MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the

LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY

at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library

http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib

Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied

(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

Senate Legislative Record

One Hundred and Twentieth Legislature

State of Maine

Volume 2

First Regular Session (Continued)
May 24, 2001 to June 22, 2001

First Confirmation Session
October 24, 2001

Second Confirmation Session
December 6, 2001

Second Regular Session
January 2, 2002 to April 1, 2002

Pages 912 - 1844

8 members of the Committee on **APPROPRIATIONS AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS** on Bill "An Act to Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of $20,000,000 to Address the Affordable Housing Crisis in the State"

S.P. 506 L.D. 1593

Reported in Report **"A"** that the same **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-354)**.

Signed:

Senators:
GOLDTHWAIT of Hancock
CATHCART of Penobscot

Representatives:
BERRY of Livermore
MAILHOT of Lewiston
TESSIER of Fairfield
BRANNIGAN of Portland
ETNIER of Harpswell
JONES of Greenville

2 members of the same Committee on the same subject reported in Report **"B"** that the same **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (S-355)**.

Signed:

Representatives:
NASS of Acton
ROSEN of Bucksport

1 member of the same Committee on the same subject reported in Report **"C"** that the same **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "C" (S-356)**.

Signed:

Senator:
MILLS of Somerset

2 members of the same Committee on the same subject reported in Report **"D"** that the same **Ought Not to Pass**.

Signed:

Representatives:
WINSOR of Norway
BELANGER of Caribou

Reports **READ**.

Senator **GOLDTHWAIT** of Hancock moved the Senate **ACCEPT** Report **"A", OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-354)**.

The Chair ordered a Division. 14 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 21 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator **GOLDTHWAIT** of Hancock to **ACCEPT** Report **"A", OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-354), FAILED**.

On motion by Senator **MILLS** of Somerset, Report **"C", OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "C" (S-356) ACCEPTED**.

READ ONCE.

Committee Amendment "C" (S-356) **READ** and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the Rules, **READ A SECOND TIME** and **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "C" (S-356)**.

Sent down for concurrence.

Under suspension of the Rules, all matters thus acted upon were ordered sent down forthwith for concurrence.

Off Record Remarks

Senate at Ease.

Senate called to order by the President.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later Today Assigned matter:

Bill "An Act to Make Supplemental Appropriations and Allocations for the Expenditures of State Government and to Change Certain Provisions of the Law Necessary to the Proper Operations of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 2002 and June 30, 2003" (EMERGENCY)

H.P. 655 L.D. 855

Tabled - June 19, 2001, by Senator **DAGGETT** of Kennebec

Pending - **ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-724) AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AMENDMENTS "I" (H-740) AND "J" (H-741)** thereto, in concurrence

(In House, June 19, 2001, the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-724)** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-724) AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AMENDMENTS "I" (H-740) AND "J" (H-741)** thereto.)

(In Senate, June 19, 2001, Reports **READ**. On motion by Senator **GOLDTHWAIT** of Hancock, the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-724)** Report **ACCEPTED**, in concurrence. **READ ONCE**. Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) **READ**. House Amendment "I" (H-740) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) **READ** and **ADOPTED**, in concurrence. House Amendment "J" (H-741) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) **READ** and **ADOPTED**, in concurrence. On motion by Senator **MITCHELL** of Penobscot, Senate Amendment "A" (S-364) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) **READ**. On motion by Senator **GOLDTHWAIT** of Hancock, Senate Amendment "A" (S-364) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) **INDEFINITELY POSTPONED**.)

On motion by Senator **GAGNON** of Kennebec, Senate Amendment "D" (S-367) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) **READ**.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Gagnon.

Senator **GAGNON**: Thank you, Mr. President, men and women of the Senate. I think that the Appropriations Committee has done an admirable job of pulling this together with all of the things that they had to face with the shared power arrangement and working with both sides of the hall. There is one issue that I have continued to fight for as Chair of the Taxation Committee and that is property tax relief. You note, Mr. President, that I had two amendments, the last delay of course was not mine, I'd like to point out. I'm presenting a second amendment. In looking at the amendment and wanting to continue revenue sharing beyond a 6 month period, which the current budget does. The current budget would allow an increase in the percent in revenue sharing to go from 5.1% to 5.2% in the last half of the second biennium of this budget. Then there would be a sunset. There is a sunset in the current budget that would then remove that and move it back to 5.1%. So what we would be doing is providing an increase for just a 6 month period, which troubled me a great deal. In looking at the amendment, I found that the original amendment, I thought that the amounts in the out-years were too high. In fact, I was correct when I asked Fiscal and Program Review to look at it again. We save $1.6 million in the out-years because of a miscalculation. We also discovered that there was a miscalculation on the revenue sharing amounts that were in this current budget to the tune of about $454,000 in this budget. The difference between my two amendments is that Amendment "C" would have spent that money in revenue sharing in this biennial budget and then remove the sunset. Instead I choose to present Amendment "D". I will not be presenting Amendment "C". I am asking all of you if we can just lift the sunset, leaving the $454,00 for anyone here to spend if they can get the votes for it. I can see that there is an amendment for cold case homicides, which is fine with me, for some of that money.

