

# 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 Eighteenth Legislature**  
**State of Maine**

**Volume 2**

**First Special Session (Continued)**  
**May 20, 1997 to June 20, 1997**

**First Confirmation Session**  
**October 6, 1997**

**Second Regular Session**  
**January 7, 1998 to March 24, 1998**

**Pages 981 - 1977**

Senator **CATHCART** of Penobscot moved the Senate **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report, in concurrence.

On further motion by same Senator, **TABLED** until Later in Today's Session, pending motion by same Senator to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report, in concurrence.

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 **BANKING AND INSURANCE** on Bill "An Act to Provide Health Insurance Coverage for Prostate Cancer Screening" S.P. 320 L.D. 1060 (C "A" S-274)

Majority - **Ought Not to Pass** (9 members)

Minority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-274)** (4 members)

In Senate, May 21, 1997, the Minority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-274)**.

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

On motion by Senator **ABROMSON** of Cumberland, the Senate **ADHERED**.

Sent down for concurrence.

##### **Non-concurrent Matter**

Bill "An Act to Revise Certain Provisions of Fish and Wildlife Laws" (Emergency) S.P. 520 L.D. 1604 (C "A" S-281)

In Senate, May 21, 1997, **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-281)**.

Comes from the House, **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-281) AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" (H-619)** thereto, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

On motion by Senator **KILKELLY** of Lincoln, the Senate **RECEDED** and **CONCURRED**.

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

#### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

##### **Senate**

##### **Ought to Pass As Amended**

Senator **LONGLEY** for the Committee on **JUDICIARY** on Bill "An Act to Amend the Uniform Commercial Code as it Relates to Letters of Credit and Investment Securities"

S.P. 430 L.D. 1378

Reported that the same **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-309)**.

Which Report was **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill **READ ONCE**.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-309) **READ** and **ADOPTED**.

The Bill as Amended, **LATER TODAY ASSIGNED FOR SECOND READING**.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

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

HOUSE REPORTS - from the Committee on **UTILITIES AND ENERGY** on Bill "An Act to Restructure the State's Electric Industry" H.P. 1274 L.D. 1804

Majority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-568)** (12 members)

Minority - **Ought Not to Pass** (1 member)

Tabled - May 22, 1997, by Senator **CAREY** of Kennebec.

Pending - motion by same Senator to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report, in concurrence

(In House, May 21, 1997, the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-568)**.)

(In Senate, May 22, 1997, Reports **READ**.)

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

Senator **CAREY:** Thank you Mr. President. Mr. President and members of the Senate. I ask for your support on this bill. The Committee was very well prepared to take on this monumental task of restructuring an entire industry. The Committee had five returning members from the previous session

and two of those members, who played key roles, are current members of this Senate. They are Senator Harriman and Senator Cleveland. We held six forums on the entire subject of restructuring so that we could prepare ourselves for this task. Its history, regulation, intervention of Congress, what other states have done or are doing, co-generation, renewable power, visits by involved parties such as FERC, people from California, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Texas, all the utilities, the coalitions, the PUC, the Public Advocate, labor and, principally, just plain citizens. The Committee held straw votes on every single item that was considered. The bill addresses low income and labor needs. It sets a minimum level of renewable power sales. It protects consumers from unfair trade practices and points the way to lower energy costs for all. Marketing was a key question. Utilities have to divest themselves of their generation plants, but the trade-off was that they are allowed to market with some regulations. The vote of the Committee on allowing marketing was 7 to 6 not to allow this, but to their credit, those people who were in the 7, the majority, worked out a compromise that we 4 and the 6 in the minority were able to buy and I must say that it went a long way toward saving this bill.

