

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-Fifth Legislature

State of Maine

Daily Edition

First Regular Session
December 1, 2010 to June 29, 2011

Pages 1 - 1494

to do this, to provide these facilities without any State funding, we've gone to the generosity of our alumni who loved the school. That's the story on that \$16 million. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Sullivan.

Senator **SULLIVAN:** Thank you Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, just real quickly. The difference between this bill and what we do for colleges has to do with the Constitution and the right to a free and public education K-12. That is what is covered. I am of a firm commitment that when we continue, as has been said before, and we begin to fund all children, all children, even from those homes where parents do not find education a priority because they are too busy, the Constitution clearly says free and public education K-12.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The pending question before the Senate is the motion by the Senator from Lincoln, Senator Trahan to Accept the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended 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 (#109)

YEAS: Senators: COLLINS, COURTNEY, HASTINGS, MCCORMICK, PLOWMAN, RAYE, SHERMAN, SNOWE-MELLO, THIBODEAU, THOMAS, TRAHAN, WHITTEMORE, THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM - GARRETT P. MASON

NAYS: Senators: ALFOND, BARTLETT, BRANNIGAN, CRAVEN, DIAMOND, DILL, FARNHAM, GERZOFISKY, GOODALL, HILL, HOBBS, JACKSON, KATZ, LANGLEY, MARTIN, PATRICK, RECTOR, ROSEN, SAVIELLO, SCHNEIDER, SULLIVAN, WOODBURY

13 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 22 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator **TRAHAN** of Lincoln to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report, **FAILED**.

The Minority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **ACCEPTED**.

Sent down for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later (5/23/11) Assigned matter:

HOUSE REPORTS - from the Committee on **AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY** on Bill "An Act To Revise Notification Requirements for Pesticide Application"
H.P. 181 L.D. 228

Majority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-244)** (9 members)

Minority - **Ought Not to Pass** (4 members)

Tabled - May 23, 2011, by Senator **SHERMAN** of Aroostook

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

(In House, May 19, 2011, 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-244).**)

(In Senate, May 23, 2011, Reports **READ.**)

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

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Schneider.

Senator **SCHNEIDER:** Thank you Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, I just want to ask a question of the Chair about the appropriate time, I would like to offer my amendment. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair would advise the Senator that the correct time to present the amendment would be after acceptance of the Ought to Pass report. The pending question before the Senate is the motion by the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Sherman to Accept the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended 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 (#110)

YEAS: Senators: COLLINS, COURTNEY, FARNHAM, HASTINGS, JACKSON, KATZ, LANGLEY, MARTIN, MCCORMICK, PLOWMAN, RAYE, RECTOR, ROSEN, SAVIELLO, SHERMAN, SNOWE-MELLO, THIBODEAU, THOMAS, TRAHAN, WHITTEMORE, THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM - GARRETT P. MASON

NAYS: Senators: ALFOND, BARTLETT, BRANNIGAN, CRAVEN, DIAMOND, DILL, GERZOFISKY, GOODALL, HILL, HOBBS, PATRICK, SCHNEIDER, SULLIVAN, WOODBURY

21 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 14 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator **SHERMAN** of Aroostook to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report, in concurrence, **PREVAILED**.

READ ONCE.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-244) **READ.**

On motion by Senator **SCHNEIDER** of Penobscot, Senate Amendment "B" (S-160) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-244) **READ.**

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Schneider.

Senator **SCHNEIDER:** Thank you Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, first it is lovely to be spending this glorious evening with all of you on this beautiful day and I'm sorry that we're having to prolong this. I didn't anticipate that we were going to move forward on this, but in light of that, we are here and we get to talk about pesticides. Why is this amendment so important and why is the registry that we currently have so important to people? That's really what this debate is about. This amendment saves the registry that we have right now, which nearly 2,000 people are on. The registry that we now have is an easy system for people to sign up on so that they can be notified about pesticides being sprayed near to their residents. It's not cumbersome. It's about citizens who are concerned. As you know, many of them have issues. We have huge rates of childhood asthma in this state. We have issues; things like autism, which is exploding here in this state. I think 1 in 110 now have developmental disabilities now in our state. There are cancer rates that are very high in this state. It has been linked to exposure to things like pesticides. That's why there is such a concern about pesticides in our state. Some of the history that we have here, I have passed out a three page handout which tells you some of the reasons why people are so opposed to eliminating this particular registry. It's important to note that decades of work have gone into this and a great deal of compromise. Unanimous reports have been received out of committees in the past on this issue. It's with great disappointment that I find myself here having to debate this issue because it was my hope that we could come to some really reasonable compromise to save the registry and also, frankly, to work out issues that business people had because that is the way I'd rather see this worked on. I prefer to work on things in a collaborative way and I think that's apparent by my previous work on a lot of different issues. I would have liked to have continued this work because we are not going to see a chance during this growing season. The registry, even with the passage of L.D. 228 as it is, even without this amendment, this growing season, they will still have to do the same notification as they do now; the growers and the people in agriculture and so on. We would have had time to deal with this and really, I think, achieve a unanimous compromise. Unfortunately, that's not the place where we found ourselves. My amendment probably, and I hope that it's not just an amendment for the sake of talk, I'm hoping that some of you will come along with me on this amendment and that we can continue to keep the registry that we have now for the people, the 1,800 to 2,000 people, who are currently on that registry so they feel comfortable with the notification process.

