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 Twenty-Second Legislature

State of Maine

Daily Edition

Second Regular Session
January 4, 2006 to May 24, 2006

Pages 1382 - 2139

Pagination:

Due to an error in numbering, the pagination of the printed Daily Edition skips from S-1766 to S-1777. No material is missing.

The bracketed page numbers have been added to indicate the page numbers used in the Senate's interim online edition.

(In House, May 23, 2006, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**.)

This being an Emergency Measure and having received the affirmative vote of 32 Members of the Senate, with no Senators having voted in the negative, and 32 being more than two-thirds of the entire elected Membership of the Senate, was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED** and having been signed by the President, was presented by the Secretary to the Governor for his approval.

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

Mandate

An Act Concerning the Taxation of Property Owned by Certain Veterans' Organizations

S.P. 258 L.D. 791
(S "A" S-663 to C "A" S-299)

Tabled - May 23, 2006, by Senator **GAGNON** of Kennebec

Pending - **ENACTMENT**, in concurrence

(In Senate, May 22, 2006, on motion by Senator **ROTUNDO** of Androscoggin, **RULES SUSPENDED. RECONSIDERED PASSAGE TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED**. On further motion by same Senator, **RULES SUSPENDED. RECONSIDERED ADOPTION** of Committee Amendment "A" (S-299). On further motion by same Senator, Senate Amendment "A" (S-663) to Committee Amendment "A" (S-299) **READ** and **ADOPTED**. Committee Amendment "A" (S-299) as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-663) thereto, **ADOPTED,** in **NON-CONCURRENCE. PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-299) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-663)** thereto, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.)

(In House, May 23, 2006, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**.)

This being a Mandate, in accordance with the provisions of Section 21 of Article IX of the Constitution, having received the affirmative vote of 32 Members of the Senate, with no Senators having voted in the negative, and 32 being more than two-thirds of the entire elected Membership of the Senate, was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED** and having been signed by the President, was presented by the Secretary to the Governor for his approval.

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

Mandate

An Act To Prevent the Use of Performance-enhancing Substances by Maine Student Athletes

S.P. 749 L.D. 1952
(S "A" S-673 to C "A" S-479)

Tabled - May 23, 2006, by Senator **GAGNON** of Kennebec

Pending - **ENACTMENT**, in concurrence

(In Senate, May 22, 2006, on motion by Senator **ROTUNDO** of Androscoggin, **RULES SUSPENDED. RECONSIDERED PASSAGE TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED**. On further motion by same Senator, **RULES SUSPENDED. RECONSIDERED ADOPTION** of Committee Amendment "A" (S-479). On further motion by same Senator, Senate Amendment "A" (S-673) to Committee Amendment "A" (S-479) **READ** and **ADOPTED**. Committee Amendment "A" (S-479) as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-673) thereto, **ADOPTED**, in **NON-CONCURRENCE. PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-479) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-673)** thereto, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.)

(In House, May 23, 2006, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**.)

This being a Mandate, in accordance with the provisions of Section 21 of Article IX of the Constitution, having received the affirmative vote of 32 Members of the Senate, with no Senators having voted in the negative, and 32 being more than two-thirds of the entire elected Membership of the Senate, was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED** and having been signed by the President, was presented by the Secretary to the Governor for his approval.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

House

Divided Report

The Majority of the Committee on **TAXATION** on Bill "An Act To Create the Taxpayer Bill of Rights"

I.B. 1 L.D. 2075

Reported that the same **Ought Not to Pass**.

Signed:

Senators:
PERRY of Penobscot
STRIMLING of Cumberland

Representatives:
CLARK of Millinocket
WOODBURY of Yarmouth
HUTTON of Bowdoinham
WATSON of Bath

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject reported that the same **Ought To Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-1106).**

Signed:

Senator:
COURTNEY of York

Representatives:
CLOUGH of Scarborough
BIERMAN of Sorrento
HANLEY of Paris
SEAVEY of Kennebunkport

Comes from the House with the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

Reports **READ**.