Let me go back a little bit on revenue sharing. What I think you are receiving here is a copy of the legislative bulletin put out by MMA on June 8th. You all received this, but I want to bring it to your attention again. The cover sheet shows the various mill-rates that occur throughout the State of Maine. What you have here is the municipal boundaries of the various towns running from Fairfield down through southern Maine with the respective mill-rates, which I think might be a year or two old at this point, so don't be too concerned if it's off. I'd ask you to take a look at some of the central areas. For example, what I believe is the Lewiston/Auburn area down in the middle here, 26.47, 25.83. Once again, if you travel a short distance, you're going to be at 12.31 or 14.15. Easy commuting distance for anyone who would be working in those cities and be paying more than 10 mills less in property taxes. A thousand dollars less a year on a $100,000 home. Think, if you might, about our income tax rates. There are different rates and they are progressive regardless of where you live and where you reside in the State of Maine. But think for a moment that if we had different income tax rates for the people of the State of Maine based on which side of the line you happened to live on. If you live on this side of the line, your income tax rate might be 8%. If you live across the street in this other municipality, then we're going to charge you 10 points more. There would be a revolution. And I would suggest that there has been a revolution about property taxes. We've been hearing about it because of GPA funding. We've been hearing about it because of property tax rates in some of service centers and distressed communities. Last year, when I was in the other body, I was fortunate enough to Chair the Taxation Committee from that side. We worked particularly hard on trying to improve this situation. We took something that had always been sacred to municipalities, which is the revenue sharing equation, which probably very few of you know what that is, you don't hear the controversy as you do with GPA, it's just a revenue sharing equation that has been so successful for large communities and small communities. But we dared to open up that equation to see how we might go after these higher mill-rate towns, these towns that are really suffering. We eventually created a second tier of revenue sharing that was acceptable to the municipalities, and in fact, received a unanimous committee report in the 119th and was passed and was funded with one-time money. The reason why municipalities got on board with this, even though some municipalities actually would receive less money, was because they understood that there was a problem with their service centers that they are close to. But they wanted two things. They wanted to make sure we preserved revenue sharing, the standard revenue sharing pool which became known as revenue sharing one, and make sure that that would continue to increase over a period of time. We wanted to make sure that the share between what the state pulls in in revenues from the people of the State of Maine would increase from 5.1% to some higher number. The goal had been 5.5%. I put a bill in this year to increase it to 5.5%. It sat on the table in the House for quite some time. It eventually got passed. In trying to make this work, I and others who this is important to, found that we could negotiate that down to 5.1% as a start. Then we negotiated it to not start for the entire budget, just the last half of the second year. It wasn't the money that was as important to me as the percent increase. My feeling about revenue sharing and the reason why I've been so passionate about this issue that seems to carry very little passion is that the state has done very well overall economically. But we haven't been able to share more of that with our partners at the municipal level. People look at taxes and they know they have to pay them. They have to pay property taxes. They have to pay those boat fees, those car fees, excise tax, sales tax, income tax, and the feds. In fact, I think most people who talk to you, your constituents, just see it as the government. It doesn't really matter. So while we have been up here providing tax relief, most of which I'm very proud of, in the past years and creating some new programs, extending some programs, we haven't shared a greater percent of our good fortune with municipalities. Sure, they've always gotten 5.1% and

that has been their share, but we haven't increased that. So with the increase in revenue sharing just from growth, and people might say that's enough, that's only 5.1%. The General Fund is getting the rest of it. I think we owe it to our municipalities, our partners at the local level, to provide greater assistance. That is what I've been striving to do. I've worked very hard to try to get the fiscal note in the out-years down. This amendment costs nothing in this budget, in fact, this amendment finds additional money that I don't know would have been found before we got out of here. So I hope that you can support me and Senate Amendment "D".