Why should we have an easy way to notify people? Why should we make it the least cumbersome way possible? If you have to go back to the old system, the old system put the burden on the individual to seek out the growers or the people who were putting the applications down. What that meant was that they would have to go, for example, to their neighbors, perhaps the

tree farmer, or what have you, and ask them to notify them. That's the old way. It also was at a cost. There is an old registry that this would fall back on that would cost people \$20. Right away when I think of having to go to a neighbor I don't think that this is always a great way to start off with neighbors. It eliminates that concern of "Oh, I'm rocking the boat" with neighbors, for one thing. In addition, it makes it a very easy process, to be able to go online and click and say, "I want to be notified when pesticides are being applied nearby." It seems so reasonable. There is also going to be a GIS system, which is in my bill, to give additional time to work that out because soon it will be all the easier for people because of the technology that we will have to notify people. It will make it much easier on those applicators.

I want to talk just a little bit about this amendment and about a report that was given to us by the Board of Pesticides Control, which was dated January 11th. Their recommendations were actually to notify people, and I quote, "Experience has demonstrated that pesticide notification is an effective, low cost, tool for alleviating conflict because it removes the element of surprise and allows nearby residents to take simple, commonsense steps to reduce the risk of pesticide exposure." People are concerned about their children and their pets. They are concerned about their working animals. They are concerned about those being exposed and they just want a simple, easy mechanism to be notified. That's what we have currently that we are about to undo. If L.D. 228 passes un-amended Maine's free and simple effective aerial and air carrier pesticide spray notification registry will be repealed. After this growing season businesses that spray pesticides using aerial and air carrier technologies will not need to consult the registry for those 1,800 or 2,000 people. My amendment will protect the interests of those registrants. It will protect the integrity of the registry. It will reduce the notification distances for pesticide applicators. It will give the Board of Pesticide Control that additional time to work out the bugs in the GIS system. The specific criteria for notification will be as follows: non-agricultural pesticide applications within 250 feet of a property listed on the registry. The non-agricultural pesticide application using air carrier application equipment will be 500 feet of a property listed on the registry. The non-agricultural pesticide application using air craft application equipment is within 1,000 feet of a property listed. Agricultural applications are within 500 feet of a property listed on the registry. Agricultural aircraft pesticide applications is within 1,000 feet of a property, and, by the way, that reduces it from the 1,320 feet.

I know there is a lot of concern over this. We had another vehicle. I was very disappointed that it was almost immediately turned down. If you look through the three page handout that I gave you, if you look on the references there are many indications that pesticides do have impacts on our health. That's why this keeps coming back over and over to us. We can turn our backs on this and deny that fact, but I can assure you that what will happen is that they will be back again. I'm sure that if we pass L.D. 228 as it is, without the amendment, I can promise you that these will be back again to deal with this. This is not an issue that will end. It was my style to try to come to some mutual understanding that we could all live with and I'm hoping that this will be a mechanism to at least bring us to a more moderate position on this issue. It's not perfect by people in the environment community. I understand that, but it's a step that holds onto the registry that was worked on for so many years. With that, I hope you will vote with me on this amendment.

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

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Saviello.

