

PA13-21

SB1118

Government Admin. & Elections	1451, 1454, 1565, 1567, 1569	5
House	3823-3844	22
Senate	1231, 1284-1286	4
		31

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS
PART 5
1351 - 1698**

2013

2
 law/gbr GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION
 & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

March 18, 2013
 11:00 A.M.

In the event of a lockdown announcement please remain in the hearing room and stay away from the exit doors until the all clear announcement is heard. And with that we will move on to our first witness, Secretary of State Denise Merrill. Thank you as always for giving us your opinion on our bills, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY OF STATE DENISE MERRILL: Good morning once again to the GAE committee. Chairman Musto, Chairman Jutila, ranking member Senator McLachlan, and members of the committee. You have -- for the record my name is Denise Merrill. I'm Secretary of the State of Connecticut. There are quite a number of bills in your agenda today some of which affect the conduct and administration of elections and some other bills that I'll testify and thank you for allowing me to do them all at once. And I'll be happy to take questions afterwards.

First, Senate Bill 775, A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO PROPOSE AN AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION TO REVERSE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DECISION KNOWN AS CITIZENS UNITED. Simply put I support this resolution. The Supreme Court's ruling in the Citizens' United case said corporations have a right to free speech on par with individuals and to spend directly from their treasuries on political campaigns is one of the greatest legal travesties we've seen in this country in the last 50 years.

It reversed over 60 years of federal campaign finance law that really sought to put some reasonable limits on the corrosive influence of money in politics. Our founding fathers when they authored the Bill of Rights surely had no intention of extending an individual's right to

HJR 3
SB 729
SB 1118
HB 6630
HB 6633
HB 6635
SB 1126
SB 1125
SB 283

March 18, 2013
11:00 A.M.

early voting in Connecticut. And while the date for state and federal elections is set by the Connecticut and U.S. Constitutions, municipal elections are not set out in the State Constitution.

That is why this might be possible to formulate as an idea. So we're happy to assist in further developing this idea. And over the last several months I've actually asked some towns and cities of all shapes and sizes if this is an idea they'd like to further develop. There are quite a few towns that are interested in pursuing this option. You may hear from some of them today. So again I urge passage of this bill so we can further develop this idea.

Senate Bill 1118, AN ACT CONCERNING QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTION MODERATORS. This bill prohibits anyone who's been convicted of or plead guilty or no contest to any felony in -- regarding fraud, forgery, larceny, embezzlement or bribery or a violation of title nine election law from serving as a moderator or an alternative moderator on Election Day. This prohibition would exist so long as that conviction or guilty plea was entered in a court of competent jurisdiction. I support this bill. We should expect the highest standards of conduct from our elections officials and we certainly would not want anyone who has committed these types of crimes to be responsible for running a polling place.

House Bill 6630, considering -- concerning delivery of absentee ballots by the town clerks. Under current law absentee ballots are required to be delivered by town clerks to the registrars two or three times over the course of the day on Election Day. This bill would allow the town clerks and registrars to

Written
3/18/13



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CONNECTICUT, INC.

CGA Government Administration and Elections Committee
March 18, 2013 Public Hearing

Comments provided by: Susan Voris, Election Laws Specialist,
League of Women Voters of Connecticut

My name is Susan Voris. I am the Election Laws Specialist for the League of Women Voters of Connecticut, a statewide organization with over 1600 members. The League is dedicated to improving the electoral process.

SB 729 – An Act Concerning a Pilot Program to Allow Early Voting.

Currently absentee balloting is the only form of early voting allowed in Connecticut. The League is a strong supporter of no-excuse absentee ballots. However, while the League supports efforts to maximize voter participation and early voting in concept, the devil is often in the details. This bill lacks enough specificity for the League to be able to support or oppose it.

SB 1118 – An Act Concerning Qualifications of Election Moderators.

The League believes in the mandatory training and supervision of all election workers to promote uniform compliance with federal and state laws. We further believe that the right to vote with confidence in the election process must be guaranteed to all.