Senator **STRIMLING** of Cumberland moved the Senate **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report, in concurrence.

On motion by Senator **BRENNAN** of Cumberland, supported by a Division of one-fifth of the members present and voting, a Roll Call was ordered.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Strimling.

Senator **STRIMLING**: Thank you, Madame President. Before we vote I did want to get a few comments on the record about what we're about to vote on. This is, obviously, the so-called 'Taxpayer Bill of Rights' and what we are voting on this evening is to send it out. I do think it's important that before we get it out that some facts, as I see them, get put on the record in terms of what this bill does. There has been quite a bit of debate out there about whether or not this bill is going to effect local communities' budgets in a negative way. A number of people have been out in the community saying that this will not cut anybody's budget and all this is going to do is limit growth and limit spending. That is absolutely false. Let's be clear. If this passes next Fall hundreds of communities across this state would have to start cutting their budgets and have to start cutting the services that everybody depends on. It says clearly in the legislation that they must change or adjust their budget based on population plus inflation or the assessed value of their community, whichever is lower. They must adjust their budget based on population plus inflation or the assessed value, whichever is lower. Adjust. Change. Cut. Dramatic cuts, if you look at communities across this state. They will be looking at 5%, 10%, 15%, up to 20% cuts of their budgets based on, often times, the assessed value because we've seen what has happened, especially in rural communities of Maine, where the assessed value has gone down, where communities are not seeing the kind of assessed values that go up as in some of the coastal areas. You are going to add hardship to the headache that is already there because people will have to see services that they depend on eliminated. I strongly encourage my colleagues today to vote Ought Not to Pass. I would prefer that this didn't go out at all, but it's going to go out and I encourage the people of the state of Maine to vote this down because it will be devastating on our communities and devastating on our state if this passes in any way, shape, or form this Fall. Thank you very much, Madame President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Courtney.

Senator **COURTNEY**: Thank you, Madame President, men and women of the Senate. Very briefly. I'm going to be voting in favor of this and I understand that this piece of legislation is very far from perfect as you start to read it line by line. It's somewhat similar to the piece that was passed by the voters requiring that the State fund education by 55%, which has been touted as L.D. 1, the companion piece and touted as tax relief for the State. I think what happened, if we're going on the record, is the process of referendums and the process of going through last Fall's referendum, when municipalities across the state said, 'Don't pass that Palesky bill. If we get extra money from the State for education we're going to return it all to the taxpayers.' Unfortunately, that didn't happen. That has led to the outrage and continued outrage of many people that pay the taxes in this state. This bill, if passed by the people next November, will give this legislature a chance to come back and put in a companion piece and address some of the deficiencies in this legislation. I would like to pass it today and address the deficiencies immediately. I think that this would go a long way to providing some tax relief that I believe the people of Maine deserve. Thank you, Madame President.

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

Senator **PERRY**: Thank you, Madame President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate. If this bill did only what the question leads you to believe it does I might consider voting for it. It goes well beyond that. In fact, how the question reads leads you to believe that bill does basically what we did in L.D. 1 and L.D. 1 is working and will continue to work as it's phased in over the next couple of years. Unfortunately, the whole nature of the state of Maine and the property tax base is changing. Home prices are escalating far faster than commercial property. As a portion of the total taxable pie, it is shifting percentage-wise more onto homes and off businesses. That is skewing everything we've done up until now. I think there is more we need to do. This certainly isn't it. Take the cap part out of it and take the rest of the bill and if had to design a bill to totally screw up the entire workings of all government I don't think you could have done a better job then the rest of what is in here. My own personal vision of what will happen if this is enacted, and I think it's a danger that it will be because it's a very neatly worded question and sounds appealing, is that I think we will be like you went back 20 years in the State budget, and lived under TABOR, the State budget would be cut roughly by 1/3. That leaves us with a couple of options, 1/3 of our budget is roughly the operation of the entire State of Maine gone, or 1/3 of K-12 education gone, or all of Human Services gone. I think what we end up doing is pushing our obligations onto the communities, municipalities, where they will override and it will end up squarely back on the homeowners. That's my biggest fear. It will be one more shift back onto the homeowners. It's terrible policy and it's time to kill it here, put it out to the voters, and tomorrow I'll start working to educate the voters as to why it's so dangerous. Thank you.