Senator **SAVIELLO:** Thank you Mr. President. I can remember what I have to say because I wrote it down. First of all, let me give you a little bit of my background. Some of you don't know this but in my previous life, when I had the peace and tranquility of the woods and did not know what I was leaving when I left there, I managed a 10,000 per year herbicide program. In fact at one time I had four helicopters working on my land, on IP's lands, and flew all over the state coordinating that. For two years I was the manager of a 100,000 acre spruce bud worm project, taking care of the environmental issue related to that. I was a member of the Pesticide Control Board. In fact, I wrote the first notification laws for 15 years. I was appointed by an Independent, a Democrat, and a Republican Governor. I chaired that committee for 8 years, so I realize the importance of the use of pesticides and that they are properly used. I realize the importance of neighbor notification. On my own projects I bent over backwards to complete those efforts in a timely manner. The spraying that I did was one time, once a year, and often times, when you got into the great North Woods at St. Aurelie and places like that, you didn't have many neighbors, but I made that effort. Agriculture is different. It is different because when I first got on the board the effort used to be, "Well, it's Monday, I spray fungicides. Tuesday, I spray herbicides. Wednesday, I spray insecticides." They are all pesticides. Pesticides control pests. We changed that. We said that they needed to use something called integrated pest management. They had to spray when the insects and the diseases are about to over-take the crop. Not just everyday because, you know what, spraying is extremely expensive. If you drive in my town, up a street which I live on called Orchard Drive, there are orchards there that are no longer being farmed because it became too expensive to do that. In fact I chuckle often. I'm the only orchard that's left on Orchard Drive because I actually cultivate and manage about 22 Macintosh trees.

L.D. 228 addresses what we need to do, the amendment does not. Let me point out to all of you that you all use pesticides. Do you have a swimming pool? Do you put chlorine in it? That's a pesticide. Do you spray Deet to protect yourself from bugs biting outside? That's a pesticide. You would be surprised how many pesticides are sprayed in the grocery stores when you go there. Do you know why you don't see any bugs on the floor? Pesticides. Most likely this room has probably been sprayed at some time to control pests, not to control us.

I do have some information from a constituent that talked about the proposal that is in front of us. I just wanted to read that to you. In short, she says to me, and this is what I consider a green landscaper, "L.D. 228, as written, without the amendment, brings back commonsense and common courtesy. It encourages us to establish a relationship with our neighbors, something that has been missing from our culture for too long." I also have some information from the Pesticide Control Board, from Henry Jennings, who is a fine young man who we hired when I was on the Pesticide Control Board and who has worked diligently to try to solve this. His quote to me was, "A one size fits all registry is very cumbersome and can create burdens. The old system that

we presently have is better tailored to fit the unique circumstances for urban, rural, and wide area spraying. No other state has a comprehensive registry like the one that we have proposed." I also want to emphasize that in the letter that Henry sent to the Commissioner he pointed out that they will continue to work on the GIS system but it needs a lot of work to have it take place so that an applicator can go online and actually see where these sites are and determine whether he has a neighbor or someone else that he needs to notify. Also that person needs to have some responsibility. Presently it's \$20 to be on the urban registry which exists. There are 24 people on that. There are 2,000 on the other one because it's free and perhaps many of them are not signing up on there or have their own reasons for signing up.

In short, I appreciate the good Senator's suggestions with her amendment. I believe and I'm very confident that we will have some kind of registry in the future using a GIS system but there is no need for this amendment. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Schneider.

Senator **SCHNEIDER:** Thank you Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, decades of work have gone into this and it seems interesting that the report findings have been pretty clear about it. I want to read you on a page here about recommended notification distances for a comprehensive registry. It specifies non-powered commercial applications; granular applications, including aerial; powered backpacks; and so on at 250 feet. It goes on to boom sprayers at 500 feet and list a whole litany of them and 1,320 feet for aerial spraying. This is from the Board of Pesticide Control, report of findings and recommendations on January of this year. I just find it interesting that now the Director is backtracking on this. I don't think it's any mystery, given the current tone under the dome and what was in L.D. 1 regarding his position. I just think what needs to happen is that we need to listen to whole board. This registry has been effective. It's unfortunate. I don't think this is just a small band of people that want to be notified.

As we learn more and more about the impact of various chemicals on our bodies that we find that there will be much more of a call out from every person, regardless of political affiliation, because of illnesses and disabilities and things that are being built up in our system that may have to do with these chemicals. If we are being exposed to them here because of bombs that have gone off in this building to clear pests, then I would like to know about it, personally. I would suggest that this is not a great thing, that we are exposing ourselves to these things. People are finding, when they are being tested, these chemicals in their bodies. We have to recognize that as we wonder why we are getting so many cases of cancer. What's going on? Why all the cases of autism? Why are so many of kids asthmatic? Yet we turn a blind eye to these things and we make it difficult for people to get notified.