SB 1118 would prohibit the Secretary of the State from certifying "any person as moderator or alternate moderator who has been convicted of or pled guilty or nolo contendere to, in a court of competent jurisdiction, any felony involving fraud, forgery, larceny, embezzlement or bribery or a violation of this title." While we understand and can support a provision that would preclude individuals convicted of crimes like fraud or forgery, which bear directly on a person's honesty, from acting as moderators because of the impact on voter confidence, we are concerned about including in the prohibition "a violation of this title" which could potentially be used to disqualify moderators based on minor offenses or misinterpretations of election and campaign finance laws which have no bearing on the honesty of the individual or voter confidence (e.g. excluding the press from the polling place, failing to file timely campaign statements or certifications). The requirement that the individual must have been convicted or pled guilty in a court of competent jurisdiction might afford some protection in these situations (which would rarely rise to that level); however, we believe that it is best to spell out the types of violations under Title 9 which might be grounds for disqualification in the bill. Accordingly, if the Committee decides to move forward with SB 1118, we recommend either deleting the reference to "a violation of this title" or qualifying it to make clear that the violation must reflect on the honesty of the individual moderator.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

1890 Dixwell Avenue, Suite 203, Hamden, CT 06514-3183
Phone (203) 288-7996 Fax (203) 288-7998 e-mail lwvct@lwvct.org Web site www.lwvct.org



DENISE MERRILL
 SECRETARY OF THE STATE
 CONNECTICUT

Spoken
3/18/13

Line Number 8

Page Number 1

**Government Administration and Elections Committee Public
 Hearing
 March 18, 2013
 Testimony**

Good Morning once again to the GAE Committee – Chairman Musto, Chairman Jutila, and members. For the record, my name is Denise Merrill and I am Secretary of the State of Connecticut. There are many bills on your agenda today, and many bills that affect the conduct and administration of elections in our state.

SENATE BILL 775 “A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO PROPOSE AN AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION TO REVERSE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT’S DECISION KNOWN AS CITIZENS UNITED.”

Simply put, I support this resolution. The Supreme Court’s ruling in the *Citizen’s United* case – that corporations have a right to free speech on par with individuals and to spend directly from their treasuries on political campaigns – is one of the greatest legal travesties we have seen in this country in the last 50 years. It reversed over 60 years of federal campaign finance law that really sought to put some reasonable limits on the corrosive influence of money in politics. Our founding fathers – when they authored the bill of rights – surely had no intention of extending an individual’s right to freedom of speech contained in the first amendment to a corporation.

I’m sorry but corporations are NOT people.

Connecticut has been a national leader in campaign finance reform and we are the first state to establish public campaign grants for state office by legislative action rather than initiative or referendum. We did that because we believe in clean elections where the influence of a few powerful well-funded donors cannot drown out the voices of everyday citizens who can only afford to give small dollar amounts to political campaigns. This Supreme Court decision reversed decades of campaign finance laws. We in Connecticut must respond.

HJR 3

SB729

SB1118

HB6630

HB6633

HB6635

set out in the state constitution. We would be happy to assist in further developing this idea.

Over the last several months I have asked several towns of all shapes and sizes if this is an idea that they would like to further develop. Early voting provides more opportunities for citizens to vote and reduces pressure on Election Day. This would be a municipal option, so only cities and towns who would like to participate would do so; no one will be mandated. I believe this is a great opportunity to test the waters and get some data on early voting – to see how it works in reality for some of the municipalities in our state so I urge passage of this bill.

SENATE BILL 1118 “AN ACT CONCERNING QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTION MODERATORS”

This bill prohibits anyone who has been convicted of or pled guilty or no contest to any felony involving fraud, forgery, larceny, embezzlement or bribery or a violation of Title 9 election law from serving as a moderator or an alternative moderator on Election Day. This prohibition would exist so long as that conviction or guilty plea happened in a court of competent jurisdiction

I support this bill; we should expect the highest standards of conduct from our elections officials. We certainly would not want anyone who had committed these types of crimes to be responsible for running a polling place.

