

PA13-80

SB0898

House	5614-5625	12
Public Safety	628, 630-631, 707	4
Senate	1992-1997, 2068-2070	9
		25

H – 1166

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL.56
PART 17
5545 – 5881**

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

264
May 22, 2013

Please check the board to determine if your vote has been properly cast.

If so, the machine will be locked, and the Clerk will take a tally.

And the Clerk will announce the tally, please.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 828, in concurrence with the Senate.

Total Number Voting 141

Necessary for Passage 71

Those voting Yea 141

Those voting Nay 0

Absent and not voting 9

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The bill is passed, in concurrence with the Senate.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 581?

THE CLERK:

Madam Speaker, on Page 31, House Calendar 581, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on HUMAN SERVICES, Senate Bill 898, AN ACT CONCERNING CHANGES TO CERTAIN STATUTES AFFECTING THE DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES AND PUBLIC PROTECTION.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Dargan.

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

265
May 22, 2013

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Thank you -- thank you, Madam Speaker.

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill, in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill, in concurrence with the Senate.

Representative Dargan.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

The bill will establish a two-year deadline for prospective security guard personnel, which will -- which would have to submit an applications for license. On completion of that required training, it also reduces the days from 15 to five for Department of Children and Families through the State Bureau of Police and Identification to perform a State and National Criminal History Record Check, when a child is placed in a home on emergency basis. It also does not have any fiscal impact.

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

266
May 22, 2013

Madam Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 6713. May he please call and I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Will the Clerk please call LCO Number 6713, designated as Senate Amendment "A".

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment "A", LCO 6713, as introduced by Representative Dargan, Senator Hartley.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize.

Is there objection? Is there objection?

Seeing none, Representative Stephen Dargan.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

This will require, after January 1, 2014, for local police departments to submit certain fingerprints electronically, which will speed up the system that we have in place already. In doing that, through that technology, will submit those fingerprints electronically.

And I move for its adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

267
May 22, 2013

Thank you, Representative Dargan.

Moving adoption and is -- any remarks on Senate
Amendment "A"?

Representative Janice Giegler.

REP. GIEGLER (138th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I have a question to the proponent of the
bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

You may.

Please proceed.

REP. GIEGLER (138th):

Thank you very much.

In the explanation for the change, it says that
they -- this will reduce -- it may realize cost
savings and speed up the process on the fingerprinting
for DESPP. In light of recent demands on their
system, I know there's a current backlog. Are they
going to be able to comply with the -- this change and
the electronic format?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Dargan.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

We hope that it is. There's a lot of departments that submit fingerprints the old-fashioned way and a number of times the State Police has to turn them back to the local police department because the way they're submitted is not accurate. So we're hoping that as many communities that could submit them electronically will be a more efficient way to run the system.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giegler.

REP. GIEGLER (138th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I'll hold the rest of my comments until we speak on the bill.

Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, madam.

Will you care to remark further on Senate Amendment "A"? Will you care to remark further on Senate "A"?

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

269
May 22, 2013

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

All those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Nay.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted.

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giegler.

REP. GIEGLER (138th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I have a question to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Please proceed.

REP. GIEGLER (138th):

Thank you so much.

To the Chairman of Public Safety. This bill also reduces the time from 15 calendar days to five that DCF has to request from the State Police Bureau of

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

270
May 22, 2013

identification for them to perform State and National Criminal History Record Checks. Are they going to be able to comply with this timeframe, given the demands on this department?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Dargan.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Madam Speaker, from the conversations that I had that we thought that it was important for the displaced child that might be placed in emergency basis that we do it in the most effective and efficient manner as possible, so we have that child within a safe home and we make sure that we facilitate that background check on that individual.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Giegler.

REP. GIEGLER (138th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I thank him for his answers.

This bill passed on not only the Public Safety Committee unanimously, but it recently has passed the Senate unanimously as well. It just helps the department clarify some of their statutes and make

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

271
May 22, 2013

some changes and it does have a potential savings and we know we're always looking for that.

So I urge my colleagues' support.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, Representative Giegler.

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

Representative Smith of the 108th. You have the floor.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Just a quick question to the proponent, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Please proceed.