Since the bill, in most purposes, doesn't kick in until March of the year 2000, we have time to fine-tune it as we observe what other states are doing in the process so that we can avoid the mistakes that they make along the way. I could go on but I do want to leave you with a couple of personal observations. We never had less than 11 of the 13 members of the Committee at any of the meetings. Truly a very dedicated group of men and women. No vote was ever taken until all debate had ended and all voices had been heard. And most important, we were carried through this entire process by the most competent policy and legal analyst staff person it has been my pleasure to work with, John Clark. The success of our mission is due to his efforts. Thank you Mr. President and colleagues.

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

**Senator HARRIMAN:** Thank you Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate. Today we will make history and unlike Winston Churchill who said, "That history will be kind to him, because he intended to write it himself." We however, will not have that luxury. The historians of electric deregulation will be the residential customers of Maine's current power companies, Maine Public Service, Bangor Hydro-Electric, and Central Maine Power Company. If enacted, this bill will irrevocably change them and the relationship they have with their customers forever. Before the historians reach for their pens, or in today's world their keyboards, I want to stand up and I need to speak up for the people who will be effected by your vote.

First, let me say a few heartfelt comments about my colleagues and the staff who make up the Utilities and Energy Committee and, in many ways, we genuinely have become family. Under the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Carey's, leadership we have spent the last five months learning, listening, probing and questioning the implications of this bill. Along the way, Senator Carey has ladled out his infamous wit in ample doses while skillfully moving us from one issue to another. Paula Thomas, our Committee Clerk, was always on top of the administrative aspects of our deliberations. After literally thousands of documents, hundreds of calls, letters and testimony, I must say how impressed I am with her flawless performance and professionalism that was delivered to us every

day and in every way. And like my good friend from Kennebec, Senator Carey, I must say that John Clark, our analyst from Policy and Legal Analysis, is a consummate professional. Day in and day out John delivered quality, professional guidance. Literally almost every day some of the best legal talent in Maine hinged on every word we discussed. John not only earned their respect and confidence, they relied on his professionalism to craft the language that is before you this afternoon. Not once, and I think this is truly remarkable, not once did the Committee find itself in conflict with the lobbyists who were working this bill, their understanding of it, and ours, not once. That's how professional John's work was.

Some of you may ask, "Why am I the only member of the Committee to part company with my colleagues after all this effort?" To be honest, I wanted to join in making this a unanimous report, to be part of the congratulatory remarks that have been so freely bestowed upon our Committee, but that would have been easy and the people affected by this bill, your neighbors and mine, would be lost and today, it is them who I am speaking for. I speak of the people, not of the businesses, who place their signatures on the front of the check each and every month to pay their electric bill. I speak of the people who work for the utility companies 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, who assure that when we flip the switch, the lights go on. And for the people from all walks of life, from every part of Maine, who have invested their hard-earned money in Maine's power utilities with the expectation of a fair return on their money and most especially, the return of their money. For the last three years I have spent the better part of my public service focusing on the goal of creating a competitive deregulated market for electricity. And while this bill is a good start, we can, and we must, do better. In fact, everyone on the Utilities and Energy Committee agrees that more legislation will be forthcoming to complete our task. And in the meantime, the Public Utilities Commission will be embarking on at least 35 new proceedings, many of them judicatory in nature during the next two and a half years. And some will say that this new regulatory process is only temporary. I say to you, why do we need to see more regulation to get ready for less regulation? I believe the reality is that we have too many doubts. Given that in the short term at least, we are saying that we need to re-regulate out of uncertainty or fear of what the future may bring. And therefore, we're saying that a true competitive market may not solve the perceived problems of unleashing an industry that we have closely regulated for over 80 years. In almost every state in America today, where electric prices are high, legislatures, just like ours are racing to enact laws purportedly to lower prices and deregulate the industry.