HOUSE BILL 6630 “AN ACT CONCERNING THE DELIVERY OF ABSENTEE BALLOTS BY THE TOWN CLERKS”

Under current state law, absentee ballots are required to be delivered by Town Clerks to the Registrars two or three times over the course of the day on Election Day. This bill would allow the town clerks and registrars to mutually agree on a later time for delivery of the ballots (provided it is not later than 8 pm) and I support this bill. Current law reflects a time when we used the old lever-ballot voting machines and absentee ballots were counted by hand – a very labor intensive and time consuming process, but since we have been using optical scanners to count ballots, some towns may prefer to run the absentee ballots through the machines very quickly and accurately in one count. Again, I support passage.

HOUSE BILL 6633 “AN ACT CONCERNING CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW AND PRIOR BAD ACTS”

As a strong supporter of public campaign financing, I think it is imperative that the campaign grants that we award through the Citizens Election Program are not misused, and I think we should be very conscious of upholding the public trust in how we award these dollars and who we award them to. This bill would prohibit persons

H – 1161

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL.56
PART 12
3815 – 4176**

cjd/lgg/cd
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

255
May 14, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The bill passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 494.

THE CLERK:

On page 29, Calendar 494, favorable report of the joint standing committee on Government, Administrations and Elections, Senate -- Substitute, Senate Bill 1118, AN ACT CONCERNING QUALIFICATIONS FOR ELECTION MONITORS.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

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

Representative Jutila, you have the floor, sir.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This bill provides that a person cannot be certified as an election moderator or alternate

moderator if they had been convicted of or pled guilty or nolo contendere to any of the following charges: a felony involving fraud, forgery, larceny, embezzlement or bribery or any criminal offense under Title IX, which is our election statutes.

Madam Speaker, the reason for this bill is that we want our top election officials to be of the highest character and the highest ethical standards and this is an important bill, I believe, that will help to make sure that our elections are appropriately run by the appropriate individuals. And I would urge my colleagues to support it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Will you remark further?

Representative Hwang of the 134th.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Long time no speak, Madam Speaker. How are you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Fine, and you, sir?

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, a couple of questions to the proponent of the bill, ma'am.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Please frame your questions, sir.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

In our public hearings and the discussions, I think there was a strong concern in regards to, as the good Chair had emphasized, either convicted or pled guilty to. Now, were their provisional considerations for accusations that were unfounded or undetermined that protected potential moderators from -- from hearsay?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila, will you respond?

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker.

To the distinguished ranking member, the committee concluded that we were not going to allow someone to be disqualified as a moderator simply based on accusations or allegations that that person would have to be convicted or plead guilty or -- or a nolo plea in a court of competent jurisdiction. Anything short of that would not disqualify the potential or perspective moderator on that basis.

Through you.

cjd/lgg/cd
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

258
May 14, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Hwang, you still have the floor,
sir.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, ma'am.

Through you, Madam Speaker, what is the process
to make that determination for a moderator to be on --
who are the major decision makers in this process?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, in the end, in this
case under this language that would become part of the
statute, the decision maker would be the court which
would either be a judge or a jury.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, would the Secretary
of State be able to unilaterally disqualify a
potential moderator or their provisos of checks and
balances to ensure that it is consulting with

cjd/lgg/cd
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

259
May 14, 2013

appropriate local authorities?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

The Secretary of State has the authority to certify the moderator, but the Secretary of State would not have any discretion in terms of making the determination on whether or not the individual has actually committed any of these crimes. Again, that would be up to the appropriate court.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

Now, from a standpoint of the moderator eligibility, it -- is it required by statute that they undertake training as taught by the Secretary of State's Office in order to be qualified or are there any other means in which they can qualify to be moderators?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

They are -- the moderators are required by statute to undergo specified training and pass an exam before the Secretary can certify them.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Hwang, you still have the floor, sir.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you. Thank you, ma'am.

You know, I appreciate the good work of the Chair and -- and there are sort of instances where we may not agree to -- we may agree to disagree, but in this case, I -- I asked for the support of this Chamber in the sense that this is a bill that moves the process forward and getting the best moderator to represent our election process.

