of the Department of Agriculture's CT Grown program and look forward to expanding it.

However, we cannot support the specific requirements as outline in the proposed language for the following reasons:

195 Farmington Avenue, Suite 200, Farmington, CT 06032

email: ctfood@ctfoodassociation.org www.ctfoodassociation.org (860) 677-8097 (860) 677-8418

- **Mandatory state labeling** of CT specific produced or grown food product is expensive for the state's retailers to implement and provides little benefit to consumers
- It fails to provide material facts concerning the safety or nutritional aspects of food and purely serves as mandated advertising of CT produced products at the retailer's expense
- The language only pertains to grocery stores and not to other retailers selling CT produced foods. It would put the grocery retailer at a cost disadvantage in relation to other classes of trade that sell CT grown products-mass merchandisers (Walmart, Target), drug stores, farm stands, etc.
- Federal legislation already mandates Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) on produce items, meat, and seafood items and nutritional signing as of March 1, 2012 on single ingredient cuts of meat. State pricing laws require that you post the price and unit price of the item below a packaged item on the shelf. Additional mandatory signage on CT produced or grown items will make the signs surrounding the product more prominent than the product itself.
- The cost of modifying and maintaining your front end system to note CT specific products(SKUs) is expensive and difficult. With produce products having standard look up codes, it would be impossible to differentiate a CT grown corn and out of state corn. What is the value of the use of the register receipt to show CT grown or produced product after the purchase is made

The additional costs associated with this well meant bill would only make Connecticut products more expensive to the consumer and inhibit sales.

The additional costs associated with this well meant bill would reduce the likelihood of retailers stocking CT produced or grown products.

Based on the well- meant goal of the legislation, we strongly recommend that Connecticut form a task force with our industry, the Food Policy Council, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Economic Development to develop a comprehensive business plan to move the purpose of the legislation- encouraging the purchase of products grown or made in Connecticut

We respectfully ask that the General Law Committee vote NO on RB 5326.

H – 1147

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2012**

**VOL.55
PART 25
8215 - 8555**

On page 6, Calendar 205, House Bill Number 5326, AN
ACT ENCOURAGING THE PURCHASE OF FOOD PRODUCTS GROWN OR MADE
IN CONNECTICUT, favorable report on General law.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Taborsak.

REP. TABORSAK (109th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Question is on acceptance and passage.

Will you remark?

REP. TABORSAK (109th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an
amendment, LCO 5531. I'd ask that the Clerk call the
amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to
summarize.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 5531, designated House
"A."]

THE CLERK:

LCO 5531, House "A," offered by Representative
Taborsak and Miner.

mr/ch/rgd/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

367
May 9, 2012

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Is there objection to summarization? Hearing none, Representative, you may proceed.

REP. TABORSK (109th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment is a strike-all. It becomes the bill. And what it does is it creates a task force charged with investigating and examining the methods and incentives to encourage consumers to purchase food products that have traceable points of origin in the state of Connecticut and then report to general law and environment by January 1, 2013, of their findings and recommendations.

I move adoption.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on adoption.

Remark further? Will you remark further?

If not, let me try your minds.

All those in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Nay? Those opposed, nay?

The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Remark further on the bill as amended? Remark
further on the bill as amended?

Representative Taborsak.

REP. TABORSAK (109th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move this item to the consent calendar.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The motion is to move this bill item on the consent.
calendar.

Is there any objection?

Hearing none, the item is put on the consent calendar.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 275.

THE CLERK:

On page 10, Calendar 275, Substitute for House Bill
Number 5320, AN ACT CONCERNING BONDS AND OTHER SURETY FOR
APPROVED SITE PLANS AND SUBDIVISIONS, favorable report by
the Committee on Planning and Development.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Linda Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Good evening, madam.

mr/ch/rgd/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

429
May 9, 2012

calendar.

Representative Sharkey.

REP. SHARKEY (88th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker..

Mr. Speaker, I'm about to call the items again that are on the consent calendar, but I would like to alert the Clerk to two bills that we will be taking off the consent calendar. They are Calendars 380, and Calendars 431. Those are Calendars 380 and Calendar 431.

HB5333
SB130

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 204.

THE CLERK:

On page 6, Calendar 204, Substitute for House Bill Number 530, AN ACT CONCERNING THE BOARD IN CONTROL OF THE CONNECTICUT AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION, favorable report by the Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Sharkey.