Maine is no exception. Yet California is the first state to do so with real experience. They've implemented their law and it is now coming to life in the marketplace and it's only been around for one year. So I ask, what's the rush? Consider if you will, this legislature completely rewriting the laws affecting education, mental health, or transportation. Wouldn't you want to go home and tell your constituents about the remarkable revolutionary, positive results that will be forthcoming? In this case, the case of electric utility deregulation, you won't be able to deliver that message. Instead, the only word you'll be able to use to your neighbor is "Maybe, hopefully, over the long run, we hope to see lower rates." In fact, a man who I've come to know and respect greatly, Tony Buxton, who is a spokesperson for the Industrial Energy Consumers Group, told me his clients are doing the best that they can. They're getting the best rates possible today and that it could only get worse for them in the future. Low income

consumers will be protected as they are now under the present law. So who will benefit? I think we'll see new multibillion dollar international companies enter our markets, and hopefully that's a good thing. They'll benefit, perhaps at the expense of some existing Maine workers. And it's true, this bill will likely produce lower rates for hospitals and municipalities and large manufacturers and malls, they'll save money on their generation costs most assuredly. But this will leave the residential, particularly the rural residential customer, in my opinion, without a robust market to choose from. It is predicted that most of these residential customers will end up on what's called the "Standard Offer" and you need to understand that the standard offer is a process that will be put out to bid by the Public Utilities Commission and as a result of this process, if the cost offered for generation of power combined with the charges of delivering the power to your home through the poles and wires along with the embedded costs for things like decommissioning Maine Yankee and the Public Advocate's office and the PUC and low-income energy assistance and some others, if you bring those two pieces back together again and they don't equal, or are less than the rates that will be in effect in the year this goes into implementation, the PUC has the power, the authority, to come back to us and say, "Whoa, sorry, slow down," maybe even say, "Stop." So I ask again, what is the rush? Would it not make more sense to learn from other states with larger population bases and utilities which are financially strong enough to withstand the turbulence this bill will create? And make no mistake about it, this bill will create big winners and it will create big losers. That's why I believe we should give Maine workers, their companies, and the communities in which they do business a better chance to succeed than this bill allows.

Let me just touch on a few examples. This bill requires utilities to divest their generation assets by the year 2000. For those of you familiar with real estate transactions, how many transactions where a house is listed and the commission check to the broker clears the bank occur in a relatively short period of time? Yet, we're saying that the utilities must divest themselves of their generating assets in that time frame, unless of course, through a proceeding, the utility can go back to the PUC and explain and prove why selling now wouldn't be a prudent thing to do. But the real question I have is, what happens to the property tax value? What happens if a generating asset in your district is sold for less than its assessed value? Wouldn't the new owner go down to Town Hall and say, "Hey, here's the market value of my generating asset. You need to lower my property taxes." We've spoken a lot in this session about property tax relief. What are we going to do for the communities that endure one of these examples I've just given you?

This bill talks a lot about marketing and as my good friend from Kennebec, Senator Carey, mentioned, that was a dividing and defining point in our committee work. The compromise says that existing Maine companies have the right to earn 33% of the market they operate in, including the so-called standard offer of only 20%. Yet, no such restrictions are placed on out-of-state or out-of-region competitors. Even if a customer wanted to do business with CMP or Bangor Hydro, they would not be able to do so if they represented the 34th percentage of the business, of the market.

I've mentioned divestiture. What happens if, by putting all of these assets on the market in a relatively short period of time, we depress the value, creating stranded costs which you and I will pay for through the wires charge?

There's another concept called securitization, an idea that could result in an immediate decrease in rates for everyone. It was not even considered as part of this bill. The answer was that we have a bill sponsored by my friend from Kennebec, Senator Carey, that will be coming in the next session to deal with that. To be sure, it's a controversial idea, yet when I asked if the Committee Chairs could write a letter to the PUC asking them to take a look at this in anticipation of the bill coming before us next session, it was summarily rejected with emphasis. Don't do it, we won't allow it. This will unravel the bill if you send a letter.

Clean air? We in Maine know all too well about the regulatory burden placed on our citizens to comply with the Clean Air Act, even though it's a proven fact that most of our pollution comes from the mid-west, with the prevailing winds delivering their dirty air here. If competition, as it spreads, enables coal and oil-fired plants there to enter new markets, our air pollution problems will get worse, creating potentially new Cleaner Air Act requirements by the federal government upon us.