REP. SMITH (108th):

I'm just wondering if there's any cost to the municipality. Are they required to actually purchase this type of equipment or do they have it already? I'm not sure if this is a fiscal cost to our town and cities.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

272
May 22, 2013

Representative Dargan.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

That's a good question. Most -- most communities do already have this sort of equipment. Basically, what happens is that a lot of times when they want to do the fingerprinting, it's in their booking area part of the police department. And we're trying to tell the local police that this is a more accurate, efficient way, in order to get that information back, whether it be on the State or Federal level, that's helpful to our constituents.

So that's an issue that we've been working on with local law enforcement people, because we're realizing the old ways of fingerprinting, when they're submitted paper-wise they're not as accurate and there's been instances where they have to be turned back, up to a half a dozen times before they get that -- the accurate fingerprint.

So it's not an added cost. There's a number of communities that have gone to this technology that's out there, so we're not making it a mandate.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

273
May 22, 2013

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Thank you.

And thank the gentleman for his answer.

And it looks like the language of the -- of the bill as amended, Lines 13 and 14, would concur with that, because it talks about the town or the police having the capability to capture the fingerprints used in this new technology.

So I'm assuming, based on that language that if on January 1, 2014, they do not have this equipment yet, they are not required to purchase it. Is my understanding correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Dargan.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Through you, Madam Speaker.

That characterization would be correct. We just -- we realize now too -- now this is not related to background checked with somebody that's applying for a gun permit that we've had a problem with backlog, but we're just trying to make the system run more efficiently so constituents that do need a background

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

274
May 22, 2013

check, for whatever reason, we'll do it in a more accurate and efficient manner.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

And again, I thank the gentleman for his answer.

I think it's important for us to move into the 21st century and to the extent that we have the means available to our towns and cities, it's great to take advantage of that. So it sounds like a good bill and hopefully, it will get passed.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, Representative.

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

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

THE CLERK:

hac/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

275
May 22, 2013

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 GODFREY:

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

If so, the machine will be locked.

Mr. Clerk, announce the tally, please.

THE CLERK:

In concurrence with the Senate, S.B. 898, as
amended by Senate "A".

Total Number Voting	140
Necessary for Passage	71
Those voting Yea	140
Those voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	10

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The bill, as amended is passed, in concurrence.

The House will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

House will come back to order.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
SAFETY AND
SECURITY
PART 2
378 - 749**

2013

6
jar/mb/gbr PUBLIC SAFETY & SECURITY
COMMITTEE

February 28, 2013
12:00 P.M.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PASQUALE SALEMI: Sure.

SENATOR DARGAN: --to whatever that their concerns are too but with that thank you very much for being here.

SENATOR HARTLEY: Further questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for being with us today. We'd like to next invite Steve Spellman, a liaison for death and good afternoon to you, Mr. Spellman.

STEVE SPELLMAN: Good Afternoon Senator Hartley and Representative Dargan and members of the committee. I am Steven Spellman, I serve as chief of staff for Commissioner Reuben Bradford for the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection. The agency has filed testimony today in regard to four bills on your agenda and I will comment briefly in regard to each of them and then be available to respond to any questions.

HB 6424
SB 898
SB 929

The first of these is Senate Bill 969 AN ACT CONCERNING FEES CHARGED FOR CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECKS. The issue addressed by this bill is that the existing language of the statute does not allow the agency to charge for criminal history background checks or individuals who are being licensed by other agencies. Essentially the language provides that if a check comes to us from a sister agency or from a municipality we cannot charge a state fee. So what happens is that the agency has the responsibility and uses it's resources and is able to only collect the pass through fee to the FBI of \$16.50. The change of this, this would not effect if an agency needed a background check for persons that it wanted to employ itself, in other words if the Department of Revenue Services needs a