Is this perfect? Is this registry the panacea? No, but at least it gives people a comfort in knowing that they have access. By the way, I don't think it's exactly neighborly. I know when a neighbor of mine does something and I go over and ask questions it puts me in a really funny, awkward position if they are doing something. They think I'm asking about it because I'd really rather them not be doing it. That's not like a big neighborly thing.

I'm sorry for that person that thinks that this is a great way to start off a neighbor relationship is by going and asking them about being notified about their pesticide application because they really don't want to be exposed to it. This isn't about the stuff that's put down on your lawn as Greenthumb drives along and puts this stuff down, the little granular things. I've had people complain about that to me, because I use that. Should I notify my neighbor if they want to know? Absolutely. I think it's our responsibility. If we're going to use things that other people are worried about that we should notify them. I think we should make it as easy as possible to notify them.

By the way, I was willing to work on this throughout this next year, but there was a rush on this because the idea was to just get rid of it. I don't think that's what the people of Maine want. I think we'll find out that it's not what the people of Maine want. I know that there are people in this Chamber that have been willing to compromise and I want to let them know that I appreciate that, but it was not during that committee deliberation that we had that opportunity. That's too bad. Instead we have to do it on debate on the floor. It's not the way I like to work. I like to work in the committee process. Believe me, I'd much rather do this discussion in the committee process, in an open and thorough way, and in a collaborative way, because I think we could have come to a better results. Here I am, arguing for something that, unfortunately, I don't have the greatest wealth of expertise on, but I have enough expertise to know that there are mothers and fathers and aunts and uncles and people who care about, in particular, their kids and they don't want them exposed to chemicals. They know, in particular, young people are very susceptible to things, the expose to these kinds of chemicals, and we should be doing what we can do to make it as easy as possible, and also recognizing that we don't want to burden businesses, for them to get that notification. That's what this is about. Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Saviello.

Senator **SAVIELLO:** Thank you Mr. President. Just a couple of things. One, in relation to neighbors. We sit here and often talk about farms. How beautiful they are. Apple orchards. When I was on the Pesticide Control Board, I'll share a little story with you, apple orchard and neighbor bought a piece of property there. Came in front of the board because they were spraying chemicals on the apple orchard. I asked the question; "How come you live by the apple orchard?" "It's beautiful. I like the blossoms. I love the apples in the Fall." I asked him how long had the apple orchard been there. A hundred years. How long had he been there? Three years. "Did you not know that they sprayed those apples?" The answer was silence on the other end.

Let me just answer a few points that were made. Presently, and I'm glad you pointed out that backpack sprayers are 250 feet, the notification requirements right now are 500 feet. Aerial spraying, that is the one thing that was chanced in the present L.D. 228, to 1,000 feet is it was aerial spray. Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Schneider, requests unanimous consent of the Senate to address the Senate a third time on this matter. Hearing no objection, the Senator may proceed.

Senator **SCHNEIDER:** Thank you Mr. President. Just briefly, I want to say a couple of things. There are people who have bee hives. When we talk about sensitive areas, people who have bees, we wonder where all the bees have gone. Ask yourself about that. There is a concern about that. About spraying bees. Perhaps maybe those people thought that this was an organic farm. I don't know. I'm just pointing out that also when these chemicals go, when they go through the air, they end up on people's land where they are trying to produce organic fruits and vegetables. I just want to point that out. Those are some of the concerns we've heard in the past. I don't think we'll stop hearing them. Mark my words. People will be back and you'll be hearing this in two years. I won't be here with you, but you'll be all here listening to a similar argument because this is not going to go away. This is going to grow. Remember that I was trying to help you all avoid that. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Goodall.

Senator **GOODALL:** Thank you Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, I rise today just to agree with the good Senator from Penobscot. As the good Senator from Franklin, Senator Saviello, pointed out, he, too, had a prior history. Before my electrical career I was in the landscaping business and went to school for that. Agronomy. People want to know, they want to know what is being applied to land. They want to have the ability to learn about the products, especially products that have a drift potential and they can see it occurring. We've probably taken a double take at those small signs that are posted, as the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Schneider, said, on residential lawns. People read them. People have misconceptions. They often go back home and they look it up on the internet and then they feel better about it. They have questions. Can I let my dog out on that? I know that's not the topic of this bill, but what this does is provide a tool that has just to be fully instituted, frankly, and we need to give it a chance to work. The amendment is heading it in the right direction. Until we have a system that is accepted by industry, obviously the Legislature, and the public we're going to be constantly battling this topic. It needs to be resolved because the Senator from Franklin is right. Pesticides are all around us, but people need to have the right to know and they shouldn't have to pay to find out. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Waldo, Senator Thibodeau.