I hope you've heard about the provision in the bill that talks about treating displaced workers with compassion, and that's a good thing. The costs associated with anyone who loses their job because of retail marketing will be borne by you and I through the wires charge. But what about the worker who loses his or her's defined Benefits pension plan, where they're vesting in accruals of benefits and just now beginning to be meaningful towards their retirement? Did you know that if another power marketing company acquires 10% or more of an existing Maine company that's marketing power, the PUC could require them to sell their marketing company. This could result, perhaps, in a lower stock value for the people who have invested their hard-earned money in these companies' stock. In fact, my good friend from Aroostook, Senator Kieffer, wanted to bring to my attention a letter he received just today from the President of Maine Public Service asking that this be given a second look, that it could cause harm to the stockholders of Maine Public Service, most of whom live in his district.

So what's the rush? You know, as important as this bill is, what's going on at Maine Yankee in Wiscasset overshadows all of the discussions, in my view, about deregulation and in the next six months or so, we'll likely know Maine Yankee's fate. If it can get back on-line, it will affect the market in a positive way. If it can't, this bill will take on a whole new perspective.

Metering and billing is in this bill. Will competition for metering and billing offer additional savings or will it be another source of confusion for the customer? We really don't know, but the bill says no later than the year 2002 it's going to happen.

In and of themselves, these matters I've mentioned don't seem too onerous, but together, when you put them all together, it says to me that in our race to deregulation we are creating more regulation. And in the race, we've placed a parachute on the backs of the very companies who have served us well and endured the regulatory and economic turmoil that got us to this point. Let me be clear. I do, I do favor a competitive market-driven electric industry. By waiting a relatively short period of time, we will know if Maine Yankee will be back on-line and as the non-utility generating contracts are renewed, whether this bill passes or not, rates will begin to come down anyway. And perhaps most importantly, our Maine companies and their employees and their stockholders will see their company regain its financial health.

And lastly, the power grid. If we could only extend that 20 miles and link up Maine Public Service's territory, then a true

robust competitive U.S. market would be open to all who choose to serve our markets.

So what's the rush? We could go forward with the wisdom that comes from learning what other states have done well and what issues have caused them to rethink. If we don't get this right, it will be the residential customers who will pay the price and these are the same customers who have already paid the price once for failed public policies that predicted that oil would likely reach \$100 a barrel. Who knows what the future will bring? Not long ago, who would have believed that you could make a phone call by a device carried in your briefcase that could make a phone call without a wire attached to it? Today we have cameras that don't need film. Will we soon see electricity delivered to our homes and businesses without poles or wires? My point is this, in life's schemes of things, sometimes we learn things that change our thinking in ways that we could not have imagined the day before. With so much at stake for Maine's residential customers, I ask, "What is the rush?" Sometimes you can act by not acting, and it seems to me that this may be one of those times, but I acknowledge that that is not to be and I have no illusions that my remarks are going to reverse the inevitable. But I do hope, I sincerely hope, that my remarks have helped you better understand and appreciate the work left for the Utilities and Energy Committee and the Public Utilities Commission. And there will be numerous bills and legislative proposals and regulatory proceedings and possible delays along the way. However, of this I am sure, by working together in the spirit of cooperation that my good friends from Kennebec and Androscoggin, Senator Carey and Senator Cleveland, have helped to foster, we will get it right for residential customers who depend upon us to include them in the results this bill seeks to achieve.

I know I've gone on probably longer than you wished and I'll close with a statement from Abraham Lincoln. "If in the end I am found to be wrong, ten legions of angels swearing I was right will not help me, but if in the end it proves me right, then all that has been said about me now will amount to nothing." Thank you Mr. President.