I would like to add that on the map that you received, you'll notice on the upper right hand corner there is a small little sliver of a city that doesn't have a figure in there, I'm not sure why it was left out. That is the City of Waterville. Last week the mayor of that good city passed a budget that brings taxes up to 25.4 mills for the City of Waterville. The City of Waterville has also seen a decrease in the population by almost 200,000 people in the last census. The mayor then had to, because there was an increase of .4 mills, stave off a recall of that budget by certain councilors who were dissatisfied with the budget despite the fact that education took a hit of over $100,000 in that budget. They are not spendthrifts up there, I can assure you. I was on the City Council once. This is important to people. It's important to the folks who are trying to pay their property taxes. They can't do it and are generally elderly, and give up. They put their houses on the market and often times go into subsidized housing. Tax exempt subsidized housing. Same city.

Somebody suggested revenue sharing two, rev-two, or whatever we called it, needed a different name because it doesn't really sell. I've tried to get press. I've tried to talk to you whenever I can. I've become a real pest, I'm sure, to many of you, particularly to my leaders. But I hope that we can see an increase in revenue sharing, this small amount, and continue it and don't make it just a joke that will stop after 6 months after being implemented. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Daggett.

Senator **DAGGETT**: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Senate. I don't want to extend the discussion on this because I'm sure we're all aware of the concerns across the state on property taxes. I have heard the issue of property taxes since I first ran for the legislature some time ago. It seems that if we are going to continue to keep taxing authority completely within state government, we need to be willing to provide support at the local level for what needs to be done there since they are our partners in managing the affairs of the people of this state. So I do encourage the support of this amendment and am pleased to have the opportunity to vote for it.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Hancock, Senator Goldthwait.

Senator **GOLDTHWAIT**: Thank you, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate. Parenthetically, I'd just like to comment on the reference to a miscalculation in the figures that we produced regarding some aspects of the budget. That is quite correct. But it reminded me to take the opportunity to say that if there are heroes in this building, they dwell in the Office of Fiscal and Program Review and the Revisors Office. They have done extraordinary work. They have produced a budget in a remarkably short amount of time, which meant them literally staying here day and night to do so. Not only that, coming back in the next morning, after very few hours of sleep, and starting to draft all of your amendments. So I am not at all surprised to find that there have been a few miscalculations. It is only amazing to me that there are not hundreds more. But they have worked with great care and diligence beyond what most of us understand and always with a smile. I wanted to let you know that and convey, by way of this statement, my heartfelt thanks to them. It's been a privilege and an honor to get to know them and to work with them and to have depended on them entirely to get this novice through a very difficult process.

It doesn't take personal consultation with the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Gagnon, to know that this issue is his mission. As all of us, we each pick out our little piece of work that we're trying to do and drive that. Frankly, that is what makes the legislature come together as a whole to provide, I think, those parts and pieces that make a good budget and good approach to the work we do in Augusta. As for the balance of that now found money, we could let that rest. It won't go away if we just let it sit there, quietly. I know there is a member of the other body who is missing an aglet and it would be about 15¢ appropriation to replace that for him. So with that possible exception, I would say that that balance ought to sit where it is and add to any balance forward we have from this budget so that we are better prepared to deal with what we'll be facing in the winter. Without any personal offense taken, I hope, and in the time honored traditions of the Appropriations Chairs regarding budget amendments, I would move Indefinite Postponement of this Senate Amendment "D".

Senator **GOLDTHWAIT** of Hancock moved Senate Amendment "D" (S-367) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) be **INDEFINITELY POSTPONED.**

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Mills.

Senator **MILLS**: Mr. President, I don't know where my time honored status leaves me, although I think I'm inclined to vote against the chair's motion and support the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Gagnon, if for no other reason than the fact that I think that this amendment has been fairly well vetted around the chamber and I think at this juncture we are released to vote our consciences on this matter. In my father's law office, as I may have told some of you, there are some town reports going back to the Civil War for the Town of Farmington. In reading the mill rate, the reports of property assessments, I find that the mill rate in those days was about the same as it is today. Property tax really hasn't changed much in terms of its amount per thousand over the last 140 years. The odd difference is that the Town of Farmington was contributing about 4 mills per year to the State of Maine to support state government out of the roughly 16 or 17 it was collecting. Now, they collect 16 or 17 from their citizens and they could not survive were it not for some, I'll take a wild guess and suggest to you, either 8 or 10 mills, on average, supplied by the state. The combination of revenue sharing, which supplies a little over a $100 million a year to our city and town governments, and much more significantly, school funding, which is 8 times bigger than revenue sharing, some $800 or $900 million a year, including teacher pensions. Then, of course, there is road assistance for another $40 or $50 million. If you add it up, we are collecting for the benefit of the towns well over a billion