Thank you, ma'am.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Smith of the 108th.

cjd/lgg/cd
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

261
May 14, 2013

REP. SMITH (108th):

Madam Speaker, you've been up there a long time.
It's good to see you again.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Good seeing you, sir.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Just a couple of questions, if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Please frame your questions, sir.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Looking at the -- the language in lines 14 through 18, it talks about the felony as being one of the reasons that would prohibit someone from being a moderator, and it's felonies involving fraud, forgery, larceny, embezzlement and bribery, which all makes sense to me. I was wondering, though, Madam Speaker, if there was any consideration for prohibiting a moderator who has a felony for any type of violation to be excluded as well, or just the ones that are listed here?

Through you. ' .

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative -- I'm sorry -- Representative Jutila, will you respond, sir?

cjd/lgg/cd
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

262
May 14, 2013

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

There is a requirement that -- but without this bill in -- in current statutes that the moderators be electors. And if the individual has been convicted of a felony and has not yet completed his or her sentence, then they would not be eligible to be electors and, therefore, would not be eligible to be moderators.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Smith, you still have the floor, sir.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Okay. So that -- I guess that makes sense to me, but if that's the case that begs another question and I'm not trying to delay this argument or prolong this discussion, but if there is a statute already that says if you have been convicted of a felony, you cannot be an elector. Do we need this language here in -- in this bill?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

cjd/lgg/cd
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

263
May 14, 2013

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

Yes, we do, because without this language in this bill, someone who has been convicted of a felony, has served their sentence and obtained their rights to be an elector again could still be eligible to be a moderator. Under this bill, they would not.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Okay, so I understand now. So there is an application process by which you can -- if you had been convicted of felony but which you can then regain your right to vote; is that accurate?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, it is.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

And then, again, was there any other

consideration given to prohibiting moderators who have been convicted of any type of felony from serving as a moderator? Because I am a little bit concerned that if you've been convicted of a felony, which is naturally a very serious criminal offense and -- under our jurisprudence, to now be a moderator in an election. I don't know, it seems a little bit difficult for me to grasp why we would want to have somebody in that position, so I'm not sure if there was any testimony or discussion of that issue during the public hearing or debate.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

There was discussion about what particular crimes should be applicable in -- in this statute and the committee chose, at least at this point in time, to focus on the crimes that had to do with honesty versus dishonesty, and therefore, came up with the particular crimes that are enumerated in the bill before us.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

I thank the Chairman for his -- his answers. And logically, these criminal offenses that are listed in the bill all makes sense if -- of course, if they're dealing with honesty, integrity, credibility, et cetera, we'd want to make sure that the moderator was one who did not have those types of issues.

I hope the committee will consider in the future, though, the true felonies. For instance, if somebody was convicted of murder, homicide, things of that nature, it's a felony. As I read this bill, they'd still be able to be a moderator in an election, which concerns me. So I hope going forward the committee would consider, may be strengthen this bill a little further than it does.

And then just one final question, how does the Secretary of State or whoever it is that appoints the moderator, how do they know whether this person has a felony conviction in the past or not?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

The statute and, therefore, the bill does not spell out what steps the Secretary would take in order to make that determination, but I can say that the Secretary attended the public hearing and spoke in favor of this bill, so my assumption is that the Secretary believes that the mechanism is available to her office to make that determination and that I would assume that is through public records.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

And again, I thank the Chairman for -- for his answers. And that's one of the concerns I have to make sure that the Secretary of States does, in fact, have that information available to him or her, whoever may be the secretary at the time, because, just because you've been convicted of a felony doesn't mean it's a public record. In today's technology, you can find out a lot of information that you may not have learned in the past, but generally speaking you would have to go either a police department or a prosecutor or some state agency to determine if, in fact, this

person has a clean record. It's not something that I could do, look up today and say I'm better do a records check on Representative Smith. That information is not available. So I just hope that the Secretary of State or whoever it may be is in the position to make this call and to make sure our moderators are actually people that we want to moderate our systems. So thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank the gentleman for his answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Alberts of the 50th.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

If I may, a question to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Looking at lines 15 through 16, there is reference to a court of competent jurisdiction, and I just wanted to make sure I understood this. Is this a court of competent jurisdiction in the state of

Connecticut or are we looking outside the state, as well?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila, will you respond, sir?