REP. SHARKEY (88th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With that, let me -- I was looking to just list the calendar numbers again that we are planning to put on the consent calendar before I move them. I'll be doing this

mr/ch/rgd/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

430
May 9, 2012

in numerical order by calendar number.

They are Calendar Number 71, Calendar 204, Calendar 205, Calendar 287, Calendar 292, Calendar 330, Calendar 402, Calendar 407, Calendar 412, Calendar 417, Calendar 425, Calendar 426, Calendar 442, Calendar 458, Calendar 460.

Calendar 463, Calendar 492, Calendar 495, Calendar 499, Calendar 500, Calendar 501, Calendar 506, Calendar 507, Calendar 508, Calendar 512, Calendar 515, Calendar 516, Calendar 530, Calendar 538 and Calendar 545.

And I'd also like to add to that -- I'm sorry. I omitted one which is Calendar 275.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question before us is passage of the bills on today's consent calendar.

Will you remark? Will you remark?

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

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call.
Members to the Chamber. The House is voting the consent calendar by roll call. Members to the Chamber, please.

HB5025
HB5368
HB5326
HB5539
HB5146
SB328
HB5534
HB5555
SB157
SB232
SB339
SB340
SB41
SB98
SB116
SB196
SB97
SB188
SB234
SB237
SB299
SB347
SB371
SB391
SB345
SB383
SB384
SB29
SB354
HB5320
SB254

mr/ch/rgd/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

431
May 9, 2012

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

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

Please check the roll call board to make sure your vote has been properly cast.

If all the members have voted the machine will be locked. The Clerk will please take a tally.

The Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

On today's consent calendar.

Total Number Voting	150
---------------------	-----

Necessary for Adoption	76
------------------------	----

Those Voting Yea	150
------------------	-----

Those Voting Nay	0
------------------	---

Those Absent and Not Voting	1
-----------------------------	---

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The consent calendar passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 443.

THE CLERK:

On page 20, Calendar 443, Senate Bill Number 60, AN ACT PROHIBITING PRICE GOUGING DURING SEVERE WEATHER EVENTS, favorable report by the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

S - 649

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2012**

**VOL. 55
PART 14
4223 - 4505**

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr
SENATE

306
May 9, 2012

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, the first item appears on Senate Agenda Number 1, Substitute House Bill Number 5342, move to place on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

On Senate Agenda Number 3, Madam President, under -- under House Bills Favorably Reported, first is House Bill 5326, move to place the item on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Calendar 5025, move to place the item on the consent calendar.

HB5025

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And Calendar 5534, move to place the item on the consent calendar.

HB5534

THE CHAIR:

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr
SENATE

317
May 9, 2012

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes.

THE CHAIR:

The Calendar Number 444 --

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes.

THE CHAIR:

-- House Bill 5037 has just been added.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

That's right, Madam President.

And -- and also, Madam President, calendar page -- excuse me, it's -- rather I don't have the calendar page but it's Substitute -- it is Calendar 507, Substitute for House Bill 5467, Madam President, move to place that item on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Got it. Thank you, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Now, Madam President, if the Clerk would now proceed to call the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, you may call the consent calendar now.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5358; House Bill 5148; House Bill 5394; House Bill 5326; House Bill 5025; House Bill 5534; House Bill 5539; House Bill 5320; House Bill 5462; House Bill 5394; House Bill 5511.

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr
SENATE

318
May 9, 2012

(HB 5283)

On page 3, Calendar 240, House Bill 3283; page 3, Calendar 299, House Bill 5437; page 5, Calendar 349, Senate Bill 374; page 6, Calendar 375, House Bill 5440; page 6, 362, House Bill 5011.

On page 7, Calendar 376, House Bill 5279; on page 7, 387, House Bill 5290; on page 8, 394, House Bill 5032; on page 8, 396, House Bill 5230.

Also on page 8, Calendar 398, House Bill 5241; on page 8, Calendar 393, House Bill 5307; on page 9, Calendar 403, House Bill 5087; on page 9, Calendar 406, House Bill 5276; on page 9, 407, House Bill 5484; on page 11, Calendar 424, House Bill 5495; on page 12, Calendar 435, House Bill 5232; on page 13, Calendar 5 -- excuse me Calendar 450, House Bill 5447; on page 14, Calendar 455, House Bill 3 -- I'm sorry -- House Bill 5353.