dollars a year. We're actually nothing more than fiscal agents. Half of our budget, in round numbers, almost half of our budget is in the form of acting as a fiscal agent to collect money to filter back to the communities. As many of you know, I have been saying for the last 7 years that we're not doing a very good job of allocating that money to solve some of the problems at the municipal level. Even more significantly, we continue to treat our towns like children. They have fiscal discretion over a single two digit number. They have no power, frankly, to decide what the value is of their own property. We help to decide that for them. They collect a fair amount of money, between 5% and 10% of their revenue comes from vehicle excise taxes. But we set the rate. The rate is set by Maine statute at around 24 mills. If they are lucky enough to attract a general contractor with lots of neat new trucks, they collect a lot in excise taxes. If they don't, they don't. It's all by chance what they collect on the vehicle excise tax. What they collect on the property tax, what they have for value to tax is almost entirely by chance. What they have to set is the rate at which it shall be taxed. Just an odd straight-jacket that we have left our communities in. It's bizarre. The property tax hasn't changed really since 1820. It is essentially what it was 181 years ago. Revenue sharing two is an interesting gesture in the right direction, perhaps. When I served on the Tax Committee 5 or 6 years ago, they began toying with the idea and I was attracted to it. I must say that the thought that I've always had about revenue sharing two is that it ought to be used as a trade off for some of these grotesque distortions of the school funding formula that arise from the never ending cushioning for cities, towns, service centers, small towns, and all of these people that seem to have trouble with the amount of money that is being allocated to them out of the $800 million pie that we distribute and call school funding. I also thought that it would be interesting to see if some of the wealthy towns would be willing to relinquish a little bit of revenue sharing in exchange for distributing it more intelligently to the service center communities. I note, with some disappointment, that this amendment will not do that. It will simply take more money from the sales tax and taxes on wages, in order words taxes on consumption, taxes on wages and labor. They will continue taxing those sources until they are strapped and give a little more money back to the towns rather than redistributing in some way the burden of the property tax itself. We have some towns and regions in our state that simply do not have a property tax problem. They don't. They don't deserve one nickel of revenue, it isn't that they don't deserve it, they don't need one nickel of revenue sharing from this state. They don't need a nickel of school funding, and most of the towns I'm talking about don't review anything very much by way of school funding though they do receive all of their teacher pension funding. It is completely paid for by this institution. I never have understood that. There are grotesque imbalances in the way in which we distribute money back to the towns. Make no mistake about it, 50% of what we do up here is raise money for towns. We deliver it back to them in some of the oddest and most distorted ways that you can imagine. Revenue sharing two is a gesture in the right direction. That is why I will be supporting the good Senator from Kennebec, Senator Gagnon.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Cathcart.

Senator **CATHCART**: Thank you, Mr. President, women and men of the Senate. I rise also to say that I am going to vote against the Indefinite Postponement of this amendment. Revenue sharing two is something that I have supported since the idea came up. I think it benefits those towns that are really struggling with high property taxes and some of those towns are in my district. We have to do more for our towns. We are doing everything that we can for the schools but the costs are going up, up, up. I say this with all due respect to my committee; I don't like to go against them. I was very pleased to learn that there had been an error made and that doing this will not cost what we feared it would to the structural gap. Therefore, I feel that it is okay for me to support something that I really feel very deeply about. Thank you, Mr. President.

On motion by Senator **ROTUNDO** of Androscoggin, supported by a Division of at least one-fifth of the members present and voting, a Roll Call was ordered.

The Doorkeepers secured the Chamber.

The Secretary opened the vote.

ROLL CALL (#151)

YEAS: Senator: GOLDTHWAIT

NAYS: Senators: ABROMSON, BENNETT, BROMLEY, CARPENTER, CATHCART, DAGGETT, DAVIS, DOUGLASS, EDMONDS, FERGUSON, GAGNON, KILKELLY, KNEELAND, LAFOUNTAIN, LEMONT, LONGLEY, MARTIN, MCALEVEY, MILLS, MITCHELL, NUTTING, O'GARA, PENDLETON, RAND, ROTUNDO, SAVAGE, SAWYER, SHOREY, SMALL, TREAT, TURNER, WOODCOCK, YOUNGBLOOD, THE PRESIDENT - MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

1 Senator having voted in the affirmative and 34 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator **GOLDTHWAIT** of Hancock to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE** Senate Amendment "D" (S-367) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724), **FAILED.**

On motion by Senator **GAGNON** of Kennebec, Senate Amendment "D" (S-367) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) **ADOPTED.**

On motion by President Pro Tem **BENNETT** of Oxford, Senate Amendment "E" (S-368) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) **READ.**

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes President Pro Tem Bennett of Oxford.