**THE PRESIDENT:** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Cleveland.

Senator **CLEVELAND:** Thank you Mr. President. The restructuring of the electric utility industry has been an issue that I have been interested in and working on for the last five years. In fact, I introduced the first bill ever to begin to restructure the electric utility industry in Maine and if I'm correct, maybe the first bill ever introduced in the United States. My good friend from Cumberland, Senator Harriman, I know, often finds that he must be a dissenting voice and often speaks on a number of issues, including the budget, in which he feels he can't join the majority and must take a position outlining some imperfection he has found in the legislation. But if we lived in a world where we expected perfection, if we lived in a world where we didn't anticipate improvement on all of our efforts, we would stand here never to do anything, too timid, too afraid, too concerned to see the future and have a vision of the possibilities of the benefits for this state and be frozen by indecision and indecisiveness and apprehension. That's often the role that some here wish to play, but it's not a role that moves us forward. When I first began looking at this issue and the concerns of this state, the well-being of its citizens and the economy of this state, it was clear that the cost of electricity and energy in this state was one of the most

critical aspects to move this economy forward, to provide job opportunities, job growth, expansion, greater income for businesses and individuals and that the benefits were enormous. And that the way to proceed to do that was to recognize that in the end of the 20th century, as we proceed to the 21st, that having a vertical monopoly on the production, distribution, and consumption of electricity was no longer an acceptable model. As a matter of fact, somewhere near 45% to 48% of all our power was already being provided by independent power producers under contract to the utilities. And that by introducing the time-tested notion of competition that we had the surest method by which we would get the price and the best reliability and the best product for the people of this state. Competition, a tried and true method of assuring that the goods and services provided are done so at the best price, in the right quantity, with the most innovation and the most incentive to succeed. Clearly our experiment with independent power producers has shown they are unbelievably reliable and when they were given the opportunity to compete openly without any artificial price markers the price dropped for the power they produced. So the benefits clearly are there. Will they all come immediately in the first few years? No, because we need a transitional period from a complete monopoly to an open and competitive market, but I have no doubt that the benefits are there and they will be substantial.

We also have to recognize that our choice is either to look at all of our New England neighbors, some of which have already proceeded with a restructured, competitive market, and others which will proceed in 1998, or to stand here still, dead in the water, waiting for years to see what will happen and then pay the penalty when we have to catch up when the other states have already benefited from an open and competitive marketplace. Are we going to be the first? No, we're not. We're not leading the pack. Many other states are going before us and we're happy that they're going before us and we have intentionally, intentionally, set our time schedule so we can benefit from the observations and experiences that they have. We are not the first. We don't want to be the first, but we don't want to be the last.

I want to describe to you for just a moment the care in which this Utility Committee, on a bipartisan basis, with an enormous number of hours, went through the process of looking and examining and discussing and debating every issue in open, in the public, allowing full discourse, full discussion by every single interested party that wanted to talk about it. Through every single work session, anyone who wanted to speak, anyone who had a point of view, anyone who had information was allowed the opportunity to express that and it was fully considered by the Committee. And 12 members were able to come to a decision that there were compromises and positions that would serve all interests. 12 out of the 13 members were able to do that. I have no doubt that the restructuring of the industry in allowing open and free market competition will provide benefits for all consumers, every single class of consumers. That was one of the underlying, primary principles of our work. If we were going to do this, everyone had to benefit, everyone needed the opportunity and, I believe, we've structured a bill that will ensure that every class of consumer will benefit from the competition. Some in different ways than others but not all classes are the same, not all classes consume electricity the same, not all classes have the same needs. Not all classes want to take, perhaps, the same level of risk that some others are willing to do but all will benefit.