Senator **THIBODEAU:** Thank you Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, just a couple of things that I think we need to clarify here. L.D. 228 in no way relieves anybody's obligation to make sure that their pesticides do not drift onto other people's property. I know that the good Senator from Penobscot, Senator Schneider, certainly wasn't trying to indicate that it did. I know she wouldn't do that. I've enjoyed working with her a great deal and found her very pleasant and forthright. The other thing that I think is real important is to recognize that nobody needs to be surprised when your neighbor is spraying pesticides. I think we all agree to that. The fact of the matter is the easiest and most effective way to make sure that you're notified, quite frankly, is to reach out to that neighbor that's growing corn next to your home or blueberries or whatever the crop happens to be and say, "You know, when you get ready to spray would you mind giving

me a call? By the way, what are you planning on spraying this year?" Guess what? That farmer then has the obligation to make sure that you are notified of what he's spraying and when he's going to spray it. I just think that's important to note. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Woodbury.

Senator **WOODBURY:** Thank you Mr. President. If I ever want to do a filibuster I'd definitely like the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Schneider, on my side. Having looked at her amendment, I find it imminently sensible. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The pending question before the Senate is the motion by the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Schneider to Adopt Senate Amendment "B" (S-160) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-244). 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 (#111)

YEAS: Senators: ALFOND, BARTLETT, BRANNIGAN, CRAVEN, DIAMOND, DILL, GERZOFISKY, GOODALL, HILL, HOBBS, PATRICK, SCHNEIDER, SULLIVAN, WOODBURY

NAYS: Senators: COLLINS, COURTNEY, FARNHAM, HASTINGS, JACKSON, KATZ, LANGLEY, MARTIN, MCCORMICK, PLOWMAN, RAYE, RECTOR, ROSEN, SAVIELLO, SHERMAN, SNOWE-MELLO, THIBODEAU, THOMAS, TRAHAN, WHITTEMORE, THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM - GARRETT P. MASON

14 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 21 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator **SCHNEIDER** of Penobscot to **ADOPT** Senate Amendment "B" (S-160) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-244), **FAILED**.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-244) **ADOPTED**, in concurrence.

ASSIGNED FOR SECOND READING NEXT LEGISLATIVE DAY.

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

Bill "An Act To Assist Seasonal Entertainment Facilities with Public Safety Requirements" (EMERGENCY)
H.P. 105 L.D. 123

Tabled - May 25, 2011, by Senator **WHITTEMORE** of Somerset

Pending - **PASSAGE TO BE ENGROSSED**, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**

(In House, May 23, 2011, the Minority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.)

(In Senate, May 24, 2011, the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.)

(In Senate, May 25, 2011, **READ A SECOND TIME**.)

On motion by Senator **WHITTEMORE** of Somerset, under unanimous consent on behalf of Senator **MASON** of Androscoggin, Senate Amendment "A" (S-163) **READ**.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Whittemore.

Senator **WHITTEMORE:** Thank you Mr. President. This amendment does nothing other than remove the Emergency Preamble in the Emergency clause. Thank you.

Senator **BARTLETT** of Cumberland requested a Division.

Same Senator requested a Roll Call.

On further motion by same Senator, supported by a Division of 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 (#112)

YEAS: Senators: COLLINS, COURTNEY, FARNHAM, HASTINGS, KATZ, MARTIN, MCCORMICK, PLOWMAN, RAYE, ROSEN, SAVIELLO, SHERMAN, SNOWE-MELLO, THIBODEAU, THOMAS, WHITTEMORE, THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM - GARRETT P. MASON

NAYS: Senators: ALFOND, BARTLETT, BRANNIGAN, CRAVEN, DIAMOND, DILL, GERZOFISKY, GOODALL, HILL, HOBBS, JACKSON, LANGLEY, PATRICK, RECTOR, SCHNEIDER, SULLIVAN, TRAHAN, WOODBURY

17 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 18 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator **WHITTEMORE** of Somerset to **ADOPT** Senate Amendment "A" (S-163), **FAILED**.

Senate at Ease.

Senate called to order by President Pro Tem **GARRETT P. MASON** of Androscoggin County.