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

Senator **GAGNON**: Thank you, Madame President, men and women of the Senate. We come to my final hours here in the Maine Legislature. When I first came to this Body, Speaker

Mitchell asked me to serve on the Taxation Committee. I served on the Taxation Committee for a number of years. During those 10 years I kept hearing about taxes in Maine, the tax code, tax reform, and all of these things and how gargantuan a task it is. Tax reform is something that sounds great but when you get into the nitty-gritty, all of those exemptions and all those things, there is a reason why they are all there. We know why they are all there. We have had to deal with them here. We've passed new ones because we felt it important to have certain things. In those 10 years prior to TABOR and prior to a few other efforts we went from a sales tax of 6% down to 5.5% and now we're at 5%. We implemented the Homestead Exemption for all homeowners in the state of Maine, which at the time was the single largest decrease in property taxes in the history of the State of Maine. Recently we've passed L.D. 1, which is creating tax savings of about one mil in my community. I know it's not happening in all communities, but L.D. 1 isn't done yet either. This year we dealt with the personal property tax and made significant inroads in trying to also help businesses and deal with the equipment that is used in manufacturing, particularly in the equipment that is important for businesses to continue production. The so-call Production Tax. You never want to tax production. We made significant progress there. We did add a few more exemptions, as you recall. I can say that we got rid of an exemption. Back in my sophomore year we got rid of the sales tax trade in allowance for chainsaws. That was one I recall. We also increased the exemption on income for our entire veterans in the state of Maine.

It would be nice to be able to take a hatchet and make these types of cuts, but as everyone reminds us so often, we are not a wealthy state. The types of tax reform that we have to deal with, and at the same time take care of people in this state by putting our people first, we have to make them surgically. We need to go after the issues that are most important to Maine people and focus on what I used to refer to as the high pain taxes. You know what I mean by pain taxes. When you go and buy a Snickers bar or a bag of chips and you pay an extra nickel for that bag there isn't a whole of pain there. You remember we got rid of the snack tax too, that's another one. Nobody would not buy that Snickers bar or that bag of chips because it had a tax. By the way, chips don't have a tax any more. How about some of the pain taxes. Well, it's that property tax bill that you have to pay. We've gotten a little cleaver, the municipalities have gotten a little cleaver. Years ago it all had to be paid at one time. Now it's being divvied up over twice a year or four times a year to decrease the payment a little bit. My favorite one is the vehicle excise tax. When you go and register that automobile. You buy a new vehicle and pay a huge sales tax. Of course you probably finance that, so there is not a lot of pain there. Then you go to the town hall and you have to pay that one. A lot of pain there. Those are the types of things that we need to address. Those are the things that effect peoples' everyday lives. Let's try to deal with those painful issues.

TABOR is such a bad idea because of the way we have to go at this thing. I hope to spend my term, along with the good Senator from Penobscot, Senator Perry, traveling around the state and encouraging people and educating people about what TABOR would really do to our communities. It would get rid of all those essential services, or at least would jeopardize them. There would be new ways. People in this Body have been pretty good about giving gaming in the state a fair shake. There would be a great deal more effort to go after those types of approaches to solving our state's ills. More lottery pressure. More pressure on gaming to get more money. More pressure to go after things that we really shouldn't be going after, water and other things. I hope that we will leave here with some type of unity and try to lead by example. I think we have done that over the last 10 years. I hope that the people of the state of Maine will read this very carefully and understand it and not just listen to the sound bits or the snippets. This is something that is going to affect everybody. Madame President, as I leave the legislature, primarily because I think we've accomplished so much in tax reform, particularly property tax reform, I hope that this doesn't undermine everything that we've all been able to do over the last 8 to 10 years. Thank you, Madame President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Strimling.