Clearly, the costs of electric power are decreasing and they will continue to decrease by actions that have been taken both by the utilities and by this Legislature. But they will not decrease, and the full benefit will not occur, if we don't introduce competition. You have had regulation for nearly a century. You've tried that. This is not an untested method. Regulation is never as successful as true competition because true competition requires that every competitor be as successful as they can or the penalty is, you don't survive. Regulation does not require that. It just requires that you make a reasonable effort to be fair. We've tried regulation, and we've gotten good regulation, but we haven't gotten the full benefit of competition which is what we want to achieve with this bill.

There is no disagreement, no disagreement, by any party involved, the utilities, members of the Committee, interest groups, consumers, that competition is coming, that it's here and that we either position Maine to benefit from it or we accept the consequences of not doing so. The issue has been, how well can we structure that transition? How well can we prepare for full competition so that we protect the environment, we protect the workers of Maine, we protect the employees, we look after the interests of the companies, we consider the stockholders, the small consumers, all of the consequences involved in going through that transition? I want to suggest to you that we have done an outstanding job. I want to suggest to you that what we have drafted will be one of the models in this country that other states will look at for how the process is done and what the product is that you get when you complete it. Is it a perfect document? No. Will there be others who will improve upon it? Yes. But is it a very good document to lead us on the road that we must go? Absolutely, it is. I would strongly urge you to support the Ought to Pass motion. This will be an enormous benefit for your constituents, for the economy of this state, for the improvement of every individual's lives. It will be one of the most important things that you do, and I urge you to support the Ought to Pass motion.

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

Senator **MITCHELL:** Thank you Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, want to commend the Committee and the many people who contributed diligently to bring this bill to us today. The many hours that went into this work, it was truly an accomplishment for all the work that has been done. All of us had the goal of seeing the day when we could have reduced electrical rates and a deregulated process. However, as you move forward with corrections and changes, I would caution you, there were two provisions which I think that we really need to focus on and it focuses on customer service. History is repeating itself. This is our second utility deregulation and as we look on to the effect of the prior deregulation we had, let's talk about customer service. We're looking at marketing and we're saying that we're going to offer our people an opportunity to make a selection of who is to provide their power. But by restricting the marketing, are we truly doing that? Do we need to really focus more on making that marketing open and providing more fair competition and not restricting the existing providers by limiting their opportunity? Is this fair to our customers and to the people, the companies that are working here in this state? Also, you have a provision that deals with billing and metering and I would caution the fact that we talk about protecting employees and shareowners, but when you talk about billing services and

putting this out to other companies which would be out-of-state, you're talking about jobs. You're talking about jobs and centralizing billing services that would move out of the state and the jobs would go with them. That is a risk to the shareowners and it's a risk to people in our state. To further protect our constituents it also is a concern on restoring of service. The metering, the charges that could occur on restoring, and the metering costs, could be another increase to our existing customers.

I applaud you, once again, and I certainly support this bill but these concerns, as we go forward, we do need to focus on. What are we doing to our existing businesses in this state? We welcome competition, but we do need to protect the interests that we have here, the jobs and our constituents, by providing customer service in an ultimate way where they will not have only limited frustration with who they're dealing with in selection and the provisioning of repair and restoring of service. I would certainly urge everyone to vote in favor of this bill, but please listen to the concerns. Thank you.

On motion by Senator **CAREY** of Kennebec, the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-568)** Report **ACCEPTED**, in concurrence.

The Bill **READ ONCE**.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-568) **READ** and **ADOPTED**, in concurrence.

Which was, under suspension of the Rules, **READ A SECOND TIME** and **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED, As Amended**, in concurrence.

Under suspension of the Rules, ordered sent forthwith to the Engrossing Department.

---

Off Record Remarks

---

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

SENATE REPORTS - from the Committee on **LABOR** on Bill "An Act to Make the Workers' Compensation System More Equitable" S.P. 491 L.D. 1523

Majority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-301)** (9 members)

Minority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (S-302)** (4 members)

Tabled - May 22, 1997, by Senator **CATHCART** of Penobscot.

Pending - motion by same Senator to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-301)** Report

(In Senate, May 22, 1997, Reports **READ**.)