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

It -- the bill does not specify that it would have to be a Connecticut court, so my reading of the bill would be that if someone was convicted in a court of competent jurisdiction in some other state that they would still be prohibited from being a moderator under this bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Alberts, you still have the floor, sir.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And that is what I hope, as well. How would the -- how would the process work by which the Secretary of States would determine this in terms of the search process? Is the proponent familiar with how that would work when it involves out-of-state

jurisdictions?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

I'm not familiar with all the mechanics of how that would be determined, but my -- my assumption is that the -- the way this would probably work in the real world is that someone would have some awareness that there might be an issue with a particular individual and some research would be done into that and, hopefully, the correct conclusion is reached and determinations made.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

So I guess now I'm getting confused. So are we going to be relying on people to raise awareness of a potential issue that matches these comments in 16 and 17 regarding felony, larceny, embezzlement, fraud, forgery, or is this going to be a proactive outreach

every time that a moderator and alternate moderators is selected?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

that would be up to the Secretary of State who's required to certify, but my assumption would be that the secretary is not going to attempt to perform a background check on every single perspective moderator in every town.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

So, just to take the comments from the proponent, so for purpose of legislative intent, we are going to leave this language as is with regard to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will develop some procedures to move forward, but if this bill is enacted, it is most likely that the Secretary of State is only going to research potential individuals who are in violation of this new statute, if enacted, if

cjd/lgg/cd
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

271
May 14, 2013

it is brought to his or her attention that they may have an issue, either in the state of Connecticut or outside the state.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

That would be my expectation and what I would understand the intent of the bill to be as the proponent.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I do thank the proponent for his response. I don't know how much of a crisis we have with these items, but I do respect the intent of this. I think we're looking to tighten up some of our procedures. I'll listen to the rest of the debate and make a decision thereafter. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you.

Representative Carpino of the 32nd.

REP. CARPINO (32nd):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm happy to hear that a court of competent jurisdiction has won in all 50 states. Frankly, that was one of my concerns as well. If we're not going to look to our 49 neighboring states, frankly, I would think this statute is useless.

Two technical questions to the proponent, through you, if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Please frame your question, madam.

REP. CARPINO (32nd):

Thank you.

First question, through you, after a moderator is certified, what is the process in the event that he or she becomes a convicted felon during the two-year period that that certification would have been valid?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila, will you respond?

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

That once that determination has been made that

person would be disqualified and unable to continue being a moderator.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Carpino.

REP. CARPINO (32nd):

Thank you.

And in today's day and age when at least in the state of Connecticut it is quite simple to look at the criminal history, at least for our Connecticut residents, I would hope that when there's an issue that has been raised that the Secretary of State or our local officials are looking at that.

My final question has to do with looking forward. In the event a moderator is later found out to have been a convicted felon, what effect, if any, will that have on the election results that they have certified?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

In my view that would have no effect on the election results, unless there was some specific

malfeasance that involved that -- that particular election. In other words, the simple fact that it was determined that this person had been a -- had been convicted of one of these crimes would not in and of itself disqualify the result of an election.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Carpino.

REP. CARPINO (32nd):

Thank you, Madam.

And I thank the good gentlemen for his answer. I will support this but I -- hope that we make this stronger going forward. My concern is that if we have an individual who is convicted of one of these four felonies or one of the criminal offenses examined that in the event we find that they have certified an election that the Secretary of State then does go back and look a little bit closer, because if they have committed fraud on the public by not disclosing that information, I suspect we should take a different and more detailed look at that result.

Thank you, Madam.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you, madam.

Will you respond -- remark further on the bill?

Will you remark further on the 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 open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Will members please return to the chamber immediately.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?

Will the members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast?

If members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

SB 1118, in concurrence with the Senate.