Senator **STRIMLING**: Thank you, Madame President. I am pleased to hear my colleague from the other side of the aisle speaking so clearly about the deficiencies in the bill and it was clearly the understatement of the night, saying that this bill is far from perfect, because it is far from perfect and it is quite deficient in many ways, that we learned in some very long work sessions and would that we could fix them now. I do not have faith that if it passes those necessarily will be fixed. I would add, I want to be very clear, that there are two pieces. One piece that I forgot to mention earlier; the issue here is about cutting programs at the local level. We had testimony in front of us, we had testimony at the hearing from the Maine Heritage Policy Center, or some variant, I don't know their exact name. They continued to say over and over again that this will not cut. When I personally asked, 'If you are saying that the language that we are reading will not cut somebody's budget and somebody else says clearly that it does, will you be okay when we come back to make sure that this doesn't cut anybody's budget? Will you go on the record today and say that as an author of this bill you are telling us your intent was not to cut anybody's budget and when we come back we should make sure that nobody's budget would be cut?' he would not say that he would agree to that statement. He would say it would not cut, he wouldn't say it would be okay for us to fix the problem as the good Senator from York, Senator Courtney, says we may do because the people who wrote this bill were very clear that this is about trying to strangle government from the services that people need.

The other piece that is really important, we understand, is that people compare this to Colorado all the time. They say this one is okay and this one is better than Colorado, which major portions were just thrown out by the voters because they recognized how detrimental it was when the schools went from some of the top in the nation to some of the worst. They threw it out. People say this one is okay because we have some pieces in it that are going to hold it tight. They don't have, for instance, what's called the ratchet. I love that name. The ratchet. This doesn't have that. What the ratchet is, basically, is that if your expected revenue is $100 this year and you only get $80, you have to start next year's budget at $80. What they are saying is you can go back to the $100. Absolutely incorrect. If you want to follow along in the bill, I'd be glad to do that, section 2044 page 82A. The amount of revenue for the local districts for the previous fiscal year adjusted, we talked about that earlier, by the change in the assessed value, etcetera. The amount of revenue for the local district for the previous fiscal year. So if revenue comes up short one year, you will have to start at that point and

go forward. That's the ratchet that they put into effect in Colorado because they wanted to ratchet down the amount of services that people were receiving and it worked until the people threw it out. They included it in this bill. Although they say they did not but they did, in black and white. I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote no on this bill and the people of Maine come November.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Andrews.

Senator **ANDREWS**: Thank you, Madame President and fellow Senators. I will be out lobbying for this bill very strongly. I have submitted this bill twice to the legislative process. As I said the last time, if we don't chose to do it here the citizens of the state of Maine will do it for us. I like being number one. I like the idea of number one on my license plate. It's kind of nice. I was number two for a number of years, but now I'm number one. I'm going out number one. However, I don't particularly enjoy being number one as the most highest taxed state in the nation and neither do my constituents and the majority of the citizens of Maine. Before I put this bill in the first time and the second time I talked to many of the legislators from Colorado. As a result of this so-called TABOR bill out there they have not gone down the drain. They have a very good economy. They are doing quite well. They have changed and they have amended the bill, as what will be done with this bill. We talk about number one. Well, I have to say that L.D. 1 has not been the panacea to solve all our problems. I know a good many school districts and communities who are having to cut programs, close schools early, and etcetera as a result of L.D. 1. Cushions, various things. We talk about the Homestead Exemption. As I told the good Chief Executive down on the second floor when he said he hadn't raised taxes, I said, 'Sir, when you cut the Homestead Exemption, you raised taxes on every one of my homeowners.' How long can the citizens of the state of Maine tolerate being number one? Yes, this bill does need some work. Yes, L.D. 1 needs some more work. Nothing is perfect the first time through. The citizens that I've talked to in Maine have told me very clearly that they've had enough of being number one. I will vote to send this out to the citizens because this is what they want. They want a chance to be heard because they don't feel they are being heard here in Augusta. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Bartlett.