President Pro Tem **BENNETT**: Thank you, Mr. President, fellow members of the Senate. I am grateful for the advertising reference of my Senate Amendment "E" during the debate on the previous motion. I present Senate Amendment "E" with great sincerity. This amendment would provide a very modest amount of money, $169,000 over the course of the biennium, for a very important cause. It is with reluctance that I bring it before you. It is because of an error that it was not included in the budget. I do not cast any aspersions about the cause of the error. This is a very important issue for many on my side of the aisle. It's important that it be included in the budget. All it does is provide

one position just to provide a little hope to families who are dealing with wrenching issues of homicides in their families that are unsolved. The hope is that there will be a squad of one person at the Department of Public Safety that will be able to take a look at what they call these cold case homicides, and in so doing, will perhaps find a solution from time to time of these most heinous of personal tragedies and help bring closure to these people across the state. There are others who can speak more eloquently to the substance of the amendment. I do believe that, both because this was an error and that it was not included in the budget and also because of the very modest nature of the appropriation and its significant importance to people around the state, you will support this amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Hancock, Senator Goldthwait.

Senator **GOLDTHWAIT**: Thank you, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate. I will point out that I believe that this was also the first priority recommendation of the Criminal Justice Committee and indeed, as President Pro Tem Bennett of Oxford, mentions it appeared at one time on the list and then vanished rather mysteriously. Nevertheless, having said that, I move for Indefinite Postponement of Senate Amendment "E".

Senator **GOLDTHWAIT** of Hancock moved Senate Amendment "E" (S-368) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) be **INDEFINITELY POSTPONED**.

On motion by Senator **LONGLEY** of Waldo, supported by a Division of at least one-fifth of the members present and voting, a Roll Call was ordered.

The Doorkeepers secured the Chamber.

The Secretary opened the vote.

ROLL CALL (#152)

YEAS: Senator: DOUGLASS, GOLDTHWAIT

NAYS: Senators: ABROMSON, BENNETT, BROMLEY, CARPENTER, CATHCART, DAGGETT, DAVIS, EDMONDS, FERGUSON, GAGNON, KILKELLY, KNEELAND, LAFOUNTAIN, LEMONT, LONGLEY, MARTIN, MCALEVEY, MILLS, MITCHELL, NUTTING, O'GARA, PENDLETON, RAND, ROTUNDO, SAVAGE, SAWYER, SHOREY, SMALL, TREAT, TURNER, WOODCOCK, YOUNGBLOOD, THE PRESIDENT - MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

2 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 33 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator **GOLDTHWAIT** of Hancock to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE** Senate Amendment "E" (S-368) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724), **FAILED**.

On motion by President Pro Tem **BENNETT** of Oxford, Senate Amendment "E" (S-368) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) **ADOPTED**.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-724) as Amended by House Amendments "I" (H-740) and "J" (H-741) and Senate Amendments "D" (S-367) and "E" (S-368) thereto, **ADOPTED**, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Under suspension of the Rules, **READ A SECOND TIME** and **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-724) AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AMENDMENTS "I" (H-740) AND "J" (H-741) AND SENATE AMENDMENTS "D" (S-367) AND "E" (S-368)** thereto, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Under suspension of the Rules, ordered sent down forthwith for concurrence.

Senate at Ease.

Senate called to order by the President.

Out of order and under suspension of the Rules, the Senate considered the following:

PAPERS FROM THE HOUSE

Non-Concurrent Matter

SENATE REPORTS - from the Committee on **APPROPRIATIONS & FINANCIAL AFFAIRS** on Bill "An Act to Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of $15,000,000 to Capitalize the School Revolving Renovation Fund for Repairs and Improvements in Public School Facilities to Address Health, Safety and Compliance Deficiencies, General Renovation Needs and Learning Space Upgrades"

S.P. 549 L.D. 1707
(C "B" S-358)

Majority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-357)** (8 members)

Minority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (S-358)** (5 members)

In Senate, June 18, 2001, the Minority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "B" (S-358)** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "B" (S-358)**.

Comes from the House, the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-357)** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-357)**, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

On motion by President Pro Tem **BENNETT** of Oxford, the Senate **ADHERED**.