Total Number of Voting	140
------------------------	-----

Necessary for Passage	71
-----------------------	----

Those voting Yea	140
------------------	-----

Those voting Nay	0
------------------	---

Those absent and not voting	10
-----------------------------	----

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The bill is passed in concurrence with the
Senate.

(Deputy Speaker Sayers in the Chair.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER SAYERS:

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 486.

THE CLERK:

Calendar Number 486, Madam Speaker, on page 28,
favorable report of the joint standing committee on
Commerce, Substitute for Senate Bill 619, AN ACT
CONCERNING THE COMMISSION OF CONNECTICUT'S FUTURE.

DEPUTY SPEAKER SAYERS:

Representative Perone.

REP. PERONE (137th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER SAYERS:

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

Representative Perone, you have the floor, sir.

S - 656

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 5
1213 - 1511**

law/gbr
SENATE

114
May 1, 2013

Total Number Voting 35

Necessary for Adoption 18

Those voting Yea 35

Those voting Nay 0

Those absent and not voting 1

THE CHAIR:

The bill passes. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would like to add an additional item to the Consent Calendar at this point and that is Calendar page 16, Calendar 311, Senate Bill 1118. Move to place that item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. And if the Clerk would call as the next item Calendar page 14, Calendar 277, Senate Bill 619.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 14, Calendar 277 substitute for Senate Bill number 619, AN ACT CONCERNING THE COMMISSION ON CONNECTICUT'S FUTURE, favorable report of the Committee on Commerce.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

law/gbr
SENATE

167
May 1, 2013

Seeing no objection, so ordered, Sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. If we might now call for a vote on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Sounds like a great idea. Senator -- Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a vote and -- and first read the Consent Calendar before I open the machine.

THE CLERK:

On page one, Calendar 454, Senate -- Senate Joint Resolution number 55, Calendar 455, Senate Joint Resolution number 56, on page two, Calendar 456, Senate Joint Resolution number 57, Calendar 470, House Joint Resolution number 5. Also --

THE CHAIR:

Ninety five, Sir. I think the House Joint Resolution is number 95.

THE CLERK:

It is indeed 95. Also on page two, Calendar 471, House Joint Resolution number 96, Calendar 472, House Joint Resolution number 97, on page ten, Calendar 230, Senate Bill 235, page 14, Calendar 283, Senate Bill number 963, on page 16, Calendar 311, Senate Bill 1118, also Calendar 315, Senate Bill 1078, on page 21, Calendar 367, Senate Bill 804, page 24, Calendar 395, Senate Bill 967, on page 33 Calendar 102, Senate Bill 822, page 34, Calendar 104, Senate Bill 833, and on page 34, Calendar 105, Senate Bill 887.

THE CHAIR:

At this time Mr. -- Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

law/gbr
SENATE

168
May 1, 2013

Thank you, Madam President. One item that needs to be removed from the Consent Calendar that is Calendar 104 -- page 34, Calendar 104. If that might be removed from the Consent Calendar and marked passed temporarily.

JB833

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no -- seeing no objection, so ordered, Sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. And if the -- if we would -- might call for a -- a vote now on the other items marked consent.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, I will open the machine.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate in voting today's Consent Calendar. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer. Senator Meyer, would you like to vote on the Consent Calendar, Sir. No problem.

Have all members vote, all members have voted. The machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you call the --

THE CLERK:

On today's Consent Calendar.

Total Number Voting 35

Necessary for Adoption 18

Those voting Yea 35

Those voting Nay 0

law/gbr
SENATE

169
May 1, 2013

Those absent and not voting 1

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam -- thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I believe the Clerk is in possession of Senate Agendas two and three for today's session.

THE CHAIR:

Senator -- Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agendas two and three both dated Wednesday, May 1, 2013. Copies have been distributed and are on Senators' desks.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move all items on Senate Agendas numbers two and three dated Wednesday, May 1, 2013 to be acted upon as indicated and that the Agendas be incorporated by reference in the Senate Journal and the Senate transcript.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, Sir. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, that will conclude our business for today. Before yielding the floor to members for announcements or points of personal privilege it's our intention to be in session