COMMITTEE

Some years ago the legislature changed the statute that -- which was like a per page fee and provided for a flat \$16 fee but it's inappropriate that the person coming in -- to expect in -- to just inspect would be able to essentially get the document for free without charging any state fee at all. The third bill which I am here for this morning is Senate Bill 898: AN ACT CONCERNING CHANGES TO CERTAIN STATUTES EFFECTING DESPP. This is essentially a technical changes bill and there are two parts to it. Under our existing statute for security officers they must complete required training which is essentially an eight hour course which includes basic first aid, search and seizure, use of force, that sort of thing. We -- We are experiencing as an agency some people coming in who have taken the course ten and fifteen years ago and they want a security license. We think for these important issues to be fresh in the minds of somebody who would take on this responsibility, the course should be taking within some reasonable time of when you are applying and we have suggested that that time be within the last two years. The second technical change is in regard to the criminal history background checks performed on a person residing in a home where an emergency placement of a child has been made. What happens sometimes is DCF has to place a child in an emergency circumstance and they don't have time to wait for a fingerprint based check in terms of the person that they are placing the child with, and FBI and state laws allow them to do that based on just a name and date of birth check. What FBI requirements are that you follow that up with a fingerprint based check and our existing statute says that that has to be done within fifteen days but the FBI requirements are that it be done within five days. So this is to bring us into compliance with federal law into

COMMITTEE

terms of when that must be done. All three of those are agency bills. The last bill that I would like to comment on is Senate Bill 929, which you heard from -- with the previous speaker regarding the consolidation functions of construction services and relate -- regulating special effects. This bill essentially would give us back -- by statute -- responsibilities that we have continued to perform pursuant to an MOU, specifically explosives and fireworks regulation which is carried out by our cause and origin unit. We have continued to do that by memorandum of understanding and this bill would give those responsibilities, and only those responsibilities. It is coupled with a provision, a proposal that actually came from DESPP when it was DPS and when it included defibs which would fill a hole in the regulatory structure in terms of regulating special effects. Increasingly LP gas displays are used for special effects and they aren't technically covered in the statutes and it would be appropriate that there be the authority to review the safety of those before they are used in public places. So with that I would be glad to respond to any questions.

SENATOR HARTLEY: Thank you very much Steve. Thank you also for this submitted written testimony for those who will be running in and out of today's meeting. Are there questions from committee members? There are a number of agency bills. We'll go first to Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS: Thank you Madam Chair. Steve could you just refresh my memory on speaking to House Bill 6424, which is the fees for a search of an accident report or a copy of an accident report. When did they -- is -- did they -- you said they changed the law back in

I am Gregg Marchand from Willimantic, CT. 06226 (860-423-0443

I agree

with Raised S.B. No. 898 without any doubt should include all police that have power of arrest, on the grounds they are a big part of pedestrian safety. Therefore this act should include random drug testing including for the anabolic steroid of all police that have power of arrest. Because, after all the reason employees get randomly drug tested is for the safety of fellow employees and for the public's safety. It's beyond comprehension that the employees that have Public Safety in their title [which are police] are not being randomly drug tested. After all they are in the public's eye more than most. Police are around pedestrians quite a bit. It's probable the regulations from the Department of Transportation would come into effect since they work within the same surroundings at times. Police also direct traffic or have a call for a bar fight. All these police actions include pedestrians. Police driving fast for a call is another pedestrian safety issue.

Therefore this proposed bill no.898 should include the random drug testing of all police that have power of arrest for Improving Pedestrian Safety. To be sure police are acting in the proper state of mind while on duty of having such a 'High Risk Safety Sensitive Occupation'. Also remember all police carry loaded weapons while upholding the law. Let's finally be responsible and be sure police are acting in the proper state of mind while on duty so there's no doubt they are being held to a higher authority as their occupation requires.

After all police are defenders of public safety, they are charged with one of the highest and most noble responsibilities known to humanity. They are a hero to many, and the antithesis of the crime on the streets that we dread. They are a role model to our children and a protector of our families when we cannot be there. They are the physical embodiment of law and justice to me, and to the everyday man on the street. But they are also human. They are made out of flesh and blood, and thus they also have the same weaknesses and vulnerabilities as everyone else. Yet they cannot show this weakness; just as they cannot show the fear they face when they enter a darkened building where shots have been reported. They are only human and sometimes they can be tempted.