On page 14, Calendar 453, House Bill 5543; on page 14, Calendar 459, House Bill 5271; on page 15, Calendar 464, House Bill 5344; on page 15, Calendar 465, House Bill 5034; on page 16, Calendar 469, House Bill 5038; on page 17, Calendar 475, House Bill 5550; on page 17, Calendar 474, House Bill 5233; on page 17, Calendar 477, House Bill 5421.

Page 18, 480, House Bill 5258; on page 18, Calendar 479, House Bill 5500; page 18, Calendar 482, House Bill 5106; on page 18, Calendar 483, House Bill 5355; on page 19, Calendar 489, House Bill 5248; on page 19, Calendar 488, House Bill 5321; on page 20, Calendar 496, House Bill 5412.

On page 21, Calendar 504, House Bill 5319; page 21, Calendar 505, House Bill 5328; on page 22, Calendar 508, House Bill 5365; on page 22, Calendar 510, House Bill 5170; on page 23, Calendar 514, House Bill 5540; on page 23, Calendar 517, House Bill 5521.

Page 24, Calendar 521, House Bill 5343; page 24, Calendar 518, House Bill 5298; page 24, Calendar 523, House Bill 5504; page 29, Calendar 355, Senate Bill 418; on page 13, Calendar 444, 5037; and Calendar 507, House Bill 5467.

THE CHAIR:

Senator -- Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO:



State of Connecticut

SENATE CLERK'S OFFICE
STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591
(860) 240-0500

GAREY E. COLEMAN
CLERK OF THE SENATE
ERNEST J. COTNOIR
ASSISTANT SENATE CLERK

TIMOTHY B. KEHOE
PERMANENT ASSISTANT
CLERK OF THE SENATE

Bills placed on the Consent Calendar on May 9, 2012

5358
5148
5394
5326
5025
5534
5539
5320
5462
5394
5511
5283
5437
374
5011
5440
5279
5290
5307
5032
5230
5241
5087
5276
5484
5495
5232
5447
5543
5353
5271
5344
5038



State of Connecticut

SENATE CLERK'S OFFICE
STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591
(860) 240-0500

GAREY E COLEMAN
CLERK OF THE SENATE
ERNEST J COTNOIR
ASSISTANT SENATE CLERK

TIMOTHY B KEHOE
PERMANENT ASSISTANT
CLERK OF THE SENATE

- 5233
- 5550
- 5258
- 5106
- 5355
- 5521
- 5248
- 5412
- 5319
- 5328
- 5365
- 5170
- 55440
- 5521
- 5298
- 5343
- 5504
- 418
- 5037
- 5467
- 5022
- 5259
- 5496
- 5360



State of Connecticut

SENATE CLERK'S OFFICE
STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591
(860) 240-0500

GAREY E. COLEMAN
CLERK OF THE SENATE
ERNEST J. COTNOIR
ASSISTANT SENATE CLERK

TIMOTHY B. KEHOE
PERMANENT ASSISTANT
CLERK OF THE SENATE

Bills from Senate Agenda Number 3 from the May 9th Senate Session that were placed on the Consent Calendar

HB5304
HB 5342

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr
SENATE

319
May 9, 2012

Good evening, Madam President.

I just want to clarify. I thought I heard the Clerk call House Bill 5034? Is that on the consent calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Do you know what page that is, sir?

SENATOR SUZIO:

No I -- he was reading so fast, Madam, I couldn't get it.

THE CHAIR:

It's -- yes it's 53 -- I don't know.

SENATOR SUZIO:

5034.

THE CHAIR:

5034, yes sir.

SENATOR SUZIO:

I object to that being put on the consent calendar, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Okay, that will be removed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Yes, just seeing that -- ask to remove that item from the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr
SENATE

320
May 9, 2012

At this time we'll call a roll call vote on the consent calendar.

Mr. Clerk.

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:

Senator Coleman, we need your vote, sir.

Senator Kissel, Senator Kissel. Senator Kissel, will you vote on the consent calendar please?

All members have voted?

If all members have voted, the machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, will you call the amendment -- I meant the tally.

THE CLERK:

On today's consent calendar.

Total Number Voting	36
Necessary for Adoption	19
Those Voting Yea	36
Those Voting Nay	0
Those Absent and Not Voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The consent calendar has passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I believe the Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda Number 6 for today's session.