Senator **BARTLETT**: Thank you, Madame President. I rise in support of the pending motion and in opposition to this measure. I view the Taxpayer Bill of Rights as an avocation of responsibility. When I'm out on the campaign trail I often hear people tell me that we need to cut spending. I hear a lot of candidates talking about the importance of cutting government spending. What no one wants to do is to stand up and take responsibility for those cuts, take responsibility for higher student-teacher ratios, take responsibility for cutting heathcare, or take responsibility for cutting a wide range of covered programs. What people are looking for through this measure is something that will handcuff them so that we, as legislators, can go back to our constituents and say that we had no choice but to cut spending and it is all their fault because they passed TABOR. We would be living up to that measure by cutting those popular programs. What we are trying to do with this measure is put a straightjacket on politicians so that none of us have to take responsibility for the tough choices that have to be made. I would argue that if you believe that government spending needs to be cut then we should be campaigning on exactly what those cuts should be so that people can send legislators to Augusta with a mandate to accomplish that. What I hear over and over again from constituents is that although they want to cut government spending they want to make sure that their public education dollars are protected, they want to make sure that every child in the state who needs it has the healthcare they need, and that our elderly are not kicked out on the streets because they can't afford nursing home care. I would ask anyone who supports this measure to rise and indicate exactly what expenses you intend to cut once this ratchet takes effect so that people can know what it is they are voting for and then anyone who supports this measure can take responsibility for those cuts instead of simply putting a straightjacket on and saying they couldn't control it and it's because of TABOR. Thank you, Madame President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Courtney.

Senator **COURTNEY**: Thank you, Madame President, men and women of the Senate. I guess this really gets to the heart of the matter; the difference between the parties and the difference between the perspectives of how government should operate. I think many on our side of the aisle feel that you ought to have a certain budget and you spend the amount of money that you have whereas I see that the other side of the aisle often says that this is what they need and they need to come up with the money to spend. It's a fundamental difference. I respect the difference. I think that we are all passionate about it. I just want to go back and comment about the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Strimling. I just want to clear up one thing. He was talking about section 2044 page 82A, about the local expenditure limitations. That's one of the reasons that, when this is ultimately passed, it will need some clarification. We had one opinion that says the good Senator is correct, that it could create a cut and you would have to base you next year's budget on a reduced amount. We had another opinion that said that there isn't. We had an analysis that said it was ambiguous. It made it real clear for us, we just voted it out four or five hours later. I think there is really a lot of work that will to be done before this could be a law for the people of the state of Maine. I'm not arguing that point.

We heard about the ratchet and I think it goes back to that fundamental difference about having a certain amount of money and you spend that money. You don't go out and borrow to take care of somebody. One of the reasons I got involved is because I want to put people first. That's my mission for being up here. I think the only way we can truly do what we want to do and put people first is through fiscal strength and responsibility. If we do that we can accomplish some of the things that are near and dear to our hearts, like healthcare and providing for the people that we've made commitments to. I believe that if we increase spending more than the rate of inflation and more than people's incomes and more than the population growth, if we have an issue that we need to raise more money than that, I'm not afraid to make that case to the people. I think that is a good restraint. A classic example is what we just saw in here. We're providing benefits for people that we have absolutely no idea how to pay for. We all want to do it. We all want to give everybody everything. I want to provide health insurance for every person in this state but we don't have the money to do that. I think that if

we can start to turn the corner and start to work and live within our means then we can do those things because ultimately whenever you reduce the tax burden, if you look at the history of taxes across the country and across the state, revenues grow. You can take a portion of those revenues and do some of those things. You truly can put people first. Thank you, Madame President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brennan.