Here is what the National Institute of Health has to say about the effects of Anabolic Steroid abuse .“Research shows that abuse of anabolic steroids may lead to aggression and other adverse effects.¹ For example, many users report feeling good about themselves while on anabolic steroids, but extreme mood swings can also occur, including manic-like symptoms that could lead to violence.² Researchers have also observed that users may suffer from paranoid jealousy, extreme irritability, delusions, and impaired judgment stemming from feelings of invincibility. In turn this is a public safety hazard. Steroid abuse can lead to serious, even irreversible health problems. Some of the most dangerous among them include liver damage, jaundice (yellowish pigmentation of skin, tissues, and body fluids), fluid retention, high blood pressure, increases in LDL (bad cholesterol), and decreases in HDL (good cholesterol). Other reported effects include renal failure, severe acne, and trembling.”

Other reasons why police should be tested: 1) Anyone driving for public service gets randomly tested. Police are Public Servants and many work double shifts. 2) They carry guns. 3) They have power of arrest. 5) Their job requires them to drive at high speed.6) Most people that drive for a living are subject to random drug testing, and they do not have the power and authority that the police have it seems to make common sense that police should also be subject to the same. There is no logical reason for police to be excluded from random drug testing. As Abraham Lincoln said, “No man is above the law.”
Gregg Marchand PO. B ox 244 North Windham ct. 06226

S - 658

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 7
1827 - 2152**

cah/meb/gdm/gbr
SENATE

316
May 14, 2013

Thank you.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 43, Calendar Number 129, Senate Bill Number 898, AN ACT CONCERNING CHANGES TO CERTAIN STATUTES AFFECTING THE DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES AND PUBLIC PROTECTION, Favorable Report from the Committee on Public Safety.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley, good evening.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Good evening, Madam President.

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

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Yes, thank you very much, Madam.

The bill before us reduces from the 15 day standard that we had to a five day standard, a deadline by which the Department of Children and Families must request a fingerprint check from the State and the national crim -- criminal history record of any person living in a home in which DCF places a child on an emergency basis.

The second part of this bill, Madam President, establishes a -- a deadline of two years by which a person must apply for the position of a security guard after completing the licensure requirement which is an eight year requirement.

cah/meb/gdm/gbr
SENATE

317
May 14, 2013

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment and that is LCO 6713 and I ask that the Clerk please call and I be granted leave to summarize please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 6713, Senate Amendment "A", offered by Senator Hartley and Representative Dargan.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Yes, Madam President, I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption. Will you remark please?

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Yes indeed thank you, Madam.

This Amendment would institute as of January 2014 that any local police department that has the capability to electronically capture fingerprints in its process of doing fingerprints for both criminal history record checks as well as for fingerprints for iden -- background checks that they do so by virtue of electronic means if, in fact, they have that capability.

The -- the purpose of this actually is to help expedite the work of the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection. It seems that we're kind of stuck in our -- in our ways where we by enlarge use paper prints when we are doing fingerprinting and the error rate on a paper print is very, very high. It borders somewhere around 20 percent or more that you have a smudge on them, there

cah/meb/gdm/gbr
SENATE

318
May 14, 2013

is some kind of a problem and, therefore, the background check can't be completed if, for example, it's a bus driver or someone who needs a background check for employment and it has to be repeated.

On the other end with regard to the workload with -- within the Department of Emergency Services, it then slows the process down and if anyone were to visit the Department they could witness the literal stacks of fingerprints that are there as a backlog and also that accumulate on a regular weekly basis.

So we're simply saying you have the fingerprint scanner, please use it for an electronic print and, interestingly enough, the -- the feds only accept electronic prints for this exact reason. So we do have the capability and we're saying where we have it please let's use it.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark? Will you remark? Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

I stand for the purpose of a question to the proponent of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

Senator, this seems like a real common sense idea. I wonder if you're familiar with what's the cost to a municipal police department for the technology necessary to comply with this option.

cah/meb/gdm/gbr
SENATE

319
May 14, 2013

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Thank you.

Through you, Madam President, first of all, Senator McLachlan, I am informed that by enlarge all of our police departments have these and, in fact, also our resident troopers are in possession of these and it is basically a fingerprint scanner and it runs about \$2,000.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

Thank you, Senator. So just for clarification, it -- it's pretty much in use already by most police departments is what I'm hearing. Is that right?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Actually, Senator McLachlan, it should really be in use. It seems that a lot of local police departments use it only on the criminal side when, in fact, there's a -- obviously a great need in background checks also in the background check other than the criminal side.

cah/meb/gdm/gbr
SENATE

320
May 14, 2013

So we're saying, you know, you have the technology, please try to use it, 1) to address the error rate, 2) for the quicker turnaround and also, in view of the legislation that we have now adopted with regard to the incidents that took place in Newtown and our fingerprinting and background checks, we need to free up every bit of capacity that the department has.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

I would agree, Senator Hartley, that anything we can do to expedite the tremendous backlog in background checks is a great idea and this seems to be a nominal cost in the big picture and I would be supportive.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McLachlan.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

Otherwise I'll try your minds on Senate "A". All those in favor please say aye.