Senator **BRENNAN**: Thank you, Madame President, men and women of the Senate. A $71 billion tax cut to the most wealthy people in this country. Those people making more than $1 million get a $42,000 benefit. The largest deficits in the history of this country, the largest reorganization of the federal government and homeland security.

Senator **COURTNEY** of York rose to a **POINT OF ORDER** as to whether the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brennan, was speaking on the issue.

The Chair **RULED** that this was unclear as the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brennan, had not finished his sentence and the Chair would make a decision upon completion of the sentence.

Senator **BRENNAN**: Thank you, Madame President. The largest single intrusion of the federal government into educational policy. A healthcare plan called Medicare Part D that resulted in a $2 billion profit for the pharmaceutical companies. This is by the party that talks about fiscal responsibility and smaller government. Interesting. This particular proposal before us tonight; not one, not two, but three different reports have all come out and talked about how L.D. 1 has been effective and is moving the state in the right direction. It's rare that we have an opportunity to consider a bill that has already been an experiment in another state, an experiment that failed. It's really curious when we've had this demonstration, this experiment, in another state, that has now been rejected by the voters in those other states, that somehow the people of Maine will now have the opportunity to decide whether or not they want to adopt that same failed experiment. Hard to believe. Hard to believe that we would do that. Most importantly, and some people have touched upon this in part of the debate and I will agree with the good Senator from York, Senator Courtney, that I did stray a bit in my opening comments, is the thing that concerns me the most about this particular proposal is the impact that it will have on education. There is not one person in this chamber that does not believe in the importance of higher education and the importance of higher education in the state of Maine. You know what they ended up doing in Colorado with higher education because of the effects of TABOR and the taxpayers bill of rights? They had to end up enacting a voucher system because it was the only way that they could get funding for students to support higher education because the restrictions under TABOR were so stretch that they could only fund K-12 education but weren't able to put appropriate resources into higher education. They developed a voucher system.

Knowing all of those things, and I think once the public and people in Maine know all those things, this initiative will be resoundingly defeated at the polls. It will give us the opportunity to come back and continue on the good work that we have not one, not two, but three different studies that showed L.D. 1 is moving us in the right direction. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is the motion by the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Strimling to Accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. A Roll Call has been ordered. Is the Senate ready for the question?

The Doorkeepers secured the Chamber.

The Secretary opened the vote.

ROLL CALL (#491)

YEAS: Senators: ANDREWS, BARTLETT, BRENNAN, BROMLEY, BRYANT, COWGER, DAMON, DIAMOND, GAGNON, HOBBINS, MARTIN, MAYO, MITCHELL, NUTTING, PERRY, RAYE, ROSEN, ROTUNDO, SCHNEIDER, STRIMLING, SULLIVAN, THE PRESIDENT - BETH G. EDMONDS

NAYS: Senators: CLUKEY, COURTNEY, DAVIS, DOW, HASTINGS, NASS, PLOWMAN, SAVAGE, SNOWE-MELLO, WESTON

ABSENT: Senators: MILLS, WOODCOCK

EXCUSED: Senator: TURNER

22 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 10 Senators having voted in the negative, with 2 Senators being absent and 1 Senator being excused, the motion by Senator **STRIMLING** of Cumberland to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report, in concurrence, **PREVAILED**.

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

SENATE PAPERS

Bill "An Act To Provide Funding for Infrastucture for a New Downtown in the Town of Canton"

S.P. 865 L.D. 2120

Sponsored by Senator BRYANT of Oxford.
Cosponsored by Representative HOTHAM of Dixfield and Representatives: GERZOFSKY of Brunswick, PATRICK of Rumford.
Approved for introduction by a majority of the Legislative Council pursuant to Joint Rule 205.

On motion by Senator **ROTUNDO** of Androscoggin, **REFERRED** to the Committee on **APPROPRIATIONS AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS** and ordered printed.

Sent down for concurrence.