VOICES:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Senate "A" is adopted.

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

cah/meb/gdm/gbr
SENATE

321
May 14, 2013

Thank you, Madam President.

If there is no objection, I would request that this be put on the Consent list.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

Mr. -- Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Also on Calendar Page 43, Number 153, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 928, AN ACT CONCERNING PRECIOUS METALS OR STONES DEALERS, Favorable Report from the Committee on Public Safety.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Yes and good evening again, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

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

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark please?

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Yes, thank you very much, Madam President.

This bill is actually the one in a series of legislative proposals which actually came to us in a consolidated fashion from the industry as well as the

The bill passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, if the Clerk might now call the items on the Consent Calendar before proceeding to a vote on that Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 1, Calendar 545, Senate Resolution Number 27; also on Page 1, Calendar 546, Senate Resolution Number 28. On Page 2, Number 547, Senate Resolution Number 29. On Page 2, Number 549, Senate Resolution Number 31. On Page 5, Number 184, Senate Bill 1026. On Page 7, Calendar Number 253, Senate Bill Number 763. On Page 16, Calendar Number 412, Senate Bill Number 962. On Page 17, Calendar Number 436, Senate Bill Number 673. On Page 18, Calendar Number 438, Senate Bill Number 761. Also on Page 18, Calendar Number 443, Senate Bill Number 1056. On Page 19, Calendar Number 449, Senate Bill Number 828. On Page 20, Calendar Number 461, House Bill Number 6540.

On Page 21, Number 469, House Bill Number 6574. On Page 23, Number 480, Senate Bill Number 238. On Page 25, Calendar Number 501, House Bill Number 5799. Also on Page 25, Number 507, House Bill Number 5117. On Page 26, Calendar Number 508, House Bill Number 6571. On Page 26, Calendar Number 509, House Bill Number 6348. Also on Page 26, Calendar Number 510, House Bill Number 6007 and on Page 26, Calendar Number 512, House Bill Number 6392.

On Page 40, Calendar Number 48, Senate Bill Number 519. On Page 40, Calendar Number 60, Senate Bill Number 859. Also on Page 40, Calendar Number 104, Senate Bill Number 833.

cah/meb/gdm/gbr
SENATE

393
May 14, 2013

On Page 41, Calendar Number 107, Senate Bill Number 917. On Page 42, Calendar Number 123, Senate Bill Number 434. On Page 43, Calendar Number 129, Senate Bill Number 898. Also on Page 43, Calendar Number 139, Senate Bill Number 158. On Page 43, Calendar Number 167, Senate Bill Number 879.

On Page 45, Calendar Number 195, Senate Bill Number 816. Also on Page 45, Calendar Number 204, Senate Bill 652. On Page 47, Calendar Number 241, Senate Bill 1040. On Page 48, Calendar Number 269, Senate Bill 1003. Also on Page 48, Calendar Number 270, Senate Bill Number 1007.

On Page 50, Calendar Number 304, Senate Bill 1019. Also on Page 50, Calendar Number 310, Senate Bill 903. And finally on Page 53, Calendar Number 399, Senate Bill 1069.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote. The machine will be open on the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

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

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, if all members have voted the machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

On Consent Calendar Number 1.

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

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar is passed.

Are there any points of personal privilege?

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE:

Thank you, Madam President.

Yeah for a point of information for the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR DOYLE:

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

Tomorrow the General Law Committee will be meeting at 11:15 outside the Hall of the House. The bulletin said 15 minutes before the early session so now we're making it definitive. Tomorrow at 11:15 outside the Hall of the House the General Law Committee will be considering one bill that was referred to us.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Senator Duff next.

SENATOR DUFF:

Thank you, Madam President.

For the point of announcement please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.